



FLOODPLAIN HARVESTING

Proposed floodplain harvesting rules for the Macquarie Valley

Submissions from public consultation

July 2021



Published by NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

dpie.nsw.gov.au

Title: Proposed floodplain harvesting rules for the Macquarie Valley

First published: August 2021

Department reference number: PUB21/466

© State of New South Wales through Department of Planning, Industry and Environment 2021. You may copy, distribute, display, download and otherwise freely deal with this publication for any purpose provided you attribute the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment as the owner. However, you must obtain permission if you wish to charge others for access to the publication (other than at cost); include the publication in advertising or a product for sale; modify the publication; or republish the publication on a website. You may freely link to the publication on a departmental website.

Disclaimer: The information contained in this publication is based on knowledge and understanding at the time of writing (August 2021) and may not be accurate, current or complete. The State of New South Wales (including the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment), the author and the publisher take no responsibility, and will accept no liability, for the accuracy, currency, reliability or correctness of any information included in the document (including material provided by third parties). Readers should make their own inquiries and rely on their own advice when making decisions related to material contained in this publication.

Acknowledgment of Country

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment acknowledges the Traditional Owners and Custodians of the land on which we live and work and pays respect to Elders past, present and future.

Contents

Submissions	4
Submission 1	4
Submission 2	7
Submission 3	9
Submission 4	11
Submission 5	13
Submission 6	15
Submission 7	17
Submission 8	19
Submission 9	21
Submission 10	23
Submission 11	24
Submission 12	26
Submission 13	28
Submission 14	30
Submission 15	32
Submission 16	33
Submission 17	35
Submission 18	37
Submission 19	38
Submission 20	39
Submission 21	41
Submission 22	43
Submission 23	45
Submission 24	46
Submission 25	48
Submission 26	50
Submission 27	51
Submission 28	53
Submission 29	56
Submission 30	57
Submission 31	59
Submission 32	61
Submission 33	63
Submission 34	65

Submission 35	67
Submission 36	69
Submission 37	71
Submission 38	73

Submissions

Public exhibition of the proposed rules began in the Macquarie valley on 18 March and ended 18 April 2021. Submissions received during the public consultation process have been collated and can be found in this document. Please note only submissions where approval was given to publish have been included.

Submission 1

1. Who are you representing? Myself (individual)

1.1. Name: Anonymous

1.2. Organisation name: N/A

2. Which stakeholder group best describes you? Community member

3. Where are you located? Other

3.1. If other, please specify: NSW voter and tax payer on Great Dividing Range: some days northern, other days coastal.

4. Attended Macquarie public webinar: No

5. Which supporting documents have you read? Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation

6. Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size: Yes

7. Support 5-year account management rules: No

7.1. Please explain your rationale: The aim of the whole policy and set of rules should be to enable Government to restrain harvesting especially of overbank flows to give environmental and Darling River needs priority immediately and for the next few decades because irrigation has previously been allowed to take all it can at expense to those downstream. 5-year rules let irrigation get further ahead and delay any chance of environmental recovery. Entitlements should not be based on this history of overuse. The proposed way of linking entitlement size and account management rules including 5 vs 1 year is fundamentally wrong. You should be focussed on repairing the environment by event-based management to meet environmental needs not on avoiding trying things because you cant model them. If the Minister was seriously trying to put the Darling first and needed extra options in the Act for event-based management she could get good options through Parliament. NSW Government has a poor record in keeping use under cap and bringing use down to achieve an average so irrigation shouldn't be allowed to get 4 years ahead then have to be constrained.

8. Available Water determination would support: 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: The environment needs much more water now to follow what it has received from rain and what bits of floods have got past the FPH diversion works. I mean environments both in the Macquarie and downstream along flood-runners and the Barwon, Darling-Baaka and into the Lower Murray need much more water - they need enough to recharge alluvial groundwater and for fish and birds to not only breed but to grow big and breed again and for regeneration of floodplain trees. You can't give the environment 5 times its average

share so it can catch up, because it is not as though there is a giant tap in the sky you can turn on, but the rules can and should limit the initial irrigation share to 1ML/unit share.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: It is really important and for everyone's benefit for the people implementing the policy on our behalf to learn more from each flood event, particularly since volumes can't be precisely measured and the models used did not have all the inputs ideally wanted. Every flood is different. It would also be good if implementation can move towards enabling achievement of particular environmental objectives if necessary while trying to be fair between licence holders

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: Yes

11.1. Please explain your rationale: I appreciated that the rules attempt to limit further environmental damage by concentration of licences to harvest water where that would be most damaging to identified environmental assets like Macquarie Marshes Nature Reserve.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Held Environmental Water must be protected so that it can flow on to whatever its natural destination can be achieving as much as possible. It might be released (or extraction foregone) with a particular purpose in mind, such as combining with other flows to enable overbank flow, and should be protected by Active Management to achieve this, and should then be actively managed until the environment has absorbed it all e.g. past Bourke's irrigators as well. The Basin Plan requires it to be fully protected and the tax payers expect this too so the rules should require full protection of HEW whenever there is HEW in the system. If it is difficult, err on the side of protecting more for the environment not less because the irrigation industry has been allowed to divert environmental water for decades.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: If coming up with a perfect system for managing floodplain harvesting was easy it would have been done decades ago. I appreciate that decades of careful thought has gone into this but that doesn't mean that whatever rules this Government decides on will be the best possible let alone ideal for future needs. It does mean that if amendment provisions aren't included improving the rules that go into the water sharing plan could be extremely expensive for tax payers.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

15. Your feedback: No diversions of overland flow should be permitted in any year until high flows actually reach Darling River wetlands like the Talywalka's lakes. The policy and rules should be changed to keep more overbank flows going to and through the Darling as well as Macquarie environment, instead of giving "entitlements" to the

maximum amount e.g. sell initial entitlements to runoff from cropped land above 10%; no entitlement just restrict the use of overbank flows.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

This relies too much on modelling of things too hard to model well enough. I don't trust the conclusion that the amount of diversions has not increased - it should be brought significantly below the 1993-4 level of development cap so that the environment does not loose out due to decreased runaoff with climate change. Tailwater should be counted not added as extra water.

