

Submissions for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

Online form and written submissions

This document includes the submissions made for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley. Some responses from stakeholders have similar replies and comments and may appear to be duplicated. We have included all submissions for transparency and redacted contact information for privacy reasons.

If you have any questions or need assistance with this document, please contact the department on water.enquiries@dpie.com.au.

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au

<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>

on behalf of

digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>

Fri 16-December-2022 12:55 AM

To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and personal details to be treated as confidential.: Yes

Personal details

Name:

Postal address:

Telephone:

Email address:

Submission details

Who are you representing?:

If you are representing 'an organisation', please provide the name of the organisation:

Which stakeholder group best describes you?:

Community member

If you answered 'other', please provide the stakeholder group that best describes you:

Have you attended a webinar or other meeting as part of this consultation?: None of these

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?: Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: No

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?: No

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?: No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?: No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?: No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?: No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?: No

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: No

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?: No

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?: No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?: No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

Upload additional feedback:

No file
uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Mon 23-January-2023 6:59 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be treated Yes
as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)
If you are representing 'an
organisation', please provide
the name of the organisation:
Which stakeholder group Irrigation
best describes you?:
If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:
Have you attended a webinar
or other meeting as part of Meeting in Wee Waa
this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account Yes
management rules?:
I support this as long as the 5 year rule starts from day 1 of the
plan and the final harvesting number for our entity is acceptable,
1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: and a true and accurate reflection of the value of this type of water
take to our business over the years
2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available No
water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:
2.1 – Please provide a reason It should be 5ML per share. Can the department determine when
for your support/opposition.: the next drought will be? What if we have a massive flow in the
system like we have had this summer and then not another for 5

years? Are all the staff, suppliers and business owners of the Namoi Valley happy to have this water flow past to then flow out to sea without being able to access the benefits of this renewable resource that has been harvested legally for the duration of the northern irrigation industry? Are the people of NSW happy to have the prosperity that comes from these events be lost to other states and ultimately be wasted? up to 75% of the value of a cotton crop is spent on inputs that supports businesses and communities.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

As long the FPH number is adequate

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

if the water is so connected to the river as is argued by the department then why cant the water be traded more widely?

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

see above,

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Why should Menindee Lakes be artificially managed in this way? Does it not experience dry and wet periods in tune with the climate? how much of this floodplain water that is harvested would make its way there? How much of this water is then released to south australia to discharge salt from the lower lakes? What provisions are in place to amend these numbers if they are proven to be wasteful of water?

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?: No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?: No

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: I support 5ML per share

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: I support 5ML per share

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on:: Downstream outcomes report, Modelling, Predicted environmental outcomes

Please provide your feedback in the below box: Does the policy adequately take into account extreme weather events that are predicted into the future. If major flood events occur, why cant irrigators access water above the cap? it will only be wasted and put further flood pressure on down stream communities

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi valley

Office use only		Submission number	
-----------------	--	-------------------	--

How to fill out this form

The department is seeking stakeholder views on the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting licences to be included in the *Water Sharing Plan for the Namoi and Peel Unregulated River Water Sources 2012* and the *Water Sharing Plan for the Upper and Lower Namoi Regulated River Water Sources 2016*.

The department acknowledges that the importance of raising issues and concerns in relation to proposed rules for floodplain harvesting licences through a transparent public submission process. The department is committed to letting members of the community 'have your say'.

To ensure a balanced and comprehensive approach to consultation, the department is focussed on the scope of issues and concerns raised rather than the number of submissions received. It is important that the reasoning for why a proposed rule is supported or not supported is understood, communicated and responded to.

Before completing this submission, please ensure you have read the Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi: [Report to assist consultation](#) and viewed the other relevant technical reports and information available on [our website](#).

After reviewing the submissions and other feedback, recommendations will be made to the Minister for Lands and Water.

Send this completed form to floodplain.harvesting@dpie.nsw.gov.au

Note: Submissions close at 11.59 pm Sunday 29 January 2023.

Information on privacy and confidentiality

All submissions received by NSW Department of Planning and Environment will be reviewed and published. The department values your input and accepts that information you provide may be private and personal.

please tick the relevant box below if you would prefer your personal details and identifying information, to be treated as confidential.

If you don't request that your personal details be treated as confidential, the department will include your name and any personal details you provide when publishing your submission.

Please note that, regardless of a request for confidentiality, the department may be required by law to release copies of submissions to third parties in accordance with the *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009*.

© State of New South Wales through Department of Planning and Environment 2022. Information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing, November 2022, and is subject to change. For more information, please visit

Personal details

I would like my name and personal details to be treated as confidential.	☐ Yes ☐ No
Name	
Postal Address	
Telephone	
Email address	

Submission details

Who are you representing?	☐ Myself (individual) ☐ An organisation (<i>name</i>):	
Which stakeholder group best describes you? (Please tick one box)	☐ Community member ☐ Irrigation ☐ First Nations ☐ Environment ☐ Fishing ☐ Local landholder	☐ Local Government/ Utilities ☐ NSW Government ☐ Other State Government (specify): ☐ Commonwealth ☐ Other (specify):
Have you attended a webinar or other meeting as part of this consultation?	☐ Public webinar ☐ Meeting in Wee Waa	☐ none of these

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Lower Namoi Regulated River

You may respond to any (or all) of the questions

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?

Yes ☒ No ☐

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

FPH access is seasonal and unpredictable. A 5 year banking arrangement makes sense.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☒

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

The account should start full. The policy has been delayed for years by Govt. and that d

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☒ No ☐

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

☒
Reason:

If the Govt. wants FPH entitlement from irrigators they should buy it back rather than err

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?

Yes ☐ No ☐

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

5 - Do you support the proposed management zones?

Yes ☐ No ☐

5.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

FPH Total FPH entitlement si Valley wide. Free and unfettered trade should be permitted

6 - Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?

Yes ☐ No ☒

6.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Free trade should be allowed.

7 - Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?

Yes ☐ No ☒

7.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

A Menindee Lakes trigger leaves FPH access in the Namoi reliant on the management of

8 - Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

Yes ☐ No ☒

8.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

We have no faith in the source model which is indicative of Govt. continually moving the

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Unregulated River Water Sources

You may respond to any (or all) of the questions

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?

Yes ☒ No ☐

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☒

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

3. - Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☒ No ☐

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

4 - Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?

Yes ☒ No ☐

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

5 - Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?

Yes ☐ No ☒

5.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

6 - Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

Yes ☐ No ☒

6.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Further feedback

The department is interested in what you have to say. If you want to provide more detailed feedback, please do so in the box below. Any feedback on the technical reports and other documentation will be considered for future planning processes.

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on:

- ☐ Downstream outcomes report
- ☒ Modelling
- ☐ Predicted environmental outcomes
- ☐ Report to assist community consultation
- ☐ Floodplain harvesting measurement
- ☒ Other information provided by the department
- ☐ Other

This feedback form below is poorly formatted and largely unusable. The text all runs on one line

Please provide your feedback in the below box or provide a separate document with your comments.

