

# Water Recovery for the Macquarie River Floodplain

## Community Workshop Summary

Prepared for



Prepared by



**Hassall & Associates**

Hassall & Associates Pty Ltd  
4/52 Phillip Street  
GPO Box 4625  
Sydney NSW 2001  
Tel 02 9241 5655  
Fax 02 9241 5684

**F  
I  
N  
A  
L  
  
R  
E  
P  
O  
R  
T**

**AU1-472**

---

**March 2007**



---

Prepared March 2007

Contact Person	Jack Knowles Consultant
Address	GPO Box 4625 4/52 Phillip Street Sydney NSW 2001
Telephone Number	02 9241 5655
Facsimile Number	02 9241 5684
E-mail address	<a href="mailto:jknowles@hassall.com.au">jknowles@hassall.com.au</a>

All description, figures, analyses, forecasts and other details have been prepared in good faith from information furnished to Hassall & Associates Pty Ltd by other parties. These data are believed to be correct at the date of preparation of this report.

However, it should be noted that predictions, forecasts and calculations are subject to assumptions which may or may not turn out to be correct and Hassall & Associates Pty Ltd expressly disclaim all and any liability to any persons in reliance, in whole or in part, on the report in total or any part of its contents.

**HASSALL & ASSOCIATES PTY LTD**

**ABN: 95 001 211 007**

---

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Introduction .....	1
1.2. Purpose of the workshops .....	1
1.3. Workshop agenda .....	1
1.4. Workshop attendance .....	2
<b>2. Dubbo Workshop .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Nyngan Workshop .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. Quambone Workshop.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5. Summary &amp; Conclusions .....</b>	<b>15</b>
5.1. Lessons learned from conducting the workshops .....	15
5.2. Possible implications for the project .....	16
<b>Appendix 1 – Workshop Agendas.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix 2 –Workshop Participant List.....</b>	<b>21</b>

### Abbreviations used in this report

WRP	Wetland Recovery Program
SKM	Sinclair Knight Mertz
CWCMA	Central West Catchment Management Authority
MCA	Multi-criteria analysis
S&D	Stock and Domestic

---

# 1. Introduction

---

## 1.1. Introduction

Hassall & Associates was contracted by Sinclair Knight Mertz (SKM), to conduct a series of community workshops for the Central West Catchment Management Authority (CWCMA) to discuss the Wetland Recovery Program (WRP). Workshops were conducted in Dubbo, Nyngan and Quambone in late February. This report provides a summary of the community feedback received at each of these workshops. It should be noted that the report presents the opinions and ideas of participants as stated in the workshops and not those of Hassall and Associates, SKM or CWCMA. These have not been checked for validity or feasibility.

## 1.2. Purpose of the workshops

The purpose of the workshops was to:

- provide an overview of the decision support tool (multi-criteria analysis), the purpose of which is to identify, assess and prioritise projects for investment;
- provide an overview of the project evaluation tool, the purpose of which is to facilitate the development of projects;
- identify community values and objectives to inform the multi-criteria analysis (MCA); and
- seek community ideas about possible water recovery projects.

## 1.3. Workshop agenda

At the commencement of the workshops, presentations were given by CWCMA and SKM to provide participants with context for the workshop.

The CWCMA presentation included an overview of the:

- WRP, including program objectives, decision making structure, funding and potential projects; and
- purpose of the decision support tool.

The SKM presentation included:

- An overview and demonstration of the project evaluation tool, the purpose of which is to provide:

- a user-friendly platform for developing projects; and
  - a consistent platform for cost /volumetric comparison.
- An introduction to the concept of multi-criteria analysis (MCA) and possible criteria for inclusion in such an analysis.

Detailed agenda for the workshops is provided in Appendix 1.

#### 1.4. Workshop attendance

The workshops were attended by 50 participants who were keenly interested in the wetland recovery program and actively contributed to discussions.