Submission 2

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Northern inland valley
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The rules are inequitable and are favourably biased to flood-plain harvesters. No other entity - the environment, third party/downstream users is allowed the luxury of a 500% carryover and it is non-sensical to 'carryover' water from a flood that never eventuated in years 1-4.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** 1:1 Aligns with current/standard, it is simple and easy to understand. Anything else is an attempt to disguise the true volumes of water in an attempt to confound the public. 1 ML per unit share is good, transparent, defensible governance.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** In the absence of an effective means of measuring FPH take, this approach is logical and defensible
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No comment
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The rule requires further refinement for it to be acceptable. The protection of Held Environmental Water must be protected from extraction at all times.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** No
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Amendment clauses create uncertainty and an element of expectation.
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** N/A

15. Your feedback: N/A

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 3

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This rule allows for FPH licenses to grow up to 500 % the size of the license volume.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events are essential for wetlands (Macquarie Marshes), floodplain specialist species of fish, and for replenishing groundwater. Also the floodplain water is not just relevant to the Macquarie - the more water that connects to the Barwon the better, to replenish the struggling Barwon-Darling system. AWD therefore should be kept to a minimum.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There is currently no accurate measurement of the volumes of water being taken by FPH.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** However this rule needs to go further and protect all held environmental water from extraction (as in the Basin Plan) - not just when active management is 100 %.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Compensation payouts from taxpayer money need to be avoided - so amendments to the FPH rules in the water sharing plans need to be permissible.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling, Other

15. Your feedback: Additional rules are needed that only allow FPH when end of system targets have been met. Again, the Macquarie Valley cannot be viewed in isolation from the Barwon-Darling. Also, the bias in modelling of 51 % upstream of Narromine is a serious information deficiency.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: The proposed FPH rules do not ensure the provisions of the NSW Water Management Act 2000, the Commonwealth Water Act 2007 and Murray-Darling Basin Plan are met.

State government bodies have changed the volume of the allowable FPH allowable limit and not explained how the new limit was determined.

Colonial-nesting birds in the Macquarie Marshes require as much water as possible to ensure chicks are raised before water levels recede.

Submission 4

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Dr Anne Jensen
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Adelaide
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** No comment
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** water allocations should not be cumulative, they should be based on actual annual availability to avoid over-extraction in a given year
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** flood events are critical to river system health and first flushes should be protected from harvesting
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** subject to introduction of effective measurement of water volumes so that more accurate conditions can be set to ensure that over-extraction is not occurring
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** it is critical that trades are subject to conditions to prevent third party and environmental impacts from trades
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** the application must include the protection of held environment water and shepherding of environmental flows to ensure they reach target sites without being extracted by irrigators
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** the amendments should be designed to avoid potential future compensation for reduced allocations
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** Floodplain harvesting measurement, Other

15. Your feedback: Management measures for floodplain harvesting need to be linked into overall water management planning, particularly with respect to water sharing plans and water allocation plans, to ensure minimum end-of-system flows during dry periods. It is also essential to secure first-flush flows in high flow events to facilitate recovery of river systems. Floodplain harvesting allocations should only occur after these protective measures are in place.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

My interests relate to maintaining the health of river systems throughout the Murray-Darling Basin, with particular priority on securing minimum flows to support river channels, wetlands and floodplains throughout the Basin, for the benefit of all Basin communities.

Submission 5

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Sarah Moles
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Environmental, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Over time, this rule will allow access to higher volumes of water by letting FPH account balances grow up to 500% the size of the licenced volume.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Until FPH is metered there is no accurate understanding of the volumes of water being taken from flood flows.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** However, this rule does not go far enough. The Basin Plan requires that Held Environmental Water (HEW) is protected from extraction, however it is proposed to only protect HEW when active management is 100%. HEW must be protected at all times.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from taxpayers funds

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling, Other

15. Your feedback: Additional rules are needed that restrict FPH access until end of system flow targets are met, to ensure that flood flows will reach the Barwon Darling before FPH commences upstream. Connectivity targets are urgently needed. The bias in the modelling of 51% upstream of Narromine is a serious information deficiency.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 6

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** N/A
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Australian Floodplain Association
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – non floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** northern and southern basin members
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Over time, this rule will allow access to higher volumes of water by letting FPH account balances grow up to 500% the size of the licenced volume.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Until FPH is metered there is no accurate understanding of the volumes of water being taken from flood flows.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from increased water extraction.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** However, this rule does not go far enough. The Basin Plan requires that Held Environmental Water (HEW) is protected from extraction, however it is proposed to only protect HEW when active management is 100%. HEW must be protected at all times.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from taxpayers funds

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling, Other

15. Your feedback: Additional rules are needed that restrict FPH access until end of system flow targets are met, to ensure that flood flows will reach the Barwon Darling before FPH commences upstream. Connectivity targets are urgently needed. The bias in the modelling of 51% upstream of Narromine is a serious information deficiency.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 7

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Southern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The rule allows for massive growth over time- up to 50%
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The river exhibits 'boom-bust' cycles. This means flood form a critical part of drought recovery for riparian and other flood dependent communities. They are also important for groundwater recharge. Initial access to an entitlement should not allow greedy opportunism
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Because Flood plain harvesting is unmetered- there is no accurate understanding of the volumes of water being taken
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important to protect our environmental and cultural assets from increased water extraction
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I support it in part- this is because Held Environmental Water is only protected when active management is 100%- we need to protect HEW at all times
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** We need to avoid compensation payouts from the taxpayer funds
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** Modelling

15. Your feedback: There appears to be a bias in the modelling upstream of Narromine

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

Issuing permanent property rights to irrigators is a massive transfer of public wealth that provides a windfall gain to private interests

The Macquarie Marshes have been undergoing significant drying and have been seriously damaged from fire. We need to prevent increased river regulation and increased consumptive use upstream of the marshes

Floodplain harvesting has the potential to significantly impact native fish populations, as many species breed based on cues provided by flooding. Any new recruitment events can be reduced because the young are isolated from the river. The structures for harvest flooding may also isolate existing adult fish populations as they move out to breed. Thus encouraging may effect not only new recruitment but also decrease increase adult populations. There needs to be some mechanism to allow fish passage across the floodplain when granting such harvesting rights

The volume of FPH modelled in the water sharing plan is zero. Will this be adjusted?

Submission 8

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Pat Schultz
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The increased volume of water taken each year is unsustainable
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is essential for flood waters to flow freely to replenish flood dependent ecosystems and groundwater supplies.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** meters are not accurately measuring the water taken
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** there are high conservation areas downstream which must be protected.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** over extraction must not happen
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** it is important that compensation payouts do not happen where they are not deserved.
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** Other

15. Your feedback: N/A

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

I have noted with distress the demise of the inland rivers over the last 20 years. My childhood swimming hole in the Namoi River is now nothing but a muddy hole that you wouldn't let your dog swim in.

On traveling out west 2018 it was devastating to witness the demise of the Murray Darling. I was heart broken camping beside a green water hole. Management of the Murray Darling system must improve. Water allocations must reduce, not increase as suggested. The River should at all times flow all the way to the ocean without any dry areas. This is a river system, not an irrigation channel.