Feedback:

Modelling. The new Source model for the Namoi is rejected. Namoi Water has identified over 4

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Fri 27-January-2023 3:03 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be Yes
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you
representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:

Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Irrigation

If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that
best describes you:

Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting
as part of this Meeting in Wee Waa
consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account Yes
management rules?:

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate seasonality.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is a reasonable concept to prevent concentration, however Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access, however it will allow businesses to adapt and adjust if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. The ability to trade is a

requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support the trade. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies / exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restri

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge (419021). This trigger is in the large fresh range, and is when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users which would not make the end of system, or in particular cases, the river channel, being inaccessible. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. For example, the Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge (416001) which is at the top of the small fresh range and the bottom of large fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations, which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system with very clear climatic, geographic, hydrological, and environmental contrasts from the beginning of the catchment to the end. To ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge (419012) should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML p

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which would be provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them "subject to further changes". They undermine confidence in the process, especially as they do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. These amendments acknowledge that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. I support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation

regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which would be provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them "subject to further changes". They undermine confidence in the process, especially as they do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. These amendments acknowledge that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on::

Modelling

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are currently forty-six (46) issues and concerns tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes which have been submitted from the public consultation with a response only provided with three working days before submissions are due. Until such time as there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further consultation with industry held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi.

Upload additional feedback:

No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Fri 27-January-2023 3:31 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be No
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: Henry Thompson
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:

Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Irrigation

If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:

Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting None of these
as part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account Yes
management rules?:

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to
store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support
the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate
seasonality.

2 – Do you support the No
proposed initial available

water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?: Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?: Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?: No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is a reasonable concept to prevent concentration, however Volumetric Licensing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access, however it will allow businesses to adapt and adjust if their historical access changes due to volumetric licensing. The ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support the trade. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further

assess anomalies / exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restric

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

- I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge (419021). This trigger is in the large fresh range, and is when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users which would not make the end of system, or in particular cases, the river channel, being inaccessible. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. For example, the Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge (416001) which is at the top of the small fresh range and the bottom of large fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations, which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system with very clear climatic, geographic, hydrological, and environmental contrasts from the beginning of the catchment to the end. To ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge (419012) should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which would be provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them "subject to further changes". They undermine confidence in the process, especially as they do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. These amendments acknowledge that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. I support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunit

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current

unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which would be provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them "subject to further changes". They undermine confidence in the process, especially as they do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. These amendments acknowledge that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. I support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunit

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

Upload additional feedback:

No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Fri 27-January-2023 6:02 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be No
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: Daniel Kahl
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)
If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:
Which stakeholder group Community member
best describes you?:
If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that
best describes you:
Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting Meeting in Wee Waa
as part of this
consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the Yes
proposed 5-year account
management rules?:

1.1 – Please provide a - I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
reason for your flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
support/opposition.: when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
 abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
 opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
 to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to
 store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support
 the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate
 seasonality.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licensing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licensing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is

no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect

of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?: No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on:: Modelling, Other

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

MODELLING The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sat 28-January-2023 4:22 AM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be Yes
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:

Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Irrigation

If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:

Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting None of these
as part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account Yes
management rules?:

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your support/opposition.: 1.1 - I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate seasonality.

2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available No

water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2.1 - The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

3.1 - Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?: Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

4.1 - The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?: Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

5.1 - Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?: Yes

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

6.1 - No trade between management zones is a reasonable concept to prevent concentration, however Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access, however it will allow businesses to adapt and adjust if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. The ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support the trade. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further

assess anomalies / exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any r

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

7.1 - I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge (419021). This trigger is in the large fresh range, and is when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users which would not make the end of system, or in particular cases, the river channel, being inaccessible. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. For example, the Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge (416001) which is at the top of the small fresh range and the bottom of large fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations, which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system with very clear climatic, geographic, hydrological, and environmental contrasts from the beginning of the catchment to the end. To ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge (419012) should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

8.1 - Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which would be provided by establishing a clear set of rules by making them "subject to further changes". They undermine confidence in the process, especially as they do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. These amendments acknowledge that there is not perfect information, which implementation of licencing can help to address. I support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting oppo

Submission details

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish
to provide feedback on::

Modelling, Other

Please provide your
feedback in the below box:

The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are currently forty-six (46) issues and concerns tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes which have been submitted from the public consultation with a response only provided with three working days before submissions are due. Until such time as there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further consultation with industry held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. Consultation has not been acceptable. There was one in person forum held, and one online webinar. To do such minimal consultation at a time when the water users in the Namoi were still managing flood impacts and trying to salvage winter crop harvest is unreasonable. A webinar which does not allow participation outside of a written comments section is an information d

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sat 28-January-2023 9:40 AM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be treated as Yes
confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please provide the
name of the organisation:

Which stakeholder group best
describes you?: Irrigation

If you answered 'other', please
provide the stakeholder group
that best describes you:

Have you attended a webinar or
other meeting as part of this Public webinar
consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account
management rules?: Yes

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only
occur when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is
most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during
these opportunities, to provide our regional communities the
opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and to
allow water users to store excess flood plain harvesting and
other forms of water for future use.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for
your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available water
determination of 1 ML per unit
share?: No

- 2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: The Available Water Determination should start at 500% as per the 5 year management rules. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.
- 3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: Yes
- 3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.
- 4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?: Yes
- 4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993- 1994 development level is acknowledged.
- 5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?: Yes
- 5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.
- 6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?: No
- 6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: The ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support the trade. Floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.
- 7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?: No
- 7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. For example, The trigger points for both the Border Rivers and the Gwydir River is generally in the small fresh range, as well as the Gwydir River has multiple trigger points. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi

(Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Builbone gauge at 2600ML Should be for the Lower Namoi trigger point. (Top of the small fresh range)

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state. I support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of the decision making.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

As in Regulated No. 1

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

As in Regulated No. 2

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

As in Regulated No. 3

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

As in Regulated No.4

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: AS in Regulated No. 5

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?: No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: As in Regulated No. 6

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on::

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sat 28-January-2023 10:57 AM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be No
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: Susan Wright
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you
representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:

Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Irrigation

If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that
best describes you:

Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting
as part of this
consultation?: Meeting in Wee Waa

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account Yes
management rules?:

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern systems, which only occur when our rivers
are full as a result of rainfall and water is most abundant. Rules must
allow for meaningful access during these opportunities to provide our
regional communities the opportunity to access water when it is most
abundant and to allow water users to store excess FPH and other
forms of water for future use, to support the productive use of water
and mitigate the impacts of climate seasonality.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:	No	
2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:		The AWD should start at 500% as per the 5 year management rules. The licencing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification
3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:	Yes	
3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:		Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.
4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:	Yes	
4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:		The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.
5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:	Yes	
5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:		Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.
6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:	No	
6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:		No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the

National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I completely reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not even make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year 5 or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect

of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The AWD should start at 300% as per the 3 year management rules. The licencing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 93-94 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on::

Modelling

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is too

important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional
feedback:

No file uploaded

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi valley

Office use only		Submission number	
-----------------	--	-------------------	--

How to fill out this form

The department is seeking stakeholder views on the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting licences to be included in the *Water Sharing Plan for the Namoi and Peel Unregulated River Water Sources 2012* and the *Water Sharing Plan for the Upper and Lower Namoi Regulated River Water Sources 2016*.