**Table 1: Summary of workshop attendance**

<i>Workshop</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Participants</i>
<b>Dubbo</b>	20/02/2007	18 people, representing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Community groups</li> <li>▪ Industry groups</li> <li>▪ Local Governments</li> <li>▪ Conservation groups</li> <li>▪ Agency representatives</li> <li>▪ Members of Environmental Flows Reference Group</li> </ul>
<b>Nyngan</b>	21/02/2007	13 people including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Landholders from the Marra Creek</li> <li>▪ Landholders from Duck Creek</li> <li>▪ Landholders from Crooked Creek</li> <li>▪ Representatives of local government</li> </ul>
<b>Quambone</b>	22/02/2007	19 people including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Landholders from the Quambone region</li> <li>▪ Landholders from Carinda region</li> <li>▪ Representative of local Government</li> <li>▪ Representative of DEC – National Parks</li> </ul>

A detailed list of participants is provided in Appendix 2.

---

## 2. Dubbo Workshop

---

The workshop in Dubbo was attended by members of the Environmental Flows Reference Group, representatives of community, environment and industry groups, and agency staff. The workshop included lengthy discussion on the WRP, with participants eager to understand the objectives of the program and how these aligned with the assessment process.

Workshop participants felt that criteria for decision making would be best categorised as being:

- Social and socio-economic
- Environmental
- Financial / Technical

Workshop participants broadly identified the following criteria under each of these broad categories:

- Social and socio-economic
  - Socio-economic impacts identified and managed
  - Maintain or improve local amenity
  - Demonstrated social benefits
  - Community support for the project
- Environmental
  - Volume of water saved
  - Volume of water is sustainable
  - Timing of the delivery of savings from the project
  - Net environmental benefit
- Financial / Technical
  - Cost effectiveness (\$/ML)
  - Overall project feasibility

There was lengthy discussion as to the relative weightings of the broad categories, with participants having differences of opinion on the preferred balance between social, economic and environmental criteria. Due to these lengthy discussions there was limited focus on the sub-criteria which detracted from the overall outcome of the process.

---

Participants raised a number of other issues in response to the presentations provided. While there was not consensus from the group, these issues included:

- the project evaluation tool appeared complex and difficult to use, and there was probably a need to provide a guide and support for community members in using the tool;
- some participants commented that it may be useful to assist individuals at a farm level, neighbours or a group to develop a project proposal together;
- one participant noted that the ability to audit projects once implemented and monitor the success of the projects was important;
- one participant commented that there should be some flexibility in the assessment of projects, and that decisions should not be solely based on the outputs of a model.

Following the workshop, additional comments were provided by the Inland Rivers Network, reinforcing the importance they place on projects being cost effective, to enable the recovery of the greatest volume of water for the funding that is available.

### 3. Nyngan Workshop

The Nyngan workshop was attended primarily by landholders, with representatives from local government also in attendance. The approach taken to this workshop differed from that in Dubbo, with a more open structure that sought to capture community values and areas of concern.

Participants were asked to nominate the most significant outcomes they would like to see from investment in projects in the Macquarie Valley. This approach elicited a range of responses, which could generally be categorised as being either:

- Principles and issues of concern; or
- Descriptions of possible projects.

For those responses identified as being a community principle or an issue of concern, the group discussed possible criteria for assessing projects that would ensure that these values and concerns were addressed. Participants were provided with a list of possible criteria, developed by SKM, to aid this discussion. Table 2 provides a summary of this discussion.

**Table 2: Summary of community principles and issues**

<b>Principle / Issue</b>	<b>Possible Criteria*</b>
<b><i>Maintaining local creek systems and their environmental values is important</i></b>	Demonstrated local and regional environmental benefits
<b><i>S&amp;D water supply should be ensured (100% reliability)</i></b>	Aids in drought proofing Maintain reliability and quality of S&D supply
<b><i>Maintain or improve reliability for all water users across the valley</i></b>	Maintain reliability and quality Aids in drought proofing Equitable allocation of water
<b><i>Maintain water quality for all users</i></b>	Maintain reliability and quality of supply
<b><i>Water savings generated from projects should be returned to the environment;</i></b>	Volume of water recovered
<b><i>Economic value of floodplains should be recognised</i></b>	Maintain or improve “local” and “regional” economy
<b><i>Social, economic and environmental considerations are all important</i></b>	Social impacts are identified and managed Improves regional economy Local and regional environmental benefits
<b><i>Local community support for the project is</i></b>	Demonstrated community support