Submission 9

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** No comment
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It gives more access to water across the 5 years by letting FPH account balances grow up to 500% the size of the licenced volume.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Until FPH is metered you can't be accurate about how much water is being taken from flood flows.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important to protect areas of high environmental and cultural value from more water take.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** But HEW (Held Environmental Water) must be protected all the time. It is a requirement of the HEW is protected from extraction, however it is proposed to only protect HEW when active management is 100%.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from public money.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling, Other

15. Your feedback: Additional rules are needed that restrict FPH access until end of system flow targets are met, to ensure that flood flows will reach the Barwon Darling-Baaka before FPH commences upstream. The bias in the modelling of 51% upstream of Narromine is a serious information deficiency.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

FPH won't be reduced in the Macquarie because the Government says total water extractions are under the allowable limit, however they have changed the volume of the allowable limit and not explained how the new limit was determined.

Submission 10

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** N/A
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Macquarie River Food and Fibre
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** Yes
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
8. **Available Water determination would support:** More than 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There has not been an opportunity for FPH take since 2016. A 500% account initialisation would reflect the current carry over in this valley.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** the trade zones are too small and restrictive. Trade should be available across the entire valley with an appropriate reduction factor applied to the volumes traded depending on geography and reliability of access to FPH.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** Other
15. **Your feedback:** N/A
 - 15.1. **Please provide feedback in the box below:** N/A

Submission 11

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** N/A
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Bathurst Community Climate Action Network
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Central West/Orana
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** If licenced, harvesting participants should be restricted to their maximum yearly water take in any one year.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** River systems require flood events to maintain healthy environmental systems and importantly the recharge of aquifers that townships rely on.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** All water take should be accounted for
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important to protect the low to medium flood events so that the environment and cultural water is protected. Medium floods would help to maintain lower levels of organic matter so as to limit the damage due to "black" events.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** BCCAN would question whether the proposed FPH would comply with M-DBA's Water Resource Plans and Commonwealth Environmental Water provisions.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Some flexible conditions must be incorporated into any FPH rules so as to adapt to reduced water availability into the future (See Draft Regional Water Strategies), to negate any further need for "buy-backs".

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling, Other

15. Your feedback: Any changes to the rules must ensure better connectivity to the Barwon-Darling river system. BCCAN would request a further peer review of the modelling to determine this outcome.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

BCCAN would support water take to be accounted for on a yearly basis without any provisions for carryover.

Submission 12

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** N/A
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Ctton Australia
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user - floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** Yes
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The episodic nature of floodplain harvesting makes the five year account rules a very sensible response, as it allows to manage take in accordance with the size of the event.kl,a
8. **Available Water determination would support:** More than 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** In keeping with the 5-year management rule, and given the fact that floodplain harvesting is an historical activity, and this process is simply the issuing of volumetric licencing, the most appropriate response is to model what take would have occurred in the Macquarie Valley over say the past five or 10 years, and initialise the accounts with the amount that would have been on average in Macquarie Valley Floodplain Harvesting licence accounts if the licencing had been introduced five or ten years ago.remi
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The is yes with qualification. Modelling is an imprecise art at best, and if it can be demonstrate that the licencing is leading to either over take or undertake then adjustment through AWD's would be appropriate.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Trade rules and areas are far too narrow and restrictive:
 - o Proposed trade boundaries do not reflect the operation of the river;
 - o Alternative proposal to open trade across the valley;
 - o Free trade both up and down the river;
 - o Entitlement volumes traded will be subject to an appropriate adjustment factor to adjust for the frequency of opportunity for FPH. i.e if trading from Narromine to below Warren, the volume would be reduced by the appropriate reduction factor. This avoids

unintended growth in use;

o Temporary trade should be allowed between related entities/parties.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No comment

12.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No comment

13.1. Please explain your rationale: N/A

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report, Report to assist community consultation

15. Your feedback: N/A

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

The exemption rules for rainfall capture are essential

Submission 13

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Beverley Smiles
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This will allow entitlements to be carried over to 500% and give legal access to large volumes of water from intermittent flood events in the Macquarie Valley.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The impact of floodplain harvesting in the lower Macquarie is significant. Only the volume of the entitlement should be available as a maximum at any given time.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Only if it means the adaptive management means that less than 1 ML per share is the outcome
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important to protect environmental and cultural values on the floodplain from increased FPH extraction
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** All environmental water must be protected from extraction as per the Northern Basin Review agreement
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The Macquarie WSP rules must be able to be amended when new information is available without triggering compensation to licence holders.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling, Predicted environmental outcomes

15. Your feedback: The model developed to assess new FPH licences in the Macquarie has serious deficiencies including a bias of +51% for take above Narromine and -8% take below Warren. The lack of real data for model validation is a high risk. There will be no environmental outcomes for the Macquarie Marshes or downstream to the Barwon-Darling. The change in volumes in the Plan Limit to account for FPH take makes a mockery of the management of environmental sustainability

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below:

The documents provided for community information do not clearly explain how Plan Limits are managed under the model scenarios. There is no connection to the reality on the ground of the environmental condition of the river, wetlands, native fish populations and their reliance on variability, seasonality and duration of flood flows. The WMA objects are not met.

Submission 14

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** N/A
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:**
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** REDACTED supports 1 year accounting with no 'carryover' - see attachment for detailed reasoning
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** No hot start. Please refer to separate detailed Submission #06 for detailed reasoning.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** with measuring and metering still years away there must be levers to control the allowable FPH take
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** floodplains hold important environmental values and must be protected from increasing fph development resulting from trade
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** However it must protect 100% of HEW - see attached for detailed reasoning
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse.
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** Downstream outcomes report, Floodplain harvesting measurement, Modelling, Other, Other information provided by the department, Predicted environmental outcomes
15. **Your feedback:** Please refer to separate detailed Submission #06 for comment on the proposed rules, the cap & plan limit, modelling, consultation, environmental outcomes and the priorities of the WMA, the WA and the MDBP.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 15

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Modelling
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It does not reflect the likelihood of getting a flood
8. **Available Water determination would support:** More than 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** We have experienced recent years of drought
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is open to abuse
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** No it restricts trade
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It will be abused
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** No comment
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** Other information provided by the department
15. **Your feedback:** We don't understand how the department has come to its conclusions
 - 15.1. **Please provide feedback in the box below:** N/A

Submission 16

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Macquarie marshes environmental landholders association
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This rule allows greater volumes of water to be extracted from the floodplain, the modelling is questionable.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** limit the AWD to start with to attempt to correct the damage that has accrued to the floodplain as a result of years of poor river/floodplain management by the NSW government
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** when take is finally measured the idea of what impact is occurring will be better understood.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Tight trade zones are a must in the policy ,the more restrictions the better ,it would be imposable to calculate CTP heights if water was allowed to be traded very far.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Active management has been brought in the unreg section of the lower Macquarie ,its been a disgrace with very little thought to the difficulties of implementing such changes .NRAR were absent from the process and still have no understanding of how things work
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** our community value the opportunity to have amendment provisions in the water sharing plans but we must be included in any proposed changes.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Predicted environmental outcomes

15. Your feedback: We have read the environmental outcomes report and are extremely disappointed that there are major inaccuracies in the document that also make us question all of the information provided .We have no confidence in the report whatsoever .The report fails to identify the value of a healthy floodplain to both the value of the Ramsar listed Macquarie marshes or the connectivity of the Macquarie to the Barwon Darling

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: the process of consultation has been disgracefully handled. Many stakeholders who stand to be impacted by the F/H policy have not been included in any consultation .The online submission process has been sub standard and is all part of failure by the NSW government to convince our community that the process stood the test of local scrutiny.