The department acknowledges that the importance of raising issues and concerns in relation to proposed rules for floodplain harvesting licences through a transparent public submission process. The department is committed to letting members of the community 'have your say'.

To ensure a balanced and comprehensive approach to consultation, the department is focussed on the scope of issues and concerns raised rather than the number of submissions received. It is important that the reasoning for why a proposed rule is supported or not supported is understood, communicated and responded to.

Before completing this submission, please ensure you have read the Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi: [Report to assist consultation](#) and viewed the other relevant technical reports and information available on [our website](#).

After reviewing the submissions and other feedback, recommendations will be made to the Minister for Lands and Water.

Send this completed form to floodplain.harvesting@dpie.nsw.gov.au

Note: Submissions close at 11.59 pm Sunday 29 January 2023.

Information on privacy and confidentiality

All submissions received by NSW Department of Planning and Environment will be reviewed and published. The department values your input and accepts that information you provide may be private and personal.

please tick the relevant box below if you would prefer your personal details and identifying information, to be treated as confidential.

If you don't request that your personal details be treated as confidential, the department will include your name and any personal details you provide when publishing your submission.

Please note that, regardless of a request for confidentiality, the department may be required by law to release copies of submissions to third parties in accordance with the *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009*.

© State of New South Wales through Department of Planning and Environment 2022. Information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing, November 2022, and is subject to change. For more information, please visit

Personal details	
I would like my name and personal details to be treated as confidential.	☐ Yes ☒ No
Name	[REDACTED]
Postal Address	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]
Telephone	[REDACTED]
Email address	[REDACTED]

Submission details		
Who are you representing?	☐ Myself (individual) [REDACTED] Environment Society ☐ An organisation (name):	
Which stakeholder group best describes you? (Please tick one box)	☐ Community member ☐ Irrigation ☐ First Nations ☒ Environment ☐ Fishing ☐ Local landholder	☐ Local Government/ Utilities ☐ NSW Government ☐ Other State Government (specify): ☐ Commonwealth ☐ Other (specify):
Have you attended a webinar or other meeting as part of this consultation?	☐ Public webinar ☐ Meeting in Wee Waa	☒ none of these

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Lower Namoi Regulated River

You may respond to any (or all) of the questions

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?

Yes ☐ No ☐

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

There is too little water allocated to the environment

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☒

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

This will mean no increase in water allocated to the environment.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☒

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

This will lead to no increase in water allocated to the environment.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?

Yes ☐ No ☒

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

It will mean that environmental flows will not increase.

5 - Do you support the proposed management zones?

Yes ☐ No ☒

5.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

This will be no increase in water allocated to the environment.

6 - Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?

Yes ☐ No ☒

6.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Water belongs to the nation, not to individual licence holders. Any unused licences should be sold to the nation.

7 - Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?

Yes ☐ No ☒

7.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

The number of gigalitres triggering access restriction is far too low for maintaining the environment.

8 - Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

Yes ☐ No ☒

8.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

The amendments do not do anything for improving the health of both the Namoi and the

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Unregulated River Water Sources

You may respond to any (or all) of the questions

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?

Yes ☐

No ☒

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

This will enshrine the already poor water management regulation of the Namoi River.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐

No ☒

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

This will not improve environmental water allocation for the Namoi.

3. - Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐

No ☒

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

This will not improve environmental water allocation for the Namoi River.

4 - Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?

Yes ☐ No ☒

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason: This will further erode environmental water allocations to the Namoi River.

5 - Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?

Yes ☐ No ☒

5.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

The rules should be tightened to ensure adequate environmental flows to unregulated st

6 - Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

Yes ☐ No ☒

6.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Th.ey will not improve environmental flows to unregulated streams

Further feedback

The department is interested in what you have to say. If you want to provide more detailed feedback, please do so in the box below. Any feedback on the technical reports and other documentation will be considered for future planning processes.

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on:

- ☐ Downstream outcomes report
- ☐ Modelling
- ☐ Predicted environmental outcomes
- ☐ Report to assist community consultation
- ☐ Floodplain harvesting measurement
- ☐ Other information provided by the department
- ☐ Other

Please provide your feedback in the below box or provide a separate document with your comments.

Feedback:

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sat 28-January-2023 12:50 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be Yes
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please provide
the name of the
organisation:

Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Local landholder

If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:

Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as None of these
part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account Yes
management rules?:

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your support/opposition.: I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users
to store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to
support the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of
climate seasonality.

2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available No

water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification

3 – Do you support the
proposed ongoing available
water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the
proposed rules for the
granting or amending of
water supply work approvals
to be nominated by a
floodplain harvesting access
licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged

5 – Do you support the
proposed management
zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the
proposed trade rules
including no trade between
management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licensing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licensing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in

specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

There must be clear definition of how unregulated floodplain harvesting trade will be assessed when some areas will be within the same zone for unregulated surface water yet in different zones when considering groundwater sources. Currently trade is unable to be of any environmental or economic benefit due to inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones, particularly the Lower Namoi which is a large, indirectly hydrologically connected unregulated catchment in which trade between water sources is supported by industry

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Modelling, Other

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

MODELLING The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops. CONSULTATION: A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi valley

Office use only		Submission number	
-----------------	--	-------------------	--

How to fill out this form

The department is seeking stakeholder views on the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting licences to be included in the *Water Sharing Plan for the Namoi and Peel Unregulated River Water Sources 2012* and the *Water Sharing Plan for the Upper and Lower Namoi Regulated River Water Sources 2016*.

The department acknowledges that the importance of raising issues and concerns in relation to proposed rules for floodplain harvesting licences through a transparent public submission process. The department is committed to letting members of the community 'have your say'.

To ensure a balanced and comprehensive approach to consultation, the department is focussed on the scope of issues and concerns raised rather than the number of submissions received. It is important that the reasoning for why a proposed rule is supported or not supported is understood, communicated and responded to.

Before completing this submission, please ensure you have read the Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi: [Report to assist consultation](#) and viewed the other relevant technical reports and information available on [our website](#).

After reviewing the submissions and other feedback, recommendations will be made to the Minister for Lands and Water.

Send this completed form to floodplain.harvesting@dpie.nsw.gov.au

Note: Submissions close at 11.59 pm Sunday 29 January 2023.