\* sourced from SKM draft list of criteria

Participants were asked to provide direct feedback on the draft criteria provided by SKM. This feedback was sought on an individual basis, with a total of 12 participants providing response. Participants were asked whether they agreed that the criteria were appropriate, and then to indicate what they thought was the relative importance of each (high / medium / low). This relative importance has been converted to a numeric weighting (High=3, Medium=2, Low=1), which were summed to provide an aggregated weighting (Table 3). Those criteria with a high aggregated weighting were considered more important than those with a low aggregated weighting.

**Table 3: Support for criteria considered to be relevant with weighting**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Respondents who agreed with criteria</b>	<b>Aggregated weighting</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>		
<b>Volume Water Saved</b>	11	28
<b>Volume water saved sustainable</b>	12	32
<b>Broad regional environmental benefits</b>	11	24
<b>Other environmental benefits</b>	11	25
<b>Greenhouse gas emission</b>	3	5
<b>Environmental risks identified and managed</b>	10	17
<b>TECHNICAL / FINANCIAL</b>		
<b>\$/ML</b>	8	21
<b>Overall cost</b>	11	32
<b>O&amp;M cost</b>	11	25
<b>Technical risk / uncertainty</b>	9	18
<b>Financial risks identified and controlled</b>	11	25
<b>Proponent contribution</b>	5	11
<b>Cost uncertainty</b>	8	16
<b>Innovation*</b>	1	1

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Respondents who agreed with criteria</b>	<b>Aggregated weighting</b>
<b>SOCIAL / SOCIO-ECONOMIC</b>		
<b>Broad local / regional support</b>	12	25
<b>Aids in drought proofing</b>	12	30
<b>Heritage Values protected</b>	10	18
<b>Equitable water allocation</b>	12	27
<b>Reliability &amp; quality of supply</b>	12	31
<b>Maintenance of regional economy</b>	12	27
<b>Amenity values protected</b>	10	16

Note \* - additional criteria added by a respondent

It should be noted that there was inconsistencies in the knowledge and understanding of the respondents on the concept of multi-criteria analysis and the criteria presented to them. Participants did not ask questions to seek clarification of any criteria, though there is possibility of double counting in some of the criteria presented. Examples of this double counting may be the inclusion of levelised O&M costs in overall cost, or “drought-proofing” and ensuring reliability of supply.

Table 4 provides a summary of those criteria respondents felt were irrelevant, and the number of respondents who held this view.

Table 4: Criteria respondents felt to be irrelevant

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Count of respondents</b>
<b><i>Volume Water Saved</i></b>	1
<b><i>Broad regional environmental benefits</i></b>	1
<b><i>Other environmental benefits</i></b>	1
<b><i>Greenhouse gas emissions</i></b>	9
<b><i>Environmental risks identified and managed</i></b>	2
<b><i>\$/ML</i></b>	4
<b><i>Overall cost</i></b>	1
<b><i>O&amp;M cost</i></b>	1
<b><i>Technical risk / uncertainty</i></b>	3
<b><i>Financial risks identified and controlled</i></b>	1
<b><i>Proponent contribution</i></b>	7
<b><i>Cost uncertainty</i></b>	4
<b><i>Heritage Values protected</i></b>	2
<b><i>Amenity values protected</i></b>	2

Participants provided the following specific comments on a possible project to provide alternative S&D supply in the Marra Creek:

- costings provided by Government for the proposed project were significantly underestimated;
- flows in the Marra Creek provide local environmental and amenity benefits in addition to supply of S&D water. These benefits need to be recognised.

The proposed piping of Marra Creek used as an example to demonstrate the project evaluation tool. This example highlighted that some members of the group understood the purpose of the project evaluation tool, and were keen to test it with a project idea.