Submission 17

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Gary Hall
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The extended time period allows for increased take from the floodplain, the modeling presented by DPIE was complete rubbish and an insult to all those who depend on a healthy river
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Over bank flows onto the floodplain in the Macquarie are rare as the catchment has 2 major water storages in the upper catchment. The fact that the NSW government uses a credit model to allocate the available water determination means that the major water storages are low most of the time. The only way that water can arrive on the floodplain with empty storage dams is if there is sufficient rainfall downstream of the dams. If the initial water determination is greater than 1mg/unit share the floodplain would not see any overbank flows.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The modeling used to assess the current take is extremely questionable at best, it must be able to be varied as there is no way the licensing will be accurate.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** CTP HEIGHTS, trade of Supplementary access, amalgamations of large volumes in 1 area
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is critical that HEW is protected, the linkage of the f/h policy to active management is extremely badly done and it appears to me that the NSW have no idea what they are doing.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: the NSW government has done a poor job of the FH rules and in time will need the ability to bring in new limits on take

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Floodplain harvesting measurement, Modelling, Other

15. Your feedback: There has been years of unlicensed take from the floodplain ,there are no water meters on the floodplain, the attempt to build a model to calculate take has been extremely poorly done. The floodplain management plan has not been implemented yet in the Macquarie, the fact that the CAP model is set in legislation in NSW and now the CAP scenario model has been made up using questionable data makes the whole process rubbish.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: poor consultation, short timeframe, disgracefully submission process limiting answers, no information on unapproved works, inability of the model to include return flows. Using 2009 as the baseline vegetation means that the floodplain was at the end of a 7 year drought is wrong and fails to identify the real value of the floodplain to the wider eco-system in the Macquarie marshes. No on ground monitoring took place ,there is major errors in the information used to develop the model even incorrect place names and river gauge names, this undermines the whole process ,the nsw government has failed to convince me that the proposed policy is a serious attempt to find a solution to the difficult problem of licensing floodplain harvest take.

Submission 18

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Central West Environment Council
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Central West NSW
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This allows for a greater volume of water to be extracted from intermittent floods. An average 5 yr occurrence of flood events in the Macquarie means that more water can be taken under these accounting rules
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Only the volume of a FPH licence should be available at any given time
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This provides the opportunity to better manage the volume of FPH take from critical flood flows
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** These will help to protect important environmental and cultural values from additional extraction of flood flows
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** All forms of environmental water must be protected from extraction through FPH. This is a requirement of the basin Plan
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important for the FPH rules in the WSP to be amended without triggering compensation calims
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** Other
15. **Your feedback:** Please refer to separate detailed Submission #04.
 - 15.1. **Please provide feedback in the box below:** Please refer to separate detailed Submission #04.

Submission 19

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Inland Rivers Network
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Across inland NSW
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** See attached submission
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** See attached submission
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This allows for improved management of FPH take once metering & monitoring is in place
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** See attached submission
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** See attached submission
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The proposed amendments allow for change to water sharing plan rules based on new knowledge without triggering compensation
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** Downstream outcomes report, Floodplain harvesting measurement, Modelling, Predicted environmental outcomes, Report to assist community consultation
15. **Your feedback:** See attached submission
 - 15.1. **Please provide feedback in the box below:** N/A

Submission 20

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – non floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I don't support this rule as it allows for greater take of water over time up to 500% greater than licensed volume all this possible before bottom end of River has received any water.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Usually these flood events come after extended dry periods.the water received from these events is critical for recovery of the the whole system not just the irrigator's in top end of the river. It is critical to understand that this is some irrigators third entitlement before others in the river have had one, and if you have 5 year account management rules this possibly is 7 entitlements before others have any. Also this water is important for ground water recharge, down stream communities and water dependent ecosystem
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** As Flood Plain Harvesting is not properly licensed yet not being metered with no idea of the take I think it would ludicrous to lock anything in.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I think it is important for these zones and rules as without these rules irrigators in these areas could trade water into areas with different commence to pump heights. I think there should be tighter restrictions on trade, its already open as a free for all if you have supplementary license Macquarie valley capped 50GL you could trade this supp water and still have a full storage or vise versa. This makes a mockery of the supp cap. Remembering these licenses are being issued to legalize existing take not create more take from

different areas. Trade could jeopardise areas of high environmental and cultural value as well as down stream irrigators with unregulated licenses.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: Yes

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Held environmental water needs to be protected from extraction at all times this is a requirement of the Basin Plan and should be enforced thoroughly.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: There has to be a provision for change the Floodplain Harvesting Rules in Water Sharing Plans, as the licensing of this take is new ground it could be disastrous if the rules and volumes are wrong. The inaccuracy in the information provided gives me NO confidence in the model. These inaccuracies could lead to huge compensation claims this would be ironic being given a license for something you just took illegally with no access licence and then to possibly receive compensation due to a mistake, this would be wrong on so many levels as there was no compensation to areas this water used to go.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling, Other

15. Your feedback: There needs to be more restrictions on Floodplain Harvesting until end of system flows targets are met ,to ensure sufficient water reaches the Barwon Darling-Baaka before upstream irrigators get there third entitlement. If the peaks of all the floods are taken there will be no further bird breeding events,more fish kills and bigger more severe droughts.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: One year accounting with no carryover will mean there is a limit to take. Five year accounting will allow take limited only by irrigators storage capacity this would lead to the demise of the already shrinking Macquarie Marshes and and other floodplains in the basin. There should be stringent check on licensing unlicensed structures used to take floodplain harvesting water with consideration of where that water might of ended up.