Information on privacy and confidentiality

All submissions received by NSW Department of Planning and Environment will be reviewed and published. The department values your input and accepts that information you provide may be private and personal.

please tick the relevant box below if you would prefer your personal details and identifying information, to be treated as confidential.

If you don't request that your personal details be treated as confidential, the department will include your name and any personal details you provide when publishing your submission.

Please note that, regardless of a request for confidentiality, the department may be required by law to release copies of submissions to third parties in accordance with the *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009*.

© State of New South Wales through Department of Planning and Environment 2022. Information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing, November 2022, and is subject to change. For more information, please visit

Personal details

I would like my name and personal details to be treated as confidential.	☐ Yes ☐ No
Name	[REDACTED]
Postal Address	[REDACTED]
Telephone	[REDACTED]
Email address	[REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?	☐ Myself (individual) ☐ An organisation (<i>name</i>):	
Which stakeholder group best describes you? (Please tick one box)	☐ Community member ☐ Irrigation ☐ First Nations ☐ Environment ☐ Fishing ☐ Local landholder	☐ Local Government/ Utilities ☐ NSW Government ☐ Other State Government (specify): ☐ Commonwealth ☐ Other (specify):
Have you attended a webinar or other meeting as part of this consultation?	☐ Public webinar ☐ Meeting in Wee Waa	☐ none of these

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Lower Namoi Regulated River

You may respond to any (or all) of the questions

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?

Yes ☒ No ☐

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☒

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year mana

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☒ No ☐

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

☒
Reason:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?

Yes ☐ No ☐

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

5 - Do you support the proposed management zones?

Yes ☐ No ☐

5.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, t

6 - Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?

Yes ☐ No ☒

6.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

No trade between management zones is a reasonable concept to prevent concentration

7 - Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?

Yes ☐ No ☒

7.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge (419021). This trigger is in th

8 - Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

Yes ☐ No ☒

8.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported u

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Unregulated River Water Sources

You may respond to any (or all) of the questions

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?

Yes ☒

No ☐

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐

No ☒

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year mana

3. - Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☒

No ☐

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction

4 - Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?

Yes ☒ No ☐

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason: The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to

5 - Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?

Yes ☐ No ☒

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal c

6 - Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

Yes ☐ No ☒

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported u

Further feedback

The department is interested in what you have to say. If you want to provide more detailed feedback, please do so in the box below. Any feedback on the technical reports and other documentation will be considered for future planning processes.

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on:

- ☐ Downstream outcomes report
- ☒ Modelling
- ☐ Predicted environmental outcomes
- ☐ Report to assist community consultation
- ☐ Floodplain harvesting measurement
- ☐ Other information provided by the department
- ☒ Other

Please provide your feedback in the below box or provide a separate document with your comments.

Feedback:

ModellingThe e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sat 28-January-2023 5:15 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be
treated as confidential.: No

Personal details

Name: Ben Turner
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: An organisation
If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation: MHPF
Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Irrigation
If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:
Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as Meeting in Wee Waa
part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account
management rules?: Yes
1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.: I feel the 5 year accounting accurately reflect the flooding nature of
the Northern Valleys. the 5 year rule does allow for meaningful
access during very wet periods allow the storage of FPH water for
productive agricultural use.
2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available
water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?: No
2.1 – Please provide a
reason for your The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as
per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain

support/opposition.:	Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification. The 500% rule has already been discussed and implemented in other valleys why should the Namoi be any different.
3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:	Yes
3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:	
4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:	Yes
4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:	
5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:	Yes
5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:	Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.
6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:	No
6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:	No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions

to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

I reject the model in its current state and no amendments are supported. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them “subject to further changes” and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The lack of engagement and information flow to industry is very concerning. There has been no farm scale modelling, individual uses have not been met with, impact of the new model has not been assessed at a farm scale to cross check if the inputs are accurate. Mistakes were found in the first model through industry engagement, so how can we assume there are none in this new model. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on::

Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before

submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sat 28-January-2023 5:48 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be Yes
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)
If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:
Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Community member
If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:
Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting
as part of this
consultation?: None of these

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account Yes
management rules?:

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your support/opposition.: I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to
store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support
the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate
seasonality.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A

trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment

must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The ability to trade water is essential to users & allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, & legislation, creates water use efficiencies through management decisions & delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity &/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access &/or deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood, so there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their risk. Currently trade is unable to be of any benefit due to inability to trade.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Modelling

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is

too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional
feedback:

No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sat 28-January-2023 5:59 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be Yes
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)
If you are representing 'an
organisation', please provide
the name of the
organisation:
Which stakeholder group Local landholder
best describes you?:
If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:
Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as Meeting in Wee Waa
part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the Yes
proposed 5-year account
management rules?:
I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users
to store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to
support the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of
climate seasonality.
1.1 – Please provide a reason
for your support/opposition.:
2 – Do you support the No
proposed initial available

water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a reason
for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the
proposed ongoing available
water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason
for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the
proposed rules for the
granting or amending of
water supply work approvals
to be nominated by a
floodplain harvesting access
licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason
for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the
proposed management
zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason
for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the
proposed trade rules
including no trade between
management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason
for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional

circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates

water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. Currently trade is unable to be of any environmental or economic benefit due to inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones, particularly the Lower Namoi.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Modelling

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is

too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sat 28-January-2023 6:08 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be Yes
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)
If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:
Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Local landholder
If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:
Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as Meeting in Wee Waa
part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account Yes
management rules?:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to
store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support
the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate
seasonality

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the No
proposed initial available

water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in

specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates

support/opposition.: water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. There must be clear definition of how unregulated floodplain harvesting trade will be assessed when some areas will be within the same zone for unregulated surface water yet in different zones when considering groundwater sources. Currently trade is unable to be of any environmental or economic benefit due to inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones, particularly the Lower Namoi which is a large, indirectly hydrologically connected unregulated catchment in which trade between water sources is supported by industry.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Modelling

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sat 28-January-2023 6:46 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be
treated as confidential.:

No

Personal details

Name: Daniel Kahl
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone:
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: An organisation
If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation: [REDACTED]
Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Irrigation
If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:
Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as Meeting in Wee Waa
part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account
management rules?: Yes

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to
store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support
the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate
seasonality.

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available No

water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the
proposed ongoing available
water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the
proposed rules for the
granting or amending of
water supply work approvals
to be nominated by a
floodplain harvesting access
licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the
proposed management
zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the
proposed trade rules
including no trade between
management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in

specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?: Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?: Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?: No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates

support/opposition.:

water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. There must be clear definition of how unr

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on::

Modelling, Other

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

MODELLING The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown

quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sun 29-January-2023 8:35 AM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be Yes
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:

Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Irrigation

If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:

Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as Meeting in Wee Waa
part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account Yes
management rules?:

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to
store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support
the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate
seasonality.