The points arising from this exercise included:

- estimates of possible savings were difficult to determine, given the lack of information on water flow and local environmental benefits in the system;
- the tool was considered by one participant to underestimate piping and pumping requirements, given design issues to overcome issues such as friction;
- comments on the assumptions that underly the tool, such as the estimate of stock watering requirements;

- 
- there was general appreciation of the need for a level playing field in the development of WRP projects

Following this exercise, a number of the participants acknowledged the benefits of the tool in providing assumed cost estimates to assess projects on a level playing field.

Overall, participants expressed the view that the workshop was of value and provided a better understanding of the WRP, project development and submission and the evaluation process for proposals.

---

Potential projects that were explored by the group included:

- rehabilitation projects in the Crooked Creek to enable more efficient delivery of water in that system;
- purchase and cancellation of licences, including supplementary licences to return water to the environment<sup>1</sup>;
- alteration of management and timing of S&D water supply (eg in Marra Creek) to generate savings;
- better timing and management of flows through the marshes to ensure S&D supply in Carinda and to generate savings;
- extension of Twynam irrigation supply channel to enable delivery of environmental flows to the lower sections of Crooked Creek.

Other issues associated with water recovery raised by participants, which were generally supported by the group included:

- water savings generated from projects should be returned to the environment
- water recovered from a particular system or creek should be used for the benefit of the environment in that system, and not used for other environmental outcomes;
- the environmental value of effluent creeks, such as Crooked Creek and the floodplains needed to be recognised in the development of water sharing and environmental flow management plans;
- water savings should not be tradeable; and
- there is a need to measure and monitor the environmental benefits of providing additional water.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: This is an example of a project idea suggested by a community member, but the benefits of which require investigation, given existing rules and priorities in the water sharing plan and Water Management Act.

## 4. Quambone Workshop

The Quambone workshop was attended primarily by landholders, with representatives from local government also in attendance. The workshop differed to the others in that participants were eager to express their concerns about the WRP and water sharing and management in the Macquarie Valley.

Participants raised a number of concerns about the WRP. These were that:

- the CWCMA and Government appeared to be losing sight of the original intent of the WRP, which was water recovery for important wetlands in the Macquarie and Gwydir Valleys;
- projects that would not recover water for the environment were being considered for funding under the program;
- a number of projects that were currently being floated involved refurbishment of government infrastructure, which should be funded by Government, but not through the program;
- there was no apparent plan for auditing and monitoring the success of the projects that would be funded by the program

Participants raised a number of issues that should be considered when making decisions about investing in projects for the WRP. Table 5 provides a summary of these issues, and criteria to address these concerns and the level of importance the group placed on the issue. This level of importance was determined through discussion by the group, and generally had broad support among the group.

**Table 5: Summary of issues raised**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Possible Criteria</b>	<b>Level of importance</b>
<b><i>Recovery of water for the environment is essential</i></b>	ML of water returned	High
<b><i>Better manage water for environmental benefit</i></b>	Demonstrated regional environmental benefits	High
<b><i>Projects should be equitable</i></b>	Social impacts of projects assessed	Medium
<b><i>Projects should not have a socio-economic impact</i></b>	Socio-economic impacts of the projects assessed	Medium
<b><i>All projects should clearly align with objectives of the program</i></b>	Demonstrated alignment with program objectives	High

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Possible Criteria</b>	<b>Level of importance</b>
<b>Projects should recognise local environmental values, eg the values of effluent creeks</b>	Demonstrated local environmental benefit	Medium
<b>Projects should not be forced on communities (eg S&amp;D management in effluent creeks)</b>	Demonstrated local community support	Medium
<b>Projects should not jeopardise security of S&amp;D supply</b>	Reliability & quality of supply / Aids in drought proofing	Medium
<b>Upgrading of Government owned infrastructure is not acceptable</b>	Project is restricted to private infrastructure systems	Medium
<b>The program needs to be realistic about what it can invest in. Large, expensive projects should be funded by other buckets of money</b>	Overall cost of project	Medium

Participants discussed a number of ideas regarding possible projects and changes to the management of the Macquarie system to improve the health of the Macquarie Marshes. These projects and ideas included<sup>2</sup>:

