

## Agenda

MEETING	Healthy Floodplains Review Committee		
MEETING NO.	6	DATE	1 <sup>st</sup> June 2018
LOCATION	<b>Teleconference:</b> [REDACTED] <b>Guest PIN:</b> [REDACTED] <b>Host:</b> [REDACTED]	TIME	10.30am – 12.30 pm
PARTICIPANTS	[REDACTED]		
APOLOGIES	[REDACTED]		
PREPARED BY	[REDACTED]		

Item no.	Time	Agenda item	Lead	Attachment number
1	10.30	Welcome and purpose	[REDACTED]	N/A
2	10.35	Report on actions and status of individual submissions presented at the meeting on 10 <sup>th</sup> of May 2018.	[REDACTED]	1 and 1.1
3	11.10	Update on actions regarding policy review on how to deal with floodplain harvesting outside a designated floodplain and how this will affect Plan Limits.	[REDACTED]	N/A
4	11.30	Progress on optimising impacts between FPH individuals with eligible development	[REDACTED]	N/A
5	11.50	Determining unregulated v's FPH	[REDACTED]	2
6	12.10	Historical Part 8 approvals in the Barwon-Darling and analysis of ROI's in the Barwon-Darling	[REDACTED]	N/A
7	12.20	Barwon-Darling Cap – does it include FPH?	[REDACTED]	N/A
8		Other business		

### Actions arising

Item no.	Notes
1	N/A Meeting opened 10am

<p>2</p>	<p>N072 – ██████████ – okay  N091 – ██████████ – okay  N142 – ██████████ – okay  N149, N150 – ██████████ – okay  N226 – ██████████ – okay  N227 – ██████████ – okay  N230 – ██████████ – okay  N142 – ██████████ – okay</p> <p>█████ Should we advise if they can go to the Minister?  █████ – Could get a judicial review to appeal if the process and procedure has been fair.  █████ - Letters are cold and hard  █████ – need to get closure</p> <p>BD021 – ██████████ – ██████ questioned the results and couldn't quite understand. Hold in abeyance.</p> <p>Indicate to landholder – considering eligibility and there will be a site inspection.  █████ – ██████████ – thought that water was flowing across land to another stream..  Unreg licences cover their take.  █████ to provide photos and notes and additional information.  █████ requested an on-ground inspection. To be organised out of session. ██████ to follow up.  █████ – may see this in higher flow events in the bd.  █████ - Need clarity if flow between rivers is regarded as overland flow.  █████ – need hydrogeology input to inform the discussion.  █████ – away 7 weeks from Monday – send notes and he will be happy.  █████ and ██████ can get out there. ██████ commitments until week after next.  █████ not available for 2-3 weeks – end of July looks okay. ██████ back 17<sup>th</sup> – maybe a Friday in last week of July.  31<sup>st</sup> Tuesday. ██████ could meet somewhere.  █████ – car from twth – will work it out.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>█████ – Brief has not been completed yet. ██████ sent a letter from NCC to express that they don't support the inclusion of water outside the floodplain – see attachment.</p> <p>Key question – does the designated floodplain need to be extended now, future or never?</p> <p>█████ – anomaly needs to be considered in policy position – others need to determine - this not the ██████</p> <p>█████ – likely to be smaller floodplains that take FPH that we could not include. Using the des FP to capture FPH and floodplain planning. Need to be hydrologically connected. If separate, doesn't make sense to expand FP. May choose to designate as its own FP on risk based assessment – if reqd planning and FPH. Not going to designate all FP in NSW – has to be done on a risk basis. Is there significant risk in that catchment area now or in the future.</p>