2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available No

water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in

specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers

environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Modelling

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sun 29-January-2023 1:17 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be
treated as confidential.: No

Personal details

Name: Janet Watt
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: An organisation
If you are representing 'an
organisation', please provide
the name of the
organisation: Wattle Ag Pty Ltd
Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Local landholder
If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:
Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as
part of this consultation?: None of these

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account
management rules?: Yes
I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users
to store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to
support the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of
climate seasonality.
1.1 – Please provide a reason
for your
support/opposition.:
2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available No

water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage the development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works that straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional

circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact on other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates

support/opposition.:

water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. There must be clear definition of how unr

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on::

Other

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

MODELLING The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown

quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sun 29-January-2023 1:42 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be Yes
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:

Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: [REDACTED]

If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:

Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting
as part of this
consultation?: None of these

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account
management rules?: Yes

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to
store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support
the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate
seasonality

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A

trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment

must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Modelling, Other

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

MODELLING The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown

quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional
feedback:

No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sun 29-January-2023 4:06 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be Yes
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:

Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: [REDACTED]

If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:

Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as None of these
part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account Yes
management rules?:

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to
store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support
the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate
seasonality.

2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available No

water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in

specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates

support/opposition.:

water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. Not enough characters

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Other

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

Unreg Trade. There must be clear definition of how unregulated floodplain harvesting trade will be assessed. Currently trade is unable to be of any environmental or economic benefit due to inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones, particularly the Lower Namoi which is a large, indirectly hydrologically connected unregulated catchment in which trade between water sources is supported by industry. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sun 29-January-2023 4:48 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be treated Yes
as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)
If you are representing 'an
organisation', please provide
the name of the organisation:
Which stakeholder group [REDACTED]
best describes you?:
If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:
Have you attended a webinar
or other meeting as part of Meeting in Wee Waa
this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?:	Yes
1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:	I support the 5 year account management rules. It strikes a balance between recognition of the seasonal nature of FPH access whilst managing growth in use.
2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:	No
2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:	The model prepared by DPE is not capable of accurately determining FPH licence shares at a property scale. The premises upon which and initial AWD of 1ML per share would be acceptable are not satisfied.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The licensing and account management must reflect the assumptions in the modelling process. Deviation from this through AWD's higher or lower than 1ML per unit share would need to be supported by improvements to the model with adequate consultation.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Rules to manage infrastructure used to access FPH are needed. The implementation of these rules needs to align with the intent of the policy and recognise that the approval process over the last 40 years has been far from perfect.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question refers to the large trade management zones the answer is yes. However there needs to be allowances for properties and works that cross trade boundaries. There also needs to be allowance for sensible exemption to these zones where trade between zones may support improvements in water use efficiencies without impacting other water users. The adoption of Management Zone A from the Floodplain Management Plans to restrict trade and additional FPH works is a poor solution that is likely to be legacy that WaterNSW and irrigators will lament in the future. I do not support the use of Floodplain Management Zones to restrict new works and/or trade

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Trade needs to be managed to ensure licences are not concentrated and water users are not unfairly impacted. The inflexible nature of the proposed trade zones will be a legacy that WaterNSW and irrigators will lament in the future. There is an opportunity to include tests that could be applied to a proposed trade across zones to allow sensible assessment of future dealings.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500

No

ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Menindee Lakes are owned by NSW government and operated by MDBA or WaterNSW. The volume of water stored in the lakes is not necessarily a good indicator of seasonal conditions in the Northern Basin. I support the adoption of a passing flow through Wilcannia as a more suitable first trigger for restricting access to FPH. When flows through Wilcannia have dropped to critical levels, indicating drought conditions, there needs to be a minimum of 2 points for assessment of events in the Namoi. WaterNSW have previously shown they are ill equipped to respond and predict flows, reducing the area of assessment spatially will likely improve this process. More equitable triggers to adopt would be 3000ML/day at Boggabri and 2600ML/day at Bugilbone, both being the top value in the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The information that has been released on the Namoi Source model has cast serious doubt over its suitability. Without accurate modelling the process is fundamentally flawed. Reviews carried out to date on the model build report have indicated that model inputs and results are incorrect. A review of development area on 32 properties has shown errors up to 75%, with an obvious tendency to understate development areas in the 93/94 & 99/00 model runs, which determine the Cap & WSP limits. Further to this the model is unable to replicate irrigator behaviour with respect to crop areas planted year to year. The model currently underestimates planted areas in the calibration period by around 30%. The assurances from DPE that the model is well calibrated when gross errors in inputs and modelled behaviour are obvious does not provide any confidence in the model. Until the model is corrected the amendment provisions must be paused.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: I will be making a submission in February, prior to the 28 February deadline

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: I will be making a submission in February, prior to the 28 February deadline

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

3.1 – Please provide a reason I will be making a submission in February, prior to the 28 February for your support/opposition.: deadline

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

4.1 – Please provide a reason I will be making a submission in February, prior to the 28 February for your support/opposition.: deadline

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

5.1 – Please provide a reason I will be making a submission in February, prior to the 28 February for your support/opposition.: deadline

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

6.1 – Please provide a reason I will be making a submission in February, prior to the 28 February for your support/opposition.: deadline

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on::

Modelling

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The modelling is not fit for purpose. The data used by DPE does not support the complexity of the modelling process resulting in something that is very hard to understand, with obvious errors, but is being presented as calibrated because regulated diversions are within expected tolerances. The current model now includes catchments that do not return to the river so it is entirely possible that the calibration to regulated diversions is meaningless. The failure to calibrate to actual crop areas remains a major concern and likely indicates that key assumptions in the model at the farm scale are incorrect, particularly with respect to rainfall runoff and access to overland flow.

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sun 29-January-2023 5:59 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be
treated as confidential.: No

Personal details

Name: Kerry Watts
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)
If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:
Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Community member
If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:
Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as Meeting in Wee Waa
part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account
management rules?: Yes
I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to
store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support
the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate
seasonality.
1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:
2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available No

water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the
proposed ongoing available
water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the
proposed rules for the
granting or amending of
water supply work approvals
to be nominated by a
floodplain harvesting access
licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the
proposed management
zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the
proposed trade rules
including no trade between
management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in

specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates

support/opposition.:

water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is

too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au
<digital.services=squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au@squiz.regional.nsw.gov.au>
on behalf of
digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au <digital.services@squiz.dpie.nsw.gov.au>
Sun 29-January-2023 7:42 PM
To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be Yes
treated as confidential.:

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:

Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: [REDACTED]

If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:

Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as None of these
part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account Yes
management rules?:

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of
flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur
when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most
abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these
opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity
to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to
store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support
the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate
seasonality.