- policy changes to tributary flow management, supplementary water access and allocation/dam accounting rules to provide additional water for the environment;
- changes to the water sharing plan to ensure more equitable access to the resource, including ensuring end of system flows below the marshes;
- changing the manner in which S&D water was delivered, by maintaining regular flow (and thus wet systems) rather than pulsed deliveries one or two times per year that required significant volumes to “wet up” the system;
- the purchase of water access licences, including general security and supplementary water access licences, and manage this water for environmental benefits;

<sup>2</sup> Note: These project ideas were suggested by participants. The benefits and limitations of these projects were not discussed in detail, and should be further explored, given existing rules and priorities in the water sharing plan and Water Management Act.

A number of participants expressed a strong willingness to explore the development of a project proposal, which involved the purchase of water access licences and were enthusiastic that such projects could be considered for WRP funding.

Participant's comments on specific projects that have been floated for funding is provided in Table 6.

**Table 6: Summary of comments on specific projects**

<i>Project</i>	<i>Comment</i>
<i>Northern By-Pass Channel and Lower Macquarie S&amp;D</i>	Likely to be very expensive. Possible environmental implications of this project are significant, given its location in a Ramsar Wetland.
<i>Gunningbar, Duck, Crooked and Marra Creek System</i>	There are local environmental issues if you change method of supplying S&D water on these systems.
<i>Albert Priest Channel</i>	Likely to be very expensive.
<i>Marthaguy S&amp;D</i>	No specific comment provided.
<i>Narromine and Trangie S&amp;D</i>	No specific comment provided.
<i>Burrendong Dam Outlet Enlargement</i>	This project is investment in government infrastructure that should not be funded through the wetland recovery program. Likely to be very expensive.
<i>Burrendong Flood Mitigation Works / Changes to Flood Management Zone</i>	This project is investment in government infrastructure that should not be funded through the wetland recovery program. Likely to be very expensive.
<i>Trangie Research Station</i>	Possibility of either purchasing or otherwise obtaining this licence for environmental purposes.
<i>STP Return Flows/Recycling</i>	Some local governments already doing this. Others reuse water from STP, reducing return flows.

The following specific feedback on the decision support tool (MCA) and the project evaluation tool:

- the CWCMA appeared to be taking a very complex approach to what should be a relatively simple initial assessment based on the volume of water that could

---

be recovered for the environment, through projects that are supported by the community;

- one participant cautioned on the reliance of the CWCMA on a “computer model” to provide an “answer”, citing experience with the PVP developer as a reason for simplifying the process.

Some participants expressed little interest in the project evaluation tool. Discussions with these participants following the demonstration indicated that they felt the tool was complex, and that they would require support to be able to utilise it. It was indicated at the time that this support would be provided as necessary. In contrast, two participants showed keen interest in the tool for the development of stock and domestic projects one participant showed interest in the tool for the development of water purchasing projects.

In summary, once participants at the workshop understood the WRP process and became aware that they were able to develop and submit proposals for funding either individually or in collaboration with their colleagues, they were very enthusiastic to pursue this prospect and complimented the CMA accordingly.

---

## Summary & Conclusions

---

### 4.1. Lessons learned from conducting the workshops

- Participants, particularly those in the Dubbo workshop, would have benefited from a better understanding of the context of the decision support tool. The answers to the following key questions may have provided additional clarity:
  - Who are the decision makers?
  - What criteria are important for the decision makers?
  - What type of projects would be considered under the WRP? EG would those that better manage water be acceptable as well as those that would recover water?
- Many participants were unable to fully distinguish between the MCA and the project evaluation tool. This confusion may be partly due to the name of the project evaluation tool, which does not evaluate the success or otherwise of a project, but seeks to provide support and information for developing projects. Nonetheless there were positive comments made about the development of a tool that would enable a person at a farm or group level to develop a project. Renaming the tool “Project Development Support Tool” may assist in providing clarity. This confusion was largely reduced at the Nyngan and Quambone workshops, the result of alterations to the agenda including the separation of the presentation and discussion of the two components.
- Participants (particularly at the Dubbo Workshop) were unwilling to isolate the decision support tool from other decisions about managing water for the environment. On a number of occasions participants were reminded that these workshops necessarily needed to focus on development of the tool within the broader framework of other water recovery projects and programmes.
- The format of the workshops in Nyngan and Quambone was more successful than that of the Dubbo workshop. In Nyngan and Quambone, the workshop commenced with participants articulating the issues that were important for them and then built on these to develop criteria for decision making and the level of importance of each of these criteria. The Dubbo workshop focused on seeking direct feedback from participants on a draft list of major criteria and sub criteria. Participants had diverse views on the relative weighting of major criteria and significant time was spent discussing the relative weighting of these. In addition, the format of the Nyngan and Quambone workshops facilitated clearer distinction between to project development tool and the framework.