Submission 21

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Susan Kilminster
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Sydney
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** Yes
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Entitlement size is moderate, ability to control current growth is moderate. Risk to environment and downstream is low. However the
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** If more than 1ML there could be an effect on environmental flow and downstream in a long lasting drought -as just experienced.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It depends on rainfall and inflow into the catchment area and on the monitoring of the extraction limits of the water entitlements-not to mention the ethics of the landholders.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Again it is the protection of the environmental flows into many areas of diversity including the RAMSAR wetlands.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** the government regulators need to protect defined types of environmental water and all the diversity that this resource supports..
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** When protected water flows freely across flood plains to replenish ecosystems, there shouldn't be any flood plain harvesting constructions to divert it. A few years ago some irrigators were observed building

kilometres of earth walls to contain flood waters on their property on Queensland NSW border.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report, Floodplain harvesting measurement, Modelling, Predicted environmental outcomes

15. Your feedback: N/A

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Water is such a vital resource so we are disappointed that the government seems to disregard its importance when discussing the enormous quantities needed (from local rivers) for the extraction of coal, and the potential contamination of the water table in the Great Artesian Basin with Coal Seam Gas Industry.

Submission 22

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Dharrivaa Elders Group
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** First Nation
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** No
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** We do not believe that carryover of water that has not rained or has not flowed in the river should be allowed. The river should not owe irrigators water.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** No comment
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Yes, we agree that available water determinations should be varied. We support Adaptive Management but not in the way the NSW government uses it, which is incorrect. Adaptive management should be managed by experts, such as Professor Richard Kingsford and other scientists from the University of NSW. We insist that the government uses adaptive management properly
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** We do not support trade of floodplain harvesting licences under any circumstances.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** We do not support licencing floodplain harvesting, but support active management of all water
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** No
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** N/A
15. **Your feedback:** It was very hard to represent our opinions using the drop-down options you provided. You have purposefully excluded providing us with opportunities

to provide rationales to our answers in some questions and not others. For example in answer to question 7 I wanted to answer "Enough to know that the modelling for floodplain harvesting is not fit for purpose. The modelling is very hard to follow and does not help communities in any way". In answer to question 11 I wanted to put "We do not support trade of floodplain harvesting licences under any circumstances."

I give permission for this submission to be made publicly available ONLY if these feedback comments in their entirety are also published.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: It was very hard to represent our opinions using the drop-down options you provided. You have purposefully excluded providing us with opportunities to provide rationales to our answers in some questions and not others. For example in answer to question 7 I wanted to answer "Enough to know that the modelling for floodplain harvesting is not fit for purpose. The modelling is very hard to follow and does not help communities in any way". In answer to question 11 I wanted to put "We do not support trade of floodplain harvesting licences under any circumstances."

I give permission for this submission to be made publicly available ONLY if these feedback comments in their entirety are also published.

Submission 23

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** National Parks Association of NSW
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** State wide
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** NPA opposed the aggregation of access allowances to up to 500% of licences volumes
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This level supports environmental flows and inundation of water dependant ecosystems during flood events
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Adaptive management is the only option in the absence of sufficient data on current extraction levels during floods
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** They have a positive effect on the delivery of water to water dependant ecosystems
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Needs to go even further to ensure that Held Environmental Water is protected from extraction
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** No comment
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** N/A
15. **Your feedback:** N/A
 - 15.1. **Please provide feedback in the box below:** N/A

Submission 24

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Jane Paul
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental Group
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Higher access to water will be possible over the time period which could result in a 500% increase to size of the licenced volume.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Larger volumes will affect flood-dependent ecosystems especially after a drought period.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** FPH must be metered to understand accurately the volume of water being taken from floodplain harvesting.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is important there be close monitoring of these areas to prevent any increase in water extraction.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** HEW must be protected at all times. Such protection must be included in this proposed application.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The proposed amendments will ensure such as compensation payouts are avoided.
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** Modelling, Other
15. **Your feedback: There is information bias of 51% in modelling upstream of Narromine that must be addressed.**

There is no rule indicated that FPH will be restricted until end of system flow targets are met. Flood flows must reach the Barwon Darling-Baaka being commencement of floodplain harvesting.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: It is wrong to issue permanent property rights at any time, even if public good outcomes are guaranteed. Such public asset of enormous wealth must remain in public hands and managed by government. FPH must be reduced in Macquarie valley even if now under allowable limit, and the rights of the river made the priority, ; more water for the river is critical. There should be no consideration of allowing rainfall runoff (tailwater) harvesting being increased from 10%.

Submission 25

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Nature Conservation Council of NSW
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** State-wide peak group
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This rule allows higher access to water over time by letting FPH account balances grow up to 500% the size of the licenced volume. FPH modelling does not include climate change. Likely changes in flood patterns due to climate change indicate less frequent, larger floods. Large account balances up to 500% would accommodate larger diversions in those conditions.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Until FPH is metered there is no accurate understanding of the volumes of water being taken from flood flows.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Areas of high environmental value must be protected from increased water extraction, as must areas of cultural significance.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The rule does not go far enough. It is a requirement of the Basin Plan that Held Environmental Water (HEW) is protected from extraction, however it is proposed to only protect HEW when active management is 100%. HEW must be protected at all times.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling, Other

15. Your feedback: Additional rules are needed that restrict FPH access until end of system flow targets are met, to ensure that flood flows will reach the Barwon Darling-Baaka before FPH commences upstream.

Rules that protect Held Environmental Water from FPH diversion when it is being used to create an overbank event must be extended to protect Active Environmental Water Allowance flows.

The bias in the modelling of 51% upstream of Narromine is a serious information deficiency.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Receive DPIE Water comms.

Submission 26

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Wentworth Group of Concerned Scientists and the Environmental Defenders Office
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Sydney
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** N/A
15. **Your feedback:** N/A
 - 15.1. **Please provide feedback in the box below:** N/A

Submission 27

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** Yes
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** 5 year account management rules give good flexibility for irrigators between flood and drought years while still limiting growth into the future
8. **Available Water determination would support:** More than 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The Macquarie valley is well below Cap even under current conditions and as a result irrigators should be able to continue to extract at current levels. To do this a Hot start of greater than 1 ML per unit share is needed in the event of floods in the first few years of implementation
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Available water determinations are the best way to reduce take in the event of a cap breach or increase take in the event of underusage in valleys like the Macquarie
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The trading zones are very restrictive for some zone and very open in others which causes inequity between certain zones. Restricting trade from new works in zone A is also problematic with significant issue in the floodplain management plan modeling and mapping
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