2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available No

water determination of 1
ML per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the
proposed ongoing available
water determination of 1
ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

4 – Do you support the
proposed rules for the
granting or amending of
water supply work
approvals to be nominated
by a floodplain harvesting
access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

5 – Do you support the
proposed management
zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the
proposed trade rules
including no trade between
management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is

no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions

to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?: Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

This section does not provide enough characters to adequately respond to this question. Please refer to the Namoi Water submission for commentary regarding unregulated river access licenses and proposed trade rules. It is disappointing to me there is a limit to responses in each section. By limiting input, there cannot be claims of robust consultation made by government or department.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

This section does not provide enough characters to adequately respond to this question. Please refer to the Namoi Water submission for commentary regarding unregulated river access licenses and proposed trade rules. It is disappointing to me there is a limit to responses in each section. By limiting input, there cannot be claims of robust consultation made by government or department.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

MODELLING The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were

managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

[REDACTED]

Sun 29-January-2023 8:37 PM

To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be
treated as confidential.: Yes

Personal details

Name:

Postal address:

Telephone:

Email address:

[REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please provide
the name of the
organisation:

Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Irrigation

If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:

Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as
part of this consultation?: None of these

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account
management rules?: Yes

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

YES I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to store excess FPH and other forms for future use, to support the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate seasonally.

2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available

No

water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination should start at 500% as per the 5 year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the
proposed ongoing available
water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the
proposed rules for the
granting or amending of
water supply work approvals
to be nominated by a
floodplain harvesting access
licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-94 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the
proposed management
zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the
proposed trade rules
including no trade between
management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in

specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should be not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I reject the trigger. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh gauge. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them 'subject to further changes' and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year fice or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision mak

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination should start at 300% as per the 3 year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-94 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current

unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them 'subject to further changes' and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendment need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Modelling

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The e-source model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are 46 issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression in the Namoi.

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

[REDACTED]

Sun 29-January-2023 9:05 PM

To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and
personal details to be
treated as confidential.: Yes

Personal details

Name: [REDACTED]
Postal address: [REDACTED]
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an
organisation', please
provide the name of the
organisation:

Which stakeholder group
best describes you?: Irrigation

If you answered 'other',
please provide the
stakeholder group that best
describes you:

Have you attended a
webinar or other meeting as Meeting in Wee Waa
part of this consultation?:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the
proposed 5-year account
management rules?: Yes

1.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Yes I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate seasonality.

2 – Do you support the
proposed initial available No

water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

. Yes Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Yes The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Yes Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in

specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business ri

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh rang

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

Yes

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision maki

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Yes Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Yes The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers

environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. There must be clear definition of how

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Modelling

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

Other MODELLING The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get w

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

Sun 29-January-2023 9:11 PM

To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and personal details to be treated as confidential.: No

Personal details

Name: Shaine Maunder

Postal address:

Telephone:

Email address:

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an organisation', please provide the name of the organisation:

Which stakeholder group best describes you?: Irrigation

If you answered 'other', please provide the stakeholder group that best describes you:

Have you attended a webinar or other meeting as part of this consultation?: Public webinar

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?: Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate seasonality.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licensing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licensing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is

no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment

must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

This section does not provide enough characters to adequately respond to this question. Please refer to the Namoi Water submission for commentary regarding unregulated river access licenses and proposed trade rules. It is disappointing to me there is a limit to responses in each section. By limiting input, there cannot be claims of robust consultation made by government or department.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them “subject to further changes” and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on::

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

Upload additional feedback:

No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

Sun 29-January-2023 11:52 PM

To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and personal details to be treated as confidential.: Yes

Personal details

Name:

Postal address:

Telephone:

Email address:

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an organisation', please provide the name of the organisation:

Which stakeholder group best describes you?: Irrigation

If you answered 'other', please provide the stakeholder group that best describes you:

Have you attended a webinar or other meeting as part of this consultation?: None of these

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?: Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate seasonality.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5 year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Assuming that the question is referring to the management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licensing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licensing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is

no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone guage. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for the upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi guage which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri guage should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone guage should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at figure of 2600ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range.

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. Tis will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment

must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

i support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is abundant, Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3 year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased , which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processess, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Modelling

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The e-source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by the industry in its current state. Need more consultation.

Upload additional feedback:

No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

Mon 30-January-2023 3:48 PM

To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and personal details to be treated as confidential.: Yes

Personal details

Name:

Postal address:

Telephone:

Email address:

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an organisation', please provide the name of the organisation:

Which stakeholder group best describes you?: Local landholder

If you answered 'other', please provide the stakeholder group that best describes you:

Have you attended a webinar or other meeting as part of this consultation?: Meeting in Wee Waa

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?: Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate seasonality.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available No

water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?: Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?: Yes

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?: No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional

circumstances in specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh range.

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates

water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. There must be clear definition of how unr

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on::

Modelling, Report to assist community consultation

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

MODELLING The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown

quoted that "This reform is too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley



Mon 30-January-2023 4:49 PM

To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and personal details to be treated as confidential.: No

Personal details

Name: Tom Carberry

Postal address:



Telephone:

Email address:



Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an organisation', please provide the name of the organisation:

Which stakeholder group best describes you?: Irrigation

If you answered 'other', please provide the stakeholder group that best describes you:

Have you attended a webinar or other meeting as part of this consultation?: Meeting in Wee Waa

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?: Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Yes I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full as a result of rainfall and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access during these opportunities, to provide our regional communities the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and to allow water users to store excess FPH and other forms of water for future use, to support the productive use of water and mitigate the impacts of climate seasonality.

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available No

water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

2.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

No The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 500% as per the 5-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is already enforcing a reduction of current access. Any other level of initial AWD would only serve to further restrict access for the first 5 years of the regulation without justification

3 – Do you support the
proposed ongoing available
water determination of 1 ML
per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Yes Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction of current access already being enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the
proposed rules for the
granting or amending of
water supply work approvals
to be nominated by a
floodplain harvesting access
licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the
proposed management
zones?:

Yes

5.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

Yes Assuming that the question is referring to management zones for the purpose of trade, then yes, the concept of using Trade Management Zones is supported to prevent concentration through trade. However, if clear proximity and/or connectivity can be demonstrated so that there is no reduction to other license holders' reliability of access then trade within management zones is supported. The rules must include how zone boundaries will be assessed regarding works which straddle zone boundaries.

6 – Do you support the
proposed trade rules
including no trade between
management zones?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a
reason for your
support/opposition.:

No trade between management zones is reasonable to prevent concentration. Volumetric Licencing of Floodplain Harvesting will reduce access from its current levels and bring it in line with Plan and Cap limits. Trade will not allow additional access but will allow businesses to adapt if their historical access changes due to volumetric licencing. Ability to trade is a requirement under the National Water Initiative and should only be restricted where there is no clear proximity and/or physical connectivity to support a trade. A trade assessment framework must be adapted including an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in

specific applications which demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity, demonstrate no impact to other licence holders' reliability of access and deliver water use efficiencies. Floodplains are connected in times of flood and there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk.