---

## 4.2. Possible implications for the project

- Workshop participants were able to clearly articulate their issues and concerns for investment in wetland recovery projects. There was some consistency between the workshops as to the overarching principles for assessing projects.

These overarching principles could be broadly summarised as being:

- Projects should align with the intent of the WRP
  - Projects should be cost effective
  - Projects should undergo a quality EIS process that takes into account issues such as social, economic and environmental impacts
  - Projects should have community support
- 
- A number of workshop participants appeared confused by the MCA process although community values relevant to the development of the evaluation framework and to the assessment of projects was forthcoming.
  - There was limited interest and feedback in the project evaluation tool although clearly some individuals understood the concept and utility of the tool. Initially the tool was unable to accommodate the project proposed by the Quambone meeting involving the purchase of irrigation licences. This was resolved at the time and the proposed project was developed and costs and water savings were assessed. It is noted that there is scope to further modify the tool to cover these types of projects.

If the purpose of this tool is to provide a user-friendly platform for developing projects, and if proponents will be required to submit project ideas using the model, significant effort will need to be invested to ensure the model can accommodate the range of projects, and that detailed guidelines and assistance in using the model are provided. As an interim arrangement SKM has indicated that they will assist stakeholders in the development of their projects by the incorporation of information into the tool.

## Appendix 1 – Workshop Agendas



### Consultation Workshop Agenda

#### Water Recovery for the Macquarie River Floodplain


Date: Tuesday, 20<sup>th</sup> February 2007

Time: 9.00am

Location: Cattleman's Motel

Facilitated by – Jack Knowles, Hassall & Associates

Agenda Item	Time	Input
Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Introductions</li> <li>▪ Welcome to Country</li> </ul>	0900 - 0910	Jack Knowles
Brief Overview of the Water Recovery Project	0910 - 0920	Jessica Brown/Shona Whitfield
Draft Evaluation Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Principles</li> <li>▪ Functionality</li> <li>▪ Demonstration</li> <li>▪ Assessment Criteria &amp; Weightings</li> <li>▪ Discussion</li> </ul>	0920 - 1030	Tony Church
Identified Water Savings and Security Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overview and Discussion</li> </ul>	1030- 1115	Tony Church
Project Registration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overview and Discussion</li> </ul>	1115 - 1145	Jack Knowles
Close <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Summary</li> <li>▪ Forward Process &amp; Associated</li> </ul>	1145 - 1200	Jack Knowles

Agenda Item	Time	Input
Timelines		
		

## Consultation Workshop Agenda

### Water Recovery for the Macquarie River Floodplain

Date: Wednesday, 21<sup>st</sup> February 2007

Time: 10.30am

Location: Nyngan RSL Club

Facilitated by – Jack Knowles, Hassall & Associates

Agenda Item	Time	Input
Welcome and Introductions	1030 - 1040	Jack Knowles
Welcome to Country	1040 - 1050	Central West CMA
Brief Overview of the Water Recovery Project	1050 - 1100	Jessica Brown/Shona Whitfield
Draft Evaluation Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Principles</li> <li>▪ Functionality</li> <li>▪ Assessment Criteria &amp; Weightings</li> <li>▪ Discussion</li> </ul>	1100 - 1230	Tony Church
Lunch	1230 - 1300	
Demonstration of project evaluation tool	1300-1400	Dennis Cho
Identified Water Savings and Security Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overview and Discussion</li> </ul>	1400 – 1430	Tony Church
Project Registration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Registration</li> <li>▪ Discussion</li> </ul>	1430 – 1500	Jack Knowles
Forward Process & Associated	1500 – 1515	Jessica Brown