15. Your feedback: N/A

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 28

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Barwon-Darling Water Inc
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – non floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** We support the licencing, monitoring, metering, and reporting of all water take to ensure compliance with legal limits. And we are disappointed that 20-years after other NSW water entitlements were brought into a legal framework, floodplain harvesting remains out of that licencing framework. It is also disappointing that the state government cannot provide entitlement holders with adequate information to make an informed decision around how to achieve compliance with legal limits. The government's approach is failing all water users and all communities directly impacted by this FPH reform. Consultation around local, valley-based rules seems to be an academic exercise at this time, as the parliament has not agreed to support the framework to enable licencing to occur. The Water Management (General) Amendment (Floodplain Harvesting) Regulation 2021 must be agreed to before valley-based rules can be drafted, the benefits and impacts modelled, and consulted with impacted water users and communities. Consequently, we support in-principle rules which ensure future access remains within long-term legal limits but balances the highly variable nature of overland flows in these northern ephemeral systems, which only occur when our rivers are full and spilling, and water is abundant. These rules must allow for peak use at those rare times when the rivers are flooding, to provide our region and its economy the opportunity to access water to store it for future use. This sort of accounting approach provides certainty for our local industry and the community. It is essential that this certainty of water access is available while ensuring overall limits can be achieved in the longer-term. These rules must consider the risks to local communities losing production, commercial activity, along with the risk to the environment and downstream communities which already seem to have been considered. Also, the community impact of accounting strategies must be considered. For example, using the last 10-years of modelled floodplain harvesting take in the Gwydir, under annual accounting periods using the same entitlement shares, the water foregone has a community impact of \$1.2B due to restrictions in 2011, 2012 and 2016 resulting in average take over that 10-year period being just 40,121 ML/year. This compares with under a 5-year accounting rule using a fully transitional licence arrangement the community impact is \$300M with restrictions in

2011 and 2012 (when rivers in the basin were full and spilling), reducing average take over the same 10-years to 92,260 ML/year. This highlights that even the 5-year approach maybe unnecessarily restricting take considering the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year is higher than the 10-year average. The state government's intention is to licence this historical form of take (FPH) within defined limits, no more or no less. This is not an exercise in environmental reform but an essential compliance reform. Achieving compliance has environmental and hydrological benefits. To achieve the compliance target, there is an estimated average community impact of \$93M which government has not considered as part of the policy. The cumulative social and economic impact of this reform on communities, and how it is being implemented, must be acknowledged, and moderated by government, to ensure there is no irreversible social and economic impact on affected regions.

8. Available Water determination would support: More than 1ML per unit share

8.1. Please explain your rationale: The negative community impacts of transitioning to FPH licences has been ignored by government and must be acknowledged. The intention of government is to licence an historical form of take called floodplain harvesting licencing, within defined limits, no more or no less. This is not an environmental reform but an essential compliance reform which has environmental benefits when implemented. In achieving this we support the adoption of a modelled account balance that estimates, what could be in accounts if licences were implemented at the time of the last valley-wide flood, which was in 2012. The Gwydir Valley Irrigators Association submission provides much more information on this matter. Our concern is if a transitional arrangement like this is not put in place and a flood occurs in the first years of the new arrangements, the rare opportunity to access up to the new lower but compliant, long-term volume will be missed. The reduction would be far greater than the long-term requirements, and it will not have any additional environmental benefit given the scale of the flooding already occurring. For example, if flooding occurs like the floods in 2011 and 2012 and no transitional arrangements are in place, there could be \$1.1B of economic losses in the Gwydir community, which cannot be regained. This will drive the community into a government enforced drought, and the overall impact of the reform will be greater than that required to achieve compliance. Even under a fully transitioned licence (using the modelled account balance) water will be foregone, but at least the Gwydir industry and community could have a share in the flows. The approach of establishing transitional licence conditions is not new and not without precedent, eg: the Gwydir Groundwater Plan. Under any licencing approach, unless there is a flood, there is no benefit to industry, community, or environment. However, a flood provides massive opportunities for all.

9. Support AWD varied as adaptive management method: Yes

9.1. Please explain your rationale: We support allowing available water determinations to be varied to manage take within limits, especially if the rules are so restrictive that future take is below allowable limits. This is relevant considering the 10-year accounting analysis that suggests average take is only 92,260 ML/year, well below the long-term compliance target of 120,000ML/year. Where an updated model scenario shows the rules are too restrictive then there needs to be a mechanism to adjust access to achieve this limit. Its important that government be able to provide opportunities for water users to have access to their legally

defined volume. If there is water that should be made available than government has a responsibility to enable rules to access it. This rule provides a consistent approach. I support raising accounting limits to allow for the carryover of this additional water, consistent with long-term accounting approach.

10. Know trade water entitlements is a requirement: Yes

11. Support the proposed trading zones: No

11.1. Please explain your rationale: The trade rules are far too narrow and restrictive, and do not reflect the operation of the river system. There should be open trade across the river, and temporary trade should be allowed between related parties.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Clear rules to protect environmental water must be implemented. However, active management adds another layer of complexity in managing water in these highly variable systems. Active management will serve to limit access because there is limited information on how floodplains work, and localised rainfall events can create sudden flushes and localised flooding. Existing water management and monitoring systems are inadequate in these situations and there are significant risks of active management being implemented in a fair and reasonable manner. The impact of this rule on those being restricted and on the valley compliance limit, has not be determined or considered. As this is a new rule, beyond just licencing historical take within limits it makes sense to undertake a socio-economic impact assessment.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The current amendment provisions undermine the certainty 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. We support an amendment that requires the recalibration of a 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.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

15. Your feedback: N/A

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: You should be using local media

Submission 29

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – non floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** Yes
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Best allows for the episodic nature of floods over time
8. **Available Water determination would support:** More than 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Accounts should start at 500% less any FPH taken over the previous 4 years
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Many general security irrigators re not flood plain harvesters, so adaptive management best applied to Supplementary take if required
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Trading zones too restrictive, better by river reaches ie Narromine-Gin Gin, Gin Gin to Warren , Warren to Marebone, Marebone to Oxley, Bulgrega alone etc.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No comment
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** No comment
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** N/A
15. **Your feedback:** N/A
 - 15.1. **Please provide feedback in the box below:** N/A

Submission 30

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** Water for Rivers
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Environmental group
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Members of group live across the Murray Darling Basin and eastern NSW
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This is another form of the 500% carryover rule and permits excessive extractions and diversions from struggling river systems which are prevent flood waters restoring whole of river connectivity
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Flood events form a critical part of drought recovery, especially for flood-dependent ecosystems, downstream communities and groundwater recharge. Initial access to licenced entitlement should not be a larger volume.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Until FPH is metered there is no accurate understanding of the volumes of water being taken from flood flows.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** NAME REDACTED oppose the privatisation of water and seek the curbing of the damage caused to river systems and First Nations Water Rights by the commodification of water
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** But the rule does not go far enough. It is a requirement of the Basin Plan that Held Environmental Water (HEW) is protected from extraction, however it is proposed to only protect HEW when active management is 100%. HEW must be protected at all times.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: There must be ability to change FPH rules in water sharing plans to avoid compensation payouts from the public purse.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