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?:

No

No I reject the 4500ML per day trigger at the Bugilbone gauge. This trigger is in the large fresh range, when anabranch connection occurs, and will result in opportunities for upstream users being inaccessible during flows which would not make the end of system or, in some cases, the river channel. This is an inequity when compared to other valleys. The Border Rivers trigger is 3000ML per day in the Barwon River at the Mungindi gauge which is at the top of the small fresh range. The Gwydir has multiple trigger locations which are generally in the small fresh range. The Namoi is a complex system and to ensure opportunities are not missed by upstream users, one single trigger point is not feasible. The Boggabri gauge should be the Upper Namoi (Keepit to Wee Waa) trigger at a figure of 3000ML per day which is the top of the small fresh range. The Bugilbone gauge should be the Lower Namoi (Wee Waa to Walgett) trigger at a figure of 2600ML per day which is at the top of the small fresh rang

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

No Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision mak

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?:

Yes I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling and water is most abundant. Rules must allow for meaningful access at these rare times, to provide our regional economies the opportunity to access water when it is most abundant and store it for future use, to support the productive use of water.

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year management rules. The licensing of Floodplain Harvesting is a reduction of current access, therefore any other level of initial AWD is restricting access for the first 3 years of the regulation.

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

Yes

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction enforced by the policy being increased, which would bring the accuracy of the policy in the first place into question.

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

Yes

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to take beyond the 1993-1994 development level is acknowledged.

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?:

No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal conditions, policy, and legislation, creates water use efficiencies through management decisions and delivers

environmental benefits through these efficiencies. The current unregulated trade rules were implemented without any consultation regarding the assessment process, resulting in an inability to trade, despite the higher levels of connectivity in several zones. There must be a trade assessment framework adapted which facilitates an appeals process to further assess anomalies/exceptional circumstances in specific applications which can demonstrate clear proximity and/or connectivity so that there is no reduction to other licence holders' reliability of access and/or deliver water use efficiencies. floodplains are connected in times of flood, hence there should not be any restrictions to allowing a mechanism for water users to manage their business risk. There must be clear definition of how unr

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?:

No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported until such time as they can be considered with a fit for purpose model. The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty which establishing a clear set of rules would provide by making them "subject to further changes" and do not provide a clear process for implementation. The amendments need to clearly articulate implementing processes, ensuring consultation and engagement of the community in any future decisions. I only support an amendment that requires the recalibration of an industry accepted valley-wide model using metering information collected from implementing floodplain licencing at year five or after a flood event. This will enable further assessment of assumptions around floodplain harvesting opportunity and the suitability of the accounting framework. Any amendment must acknowledge the cumulative effect of water reform and put the local communities at the centre of decision making.

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on.:

Other

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

The e-Source Model used for the Namoi Floodplain Harvesting has been rejected by industry in its current state. There are forty-six (46) issues tabled to the department arising from the model outcomes with a response only provided three working days before submissions are due. Until there is a model available which has been peer reviewed, further industry consultation held and acceptance of that model there should be no further progression of Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi. I reject the e-Source Model of the Namoi. CONSULTATION has not been acceptable. Only one in person forum was held and one online webinar. Such minimal consultation at a time when stakeholders in the Namoi were managing flood impacts and salvaging crops is unreasonable. A webinar with only a written comments section for questions is an information download, not consultation. The presentations shown quoted that "This reform is

too important to delay". Wrong. "This reform is too important to get wrong".

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Submission for the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Valley

Wed 28-December-2022 1:36 AM

To: Lands-Water FloodPlain Harvesting Mailbox <floodplain.harvesting@dpi.nsw.gov.au>

Permission

I would like my name and personal details to be treated as confidential.: Yes

Personal details

Name:

Postal address:

Telephone:

Email address:

Submission details

Who are you representing?: Myself (individual)

If you are representing 'an organisation', please provide the name of the organisation:

Which stakeholder group best describes you?: First Nations

If you answered 'other', please provide the stakeholder group that best describes you:

Have you attended a webinar or other meeting as part of this consultation?: None of these

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?: Yes

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.:

All water and water ways need to be left alone. Wasnt the last drought a wake up call for everyone. The deaths of native specious. The towns and people with no water. Just because we've had floods doesnt mean we should rape the water and waterways again. The floods are a sign of Mother Nature giving replenishment back to the lands

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See above

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water No

determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See above

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be No nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See above

5 – Do you support the proposed management zones?: No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See above

6 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?: No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See above

7 – Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?: No

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See above

8 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?: No

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See above

Submission details

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?: No

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See first answer

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?: No

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See first answer

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water

determination of 1 ML per unit share?:

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See first answer

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be No nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?:

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See first answer

5 – Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?: No

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See first answer

6 – Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?: No

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.: See first answer

Further feedback

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on:: Other

Please provide your feedback in the below box:

We need to stop taking any water from our waterways, period. If your dams are full, use it but only from them. People are only thinking of their wallets and Governments are only thinking the same!!! Personally, I dont care about exports, only supplying OUR country with what it needs and nothing more. We are a Country that doesnt get much water compared to the rest of the world. We need to think of OUR COUNTRY FIRST AND ONLY !!!

Upload additional feedback: No file uploaded

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi valley

Office use only		Submission number	
-----------------	--	-------------------	--

How to fill out this form

The department is seeking stakeholder views on the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting licences to be included in the *Water Sharing Plan for the Namoi and Peel Unregulated River Water Sources 2012* and the *Water Sharing Plan for the Upper and Lower Namoi Regulated River Water Sources 2016*.

The department acknowledges that the importance of raising issues and concerns in relation to proposed rules for floodplain harvesting licences through a transparent public submission process. The department is committed to letting members of the community 'have your say'.

To ensure a balanced and comprehensive approach to consultation, the department is focussed on the scope of issues and concerns raised rather than the number of submissions received. It is important that the reasoning for why a proposed rule is supported or not supported is understood, communicated and responded to.

Before completing this submission, please ensure you have read the Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi: [Report to assist consultation](#) and viewed the other relevant technical reports and information available on [our website](#).

After reviewing the submissions and other feedback, recommendations will be made to the Minister for Lands and Water.

Send this completed form to floodplain.harvesting@dpie.nsw.gov.au

Note: Submissions close at 11.59 pm Sunday 29 January 2023.

Information on privacy and confidentiality

All submissions received by NSW Department of Planning and Environment will be reviewed and published. The department values your input and accepts that information you provide may be private and personal.

please tick the relevant box below if you would prefer your personal details and identifying information, to be treated as confidential.

If you don't request that your personal details be treated as confidential, the department will include your name and any personal details you provide when publishing your submission.

Please note that, regardless of a request for confidentiality, the department may be required by law to release copies of submissions to third parties in accordance with the *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009*.