	<p>█ – Pilliga scrub shifts water not absorbs. Drains into a swamp and lagoon. Hydrologically connected and massive amount of water comes from this area. So, is it a fp, needs to be determined by department. People catching it so wonder what they should be doing?</p> <p>█ – greater implications for other industries – contentious issues regarding the floodplain. Is a legislative response by the govt. Not RC's place to have a position on this.</p> <p>If not designated as floodplains so not in the brief of the committee.</p> <p>█ – Can't make a decision on this. Where do you stop with exemptions and anomalies. Not our consideration.</p> <p>█ – ineligible not on floodplain. Hold letter until we can articulate the policy in relation to his.</p> <p>█ – can he continue with his practices?</p> <p>█ – Do they have other forms of licensing for water take?</p> <p>█ – would look at his development and licenses and wouldn't necessarily get a volume. Follow the same process as others.</p> <p>█ – this process has not yet dealt with the issues that pertain to your application. Outside the process- ineligible as they don't meet the criteria under the current view.</p> <p>█ not outside the process at large.</p> <p>█ Outside the scope of review committee</p> <p>█ – need to resolve this for a broader area not just this one</p> <p>RC happy with letter to be sent to participant N0142.</p>
4	<p>Optimising impacts – █ – looked at options – found one that might work – will take around four weeks. Discussion with cmmwth. Progressing the works to smooth impacts across individuals</p>
5	<p>█ – if people not deemed eligible, how do they deal with rainfall runoff? Levees impoundment?</p> <p>█ – two components – need to calculate amount of rainfall in fph. If already unreg licence – no eligibility – have had volcon sufficient to cover entitlement.</p> <p>If only RR property – no unreg, fph, eligible for FPH.</p> <p>2 parts –RR, overland. Both or one. If you have access to either one you are eligible for FPH.</p> <p>Need to consider this more closely</p> <p>█ –Do you require info or do you want to ask questions?</p> <p>█ – policy that outlines this?</p> <p>█ – what would you like?</p> <p>█ – advice being offered to the growers would be a good start.</p> <p>If a farmer is not eligible for FPH what offering in terms of RR?</p> <p>█ – policy – if you have works that are eligible then you can take that volume. Based on four criteria (FPH policy) – if you have infrastructure to capture RR and/or overland.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Criteria</li> <li>2. Unreg licence – already have the volume for fph perhaps</li> </ol> <p>█ – developed could take more than HR – exceeded quite quickly</p> <p>█ – some development in landscape with no development or &gt;2008. Some might not get what they need for development. If unreg licence don't use FP licence as it is dealt with in</p>

	<p>unreg licence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ – more information required and to contemplate.</li> <li>■ – potential to open pandora’s box. Good to have time to reflect on issues</li> <li>■ - what is relevance to our role</li> <li>■ – FPH licence in two parts – RR, OL flow. If you have 100% developed farm that has no access to FPH – rainfall would be in FPH.</li> <li>■ – <b>role is determining eligibility. Have to deal with what comes before you. First – not an issue as eligibility has not been challenged – none regarding this issue. Work through these on a case by case basis. Best understood when we get submissions that deal with this type of issue.</b></li> <li>■ – more materials about fph policy plays out when there is an unreg licence.</li> </ul> <p>Will apply policy as need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ – all water take will be under access licence and HR on the property. Booked against his unreg licence.</li> <li>■ – affect account balance.</li> <li>■ – may need to make good with volume assigned. Need to bring individuals into line with framework and policy. C&amp;E.</li> <li>■ – reg?</li> <li>■ – no RR in reg – not the same.</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ reported his investigations. See action notes</li> <li>■ – changed works from permissions to Part 8 when he realised it was needed. Requirements for part 8 for irrigation infrastructure is only very recent.</li> <li>■ – Act made no exemptions – part 8 was always required..</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ – Cap – 189GL is unreg, abc licences , FPH on top is 16.5GL. Similar to all processes – will be getting a better picture under this project. Expect this number to increase. FPH not included – FPH on top of that. Not in 189GL Cap.</li> <li>■ – in wsp?</li> <li>■ – yes</li> <li>■ – within channel is 189 est of fph in BDL is 16.5</li> </ul>
8	<p>Next meeting – tbc <b>Meeting closed 1145</b></p> <p>Policy refinements – consultation outcomes and fact sheet. Will set framework for us – everyone will get a copy.</p> <p><b>Amend CRO letter and send to ■ – LLS Office</b></p>