15. Your feedback: Additional rules are needed that restrict FPH access until end of system flow targets are met, to ensure that flood flows will reach the Barwon Darling-Baaka before FPH commences upstream. The bias in the modelling of 51% upstream of Narromine is a serious information deficiency.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 31

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – non floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Modelling, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** If we knew what our individual allocations were it would make this decision easier. 5-year account rules means a large amount of floodplain water license is going to be held by people who have not been traditional Floodplain harvesters in the past.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** More than 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** If we have 5-year accounting, we need a worthwhile start seeing we don't know what our license allocation is.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Water to the Macquarie marshes has had increased flows by 10% to 15% according to modelling carried out during the 1998 to 2008 Floodplain plan, due to development on the floodplain by the way of roads, railways, levees and structures on various creeks keeping the water to the eastern side of the river and going north instead of west. It would be good if a modeller would publicly acknowledge this as the department stopped Sinclair Knight Mertz from doing this.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The water trading zones are unworkable. Trade zones should be the same as general security water licenses not restricted to your neighboring property holders in little areas on the floodplain.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The people managing the river system are out of touch. River had never run dry below Warren until the environment had half the dam. Water is being wasted after major flood events by the environmental

water holders decision makers by releasing large volumes irresponsibly taking the dam straight down to 70% to 80%. They have already shown us how they manage water.

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? No

13.1. Please explain your rationale: The goal post never stops moving. If you want to kill irrigation your going the right way about it. We can't keep living with the uncertainty that our infrastructure investments are continually eroded at the hands of some ill informed bureaucrats

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling

15. Your feedback: The percentage of floodplain water allocated to the southern zones is ridiculous given they have never pumped these allocations and never will. All I have heard about is history of use. You stated current floodplain harvesting is below the plan limit and no reduction in current floodplain harvesting is required, why the restrictive zones and reduced allocations for traditional floodplain harvesters in the Northern areas of the valley.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: Communication to people who went to a lot of trouble and expense to fill in a ROI for floodplain harvesting has been appalling with most consultation meetings being found out about by word of mouth. All our contact details were in the ROI.

Submission 32

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Michael Egan
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – non floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Modelling, Environmental, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** Yes
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** accept an industry standard approach which loosely aligns with FPH sequences.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** More than 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** 500% hot start as agreed to by industry and DPIW policy. Many irrigators will be disadvantaged whilst others are not, if less than 500% AWD initialization. This is the only fair way
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** HEW(Held Environmental Water) is not on the Floodplain at any time at higher river flows. HEW can only be delivered in the Macquarie Regulated river system at 3200ML/Day at Marebone where it is measured. This volume also assumes there is no other water orders in the system below Marebone.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The trading zones suggested is not fit for purpose. They were made up by an inter-agency panel for the Unregulated Macquarie Bogan Water Source in 2012 where OEH had a conflict of interest as the only Stakeholder involved. It was an appalling set of rules where nearly every irrigator including myself was disadvantaged and sidelined. A select few were able to take advantage of the situation at other people's expense. Me included! I am very annoyed that other water uses including the E water can better their positions and I cannot. This is because of a few draconian rules by NSW Departments that do not align with the basic principles and objectives of all Water Sharing plans. Nor does it comply with the MDB Plan trading Rules. The Proposed Trading rules are not fit for purpose! There should be free and open trade up and down the floodplain system with a conversion factor exercised at the same as the Model entitlements are to be issued where flood sequences vary in different river reaches. Temporary

Trade should be allowed between related or same businesses and ownership. Our farms is an example of this. Kiameron (M052) and Duffity (M004), are connected by the same floodway.

12. Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences: No

12.1. Please explain your rationale: Same reason as answer for 10.1

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: Only if the ammendments are both ways, up or down. If the rules cannot be ammended to allow for model inconsistencies that stop floodplain harvesters realising their long term extractions there must be no ammendments at all.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: N/A

15. Your feedback: N/A

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: NSWIC & MRFF & emails have been good sources in this regard. What the DPIE does with the feedback is what is important.

Submission 33

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Catherine Merchant
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Ducklamoi near Oberon
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Five years is too long - especially for floodplain take where there is a high degree of uncertainty for individual take and it is unclear if/when FPH take will be brought under the metering reforms. It is noted no downstream report is available as it has not been done for the Macquarie Valley.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Anything higher is not consistent with the precautionary principle under water laws as there is a high degree of uncertainty and modelling data not independently validated.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Yes - until flood water is properly measured there is no understanding of what flood water is being taken. This may explain why the Macquarie Marshes are dying.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** First Nation peoples spiritual and cultural flows must be better protected along with sensitive wetlands and riparian zones.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It provides the best approach to responsive management but should be stronger.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Locking in rules for ten years is silly as many things could change such as ecological crash from excessive extraction or climate change impacts especially when recent data is ignored ie only until 2009..

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report, Floodplain harvesting measurement, Modelling

15. Your feedback: I am disappointed at the lack of rigour in the modelling that supports the introduction of what should be a significant reform of floodplain management. Stronger rules are needed to protect water take access until end of catchment targets have been reached rather than take based on uncertain and weak predictions. The community has no confidence in current levels of take and it is unclear when metering will commence. Licencing FPH waters in such a vacuum is dangerous.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: We often travel in central NSW - we have a bush block at Duckmaloi. The death of the Macquarie Marshes is disturbing and unfair and can only be a consequence of NSW water mismanagement. Licencing of FPH waters should provide an opportunity for government to correct this past mismanagement. NSW government has not genuinely committed to the MDBP and its intent to bring basin water take to levels that are sustainable and take account of future climate predictions. Locking in current over allocations now with a FPH licences that become private property only exacerbates this dire situation for the Macquarie Valley and contradicts the requirement for sustainable water management under water laws.

Submission 34

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – non floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Lower Darling
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** A 500% increase to FPH account balances over time has a significant impact to the environment and downstream users.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Floods contribute to the health of dependent ecosystems and are a natural process to aid with drought recovery.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** Yes
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** M Until FPH is metered accurately there is no understanding or transparency of the volumes taken from flood flows.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** Yes
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Trading zones should protect cultural and environmental significant sites from over extraction.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Held Environmental Water must be protected at all times. Active Management must ensure this is the case at all times.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** No one wants to see a situation where compensations payouts are given by government for licenses given out by government.
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** Downstream outcomes report

15. Your feedback: Although not updated, the down stream effects must be considered as a whole of river approach and additional rules are needed to restrict FPH access until proper down stream flow targets are implemented and met.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: FPH won't be reduced in the Macquarie because the Government says total water extractions are under the allowable limit? The volume of the allowable limit was changed. No one understands how this new limit was determined.