Personal details

I would like my name and personal details to be treated as confidential.	☐ Yes	☐ No
Name		
Postal Address		
Telephone		
Email address		

Submission details

Who are you representing?	☐ Myself (individual) ☐ An organisation (<i>name</i>):	
Which stakeholder group best describes you? (Please tick one box)	☐ Community member ☐ Irrigation ☐ First Nations ☐ Environment ☐ Fishing ☐ Local landholder	☐ Local Government/ Utilities ☐ NSW Government ☐ Other State Government (specify): ☐ Commonwealth ☐ Other (specify):
Have you attended a webinar or other meeting as part of this consultation?	☐ Public webinar ☐ Meeting in Wee Waa	☐ none of these

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Lower Namoi Regulated River

You may respond to any (or all) of the questions

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?

Yes ☐ No ☐

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☐

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

3 - Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☐

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

4 - Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?

Yes ☐ No ☐

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

5 - Do you support the proposed management zones?

Yes ☐ No ☐

5.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

6 - Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?

Yes ☐ No ☐

6.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

7 - Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?

Yes ☐ No ☐

7.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

8 - Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

Yes ☐ No ☐

8.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Unregulated River Water Sources

You may respond to any (or all) of the questions

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?

Yes ☐ No ☐

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☐

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year mana

3. - Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☐

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction

4 - Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?

Yes ☐ No ☐

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason: The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to t

5 - Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?

Yes ☐ No ☐

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to t

6 - Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

Yes ☐ No ☐

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported u

Further feedback

The department is interested in what you have to say. If you want to provide more detailed feedback, please do so in the box below. Any feedback on the technical reports and other documentation will be considered for future planning processes.

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on:

- ☒ Downstream outcomes report
- ☒ Modelling
- ☒ Predicted environmental outcomes
- ☒ Report to assist community consultation
- ☒ Floodplain harvesting measurement
- ☒ Other information provided by the department
- ☐ Other

Please provide your feedback in the below box or provide a separate document with your comments.

Feedback:

I am deeply angered and concerned the entire Floodplain Harvesting policy implementation is b

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi valley

Office use only		Submission number	
-----------------	--	-------------------	--

How to fill out this form

The department is seeking stakeholder views on the proposed rules for floodplain harvesting licences to be included in the *Water Sharing Plan for the Namoi and Peel Unregulated River Water Sources 2012* and the *Water Sharing Plan for the Upper and Lower Namoi Regulated River Water Sources 2016*.

The department acknowledges that the importance of raising issues and concerns in relation to proposed rules for floodplain harvesting licences through a transparent public submission process. The department is committed to letting members of the community 'have your say'.

To ensure a balanced and comprehensive approach to consultation, the department is focussed on the scope of issues and concerns raised rather than the number of submissions received. It is important that the reasoning for why a proposed rule is supported or not supported is understood, communicated and responded to.

Before completing this submission, please ensure you have read the Floodplain Harvesting in the Namoi: [Report to assist consultation](#) and viewed the other relevant technical reports and information available on [our website](#).

After reviewing the submissions and other feedback, recommendations will be made to the Minister for Lands and Water.

Send this completed form to floodplain.harvesting@dpie.nsw.gov.au

Note: Submissions close at 11.59 pm Sunday 29 January 2023.

Information on privacy and confidentiality

All submissions received by NSW Department of Planning and Environment will be reviewed and published. The department values your input and accepts that information you provide may be private and personal.

please tick the relevant box below if you would prefer your personal details and identifying information, to be treated as confidential.

If you don't request that your personal details be treated as confidential, the department will include your name and any personal details you provide when publishing your submission.

Please note that, regardless of a request for confidentiality, the department may be required by law to release copies of submissions to third parties in accordance with the *Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009*.

© State of New South Wales through Department of Planning and Environment 2022. Information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing, November 2022, and is subject to change. For more information, please visit

Personal details

I would like my name and personal details to be treated as confidential.

☐ Yes

☐ No

Name

Postal Address

Telephone

Email address

Submission details

Who are you representing?

☐ Myself (individual)

☐ An organisation (*name*):

Which stakeholder group best describes you?

(Please tick one box)

☐ Community member

☐ Irrigation

☐ First Nations

☐ Environment

☐ Fishing

☐ Local landholder

☐ Local Government/ Utilities

☐ NSW Government

☐ Other State Government

(specify):

☐ Commonwealth

☐ Other (specify):

Have you attended a webinar or other meeting as part of this consultation?

☐ Public webinar

☐ Meeting in Wee Waa

☐ none of these

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Lower Namoi Regulated River

You may respond to any (or all) of the questions

1 – Do you support the proposed 5-year account management rules?

Yes ☐ No ☐

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☐

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

3 – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☐

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?

Yes ☐ No ☐

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

5 - Do you support the proposed management zones?

Yes ☐ No ☐

5.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

6 - Do you support the proposed trade rules including no trade between management zones?

Yes ☐ No ☐

6.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

7 - Do you support the proposed access rule that restricts access when Menindee Lakes is below 195 GL except during periods when there is at least 4,500 ML/day in the Namoi River at the Bugilbone gauge?

Yes ☐ No ☐

7.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

8 - Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

Yes ☐ No ☐

8.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Proposed rules for floodplain harvesting in the Namoi Unregulated River Water Sources

You may respond to any (or all) of the questions

1 – Do you support the proposed account management rules of a take limit of 3 ML per unit share over 3 years and account limit of 3 ML per unit share at any time?

Yes ☒ No ☐

1.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

I support rules which accurately reflect the seasonal nature of flooding events in northern

2 – Do you support the proposed initial available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☐ No ☒

2.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

The Available Water Determination (AWD) should start at 300% as per the 3-year mana

3. – Do you support the proposed ongoing available water determination of 1 ML per unit share?

Yes ☒ No ☐

3.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Any reduction or withholding of water via an ongoing AWD would result in the reduction

4 – Do you support the proposed rules for the granting or amending of water supply work approvals to be nominated by a floodplain harvesting access licence?

Yes ☒ No ☐

4.1 – Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason: The premise that the rules discourage development of works resulting in an increase to

5 - Do you support the proposed trade rules including the replication of existing rules for unregulated river access licences?

Yes ☐ No ☒

5.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

The ability to trade water is essential to water users and allows adaptation to seasonal c

6 - Do you support the proposed amendment provisions?

Yes ☐ No ☒

6.1 - Please provide a reason for your support/opposition.

Reason:

Industry has rejected the model in its current state and no amendments are supported u

Further feedback

The department is interested in what you have to say. If you want to provide more detailed feedback, please do so in the box below. Any feedback on the technical reports and other documentation will be considered for future planning processes.

Select the subject you wish to provide feedback on:

- ☐ Downstream outcomes report
- ☐ Modelling
- ☐ Predicted environmental outcomes
- ☐ Report to assist community consultation
- ☐ Floodplain harvesting measurement
- ☐ Other information provided by the department
- ☒ Other

I have been to umpteen flood plain harvesting meetings in Gunnedah over the last ten or more y

Please provide your feedback in the below box or provide a separate document with your comments.

Feedback:

Individual farm operation guides. There is a clear requirement for individual farms to have an ap