Submission 35

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – non floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** This rule is allowing a huge access to water over time. It is 500% carryover which means that licence holders would be able to take a bulk of water when it does flood, taking away any opportunity after drought of bird breeding events. It's a catastrophic and outrageous rule.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Recovery after drought is dependent upon flooding rains. FPH licence holders should not be entitled to any larger volumes of water. The take of a first flush of up to 500% should not be allowed at all.
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There has been so much mismanagement thus far, the dept cannot be trusted with any decision making.
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** FP harvested water shouldn't be happening in the first place, let alone that it be traded.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is a requirement of the Basin Plan that Held Environmental Water is protected from extraction AT ALL TIMES. Active management does not ensure that.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** Yes
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** If licensing of FPH goes ahead there must be a mechanism to change FPH rules in WSP's to avoid compensation payouts, and possibly to reverse FPH licencing all together.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Modelling, Other

15. Your feedback: There needs to be more rules in regard to restricting FPH access until proper end of system flow targets are met, to make sure flood flows reach the Barwon Darling before FPH commences upstream.

The modelling provided is flawed.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: The whole process of trying to licence FPH in the northern basin has just been a tick the box process for you. It is outrageous to allow any carryover at all, let alone it being a compensable and tradable right. It is in contravention of the water act. This is not restoring and maintaining the environment which should come first, it is actively managing to destroy it.

It is also reflected in the cut, paste and flick mentality as seen above in leaving the Gwydir text in, instead of the Macquarie. It's sloppy and reflects little care for what or who is trying to survive downstream.

Submission 36

1. **Who are you representing?** An organisation
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – non floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Northern inland valley
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** N/A
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Average flood interval =5years, thus FPH is designed to TAKE the first of all floods before the environment in contravention of S5(3)abc
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** FPH has occurred last year & this year which would be more than the average 5 year total. Therefore NO more take in this 5 year period. It is also a requirement to restore, repair & maintain to sustainability the ecosystem this has not been done since the DOR, which was 30% of the previous DOR
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The SA royal commission found maladministration, unlawfulness & political fixes. The NSW ICAC found Corruption, Nepotism, Cronyism. The proof is in the last 50 years of your management. you can't be trusted with anything
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** It is also a requirement in the water act 2007 to follow schedule 2 "Basin water charging objectives & principles" including full cost recovery including environmental externalities & it is to move to "upper bound pricing" if not the size of the subsidy is to be reported publicly.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** In the water act 2007 part 1 sec.3 "OBJECTS" of the act (a)The Com. & basin states to manage the basin water

resources in the 'NATIONAL INTEREST'. FPH under any management is not in the 'National Interest'

13. Do you support proposed amendment provisions? Yes

13.1. Please explain your rationale: When there is a Royal Commission & your mis management is fully exposed their needs to be a mechanism to reverse this mess.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Downstream outcomes report, Floodplain harvesting measurement, Modelling, Other information provided by the department, Predicted environmental outcomes, Report to assist community consultation

15. Your feedback: The WRAP (Water Reform Action Plan) has now been exposed as a publicity stunt to cover up the WaterNSW Strategic Plan to be a customer centric organisation increasing their value by 15%. customer service by 20% ie 20% more water. and a 20% more entangled relationship ie corrupted

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: It first became apparent to me that there was a disaster unfolding in the Macquarie in about 1967. The spiral downwards which won't end until all the water is taken. Submission are a (floored) transparency way of passing the guilt onto the community whilst justifying taking more water. SEE Q6 This is not the Gwydir WSP, You need to restart your consultation corrected !

Submission 37

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Water user – non floodplain harvester
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Macquarie
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** Yes
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Modelling, Peer review, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** Yes
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No comment
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** N/A
8. **Available Water determination would support:** More than 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** There's been no floodplain harvesting by 75% of the water harvesters on your map
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** You will only keep taking until you have all the water with out paying any compensation
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** Yes
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** The Macquarie valley is under its SDL and you have only allocated 52gl so even if this was all traded to the one area it's not going to have a big impact. Also if you have licensed on history of use there will be minimal trading. You have also made the zones so small that you have people's places in two different areas making accounting the water very difficult.
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** Yes
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Water needs to be managed not taken away which is what has been happening for the last 20 years
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** No
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** I would like to say yes if I thought that if the government found that they'd Got the figures incorrect they would issue more water but i can only see more uncertainty for the landholders who have already had 13 years of limbo.

14. Select subject you want to provide feedback on: Other

15. Your feedback: I can not see how we should have faith in the ability of the FPH decision makers when they have allocated 70% of the FPH water where there's no FPH taking place. This looks like a great way to allocate 52gl and not have it pumped. I also think it's ridiculous we're doing this without a farm take figure being given out and a map of the FPH zones being so small just looks like you're hiding information from the people who's livelihood is being played with !!! DON'T PUSH TO HARD WE ARE ONLY HUMAN AND HUMANS HAVE LIMITS.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: N/A

Submission 38

1. **Who are you representing?** Myself (individual)
 - 1.1. **Name:** Anonymous
 - 1.2. **Organisation name:** N/A
2. **Which stakeholder group best describes you?** Community member
3. **Where are you located?** Other
 - 3.1. **If other, please specify:** Lower Darling Basin
4. **Attended Macquarie public webinar:** No
5. **Which supporting documents have you read?** Downstream outcomes, Environmental, Report to assist community consultation
6. **Understand linkage between account management & entitlement size:** No
7. **Support 5-year account management rules:** No
 - 7.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Your 'rules ' are lies.
8. **Available Water determination would support:** 1ML per unit share
 - 8.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Less than 1 Meg. That water belongs in our rivers and lakes
9. **Support AWD varied as adaptive management method:** No
 - 9.1. **Please explain your rationale:** During dry times. Irrigation farms seems to remove essential water for down stream
10. **Know trade water entitlements is a requirement:** No
11. **Support the proposed trading zones:** No
 - 11.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Floodplain harvesting needs to be banned
12. **Support active management to floodplain harvesting access licences:** No
 - 12.1. **Please explain your rationale:** Floodplain harvesting is detrimental to Australia's environment.
13. **Do you support proposed amendment provisions?** No
 - 13.1. **Please explain your rationale:** More water for the environment and proper management
14. **Select subject you want to provide feedback on:** Downstream outcomes report, Floodplain harvesting measurement, Predicted environmental outcomes, Report to assist community consultation
15. **Your feedback:** Floodplain harvesting is a catastrophic environment disaster waiting to happen. You are foolish to believe that this is a good thing. Detrimental to Australia's struggling flora and fauna . Already happening where I live. Fish kills , vanishing of breeding grounds.

15.1. Please provide feedback in the box below: We are watching the bad decisions already being made by NSW Water NSW Government and the National Party.