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Input</b>
Timelines		
Summary & Close	1515 – 1530	Jack Knowles



## **Consultation Workshop Agenda**

### **Water Recovery for the Macquarie River Floodplain**

Date: Thursday, 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2007, Time: 9.00am

Location: Quambone Hall

Facilitated by – Jack Knowles, Hassall & Associates

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Input</b>
Welcome and Introductions	0900 - 0910	Jack Knowles
Welcome to Country	0910 - 0920	Central West CMA
Brief Overview of the Water Recovery Project	0920 - 0930	Shona Whitfield
Draft Evaluation Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Principles</li> <li>▪ Functionality</li> <li>▪ Assessment Criteria &amp; Weightings</li> <li>▪ Discussion</li> </ul>	0930 - 1100	Tony Church
Break	1100 - 1115	
Identified Water Savings and Security Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overview and Discussion</li> </ul>	1115 - 1215	Tony Church
Project Registration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overview and Discussion</li> </ul>	1215 - 1300	Jack Knowles
Forward Process & Associated	1330 - 1400	Shona Whitfield

---

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Input</b>
Timelines		
Summary & Close	1400 - 1430	Jack Knowles
Lunch	1300 - 1330	
Demonstration of project evaluation tool		

---

## Appendix 2 –Workshop Participant List

---

### Dubbo Workshop – Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> February

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representative Organisation</b>
<b>Amy Hankinson</b>	Inland Rivers Network
<b>Bev Smiles</b>	Nature Conservation Council of NSW
<b>Chris Hogendyk</b>	Macquarie River Food & Fibre
<b>Richard Woodlock</b>	Creeks Association
<b>Libby McIntyre</b>	Wetlands Alliance
<b>Mike Maher</b>	DEC Riverbank. Member Environmental Flows Reference Group (EFRG)
<b>Anne Reeves</b>	EFRG
<b>Debbie Love</b>	DNR EFRG
<b>Lorraine</b>	EFRG
<b>Sue Jones</b>	Macquarie Marshes Management Committee, EFRG
<b>Peter McClellan</b>	EFRG
<b>Glen Whittaker</b>	Macquarie River Food & Fibre
<b>Ashley Weilinga</b>	Warren Shire Council
<b>Renee Shepherd–</b>	DNR
<b>Sam Davis</b>	DPI Fisheries, EFRG
<b>Lynne Sykes</b>	Chair, EFRG
<b>Danielle Anderson</b>	Macquarie River Food & Fibre
<b>Rick Reid</b>	Macquarie River Customer Service Committee
<b>John Madden</b>	Hassall & Associates
<b>Jessica Brown</b>	CWCMA
<b>Shona Whitfield</b>	CWCMA
<b>Tony Church</b>	SKM
<b>Dennis Cho</b>	SKM
<b>Jack Knowles (Chair)</b>	Hassall & Associates

---

**Nyngan Workshop – Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> February**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representative Organisation / Locality</b>
<b><i>Rick Reid</i></b>	Macquarie Customer Service Committee
<b><i>Frank McKillop</i></b>	Marra Creek Association
<b><i>David Green</i></b>	Marra Creek Association
<b><i>Graeme Johnson</i></b>	Marra Creek Association
<b><i>Rowan Cleaver – Duck</i></b>	Duck Creek
<b><i>Lionel Kennedy – Duck</i></b>	Duck Creek
<b><i>Jim Cleaver – Duck</i></b>	Duck Creek
<b><i>Michael Kennedy – Duck</i></b>	Duck Creek
<b><i>Ashley Weilinga –</i></b>	Warren Shire Council
<b><i>David Thornton</i></b>	Crooked Creek
<b><i>George Thornton</i></b>	Crooked Creek
<b><i>Julian Campbell</i></b>	Warren Shire Council
<b><i>Helen Semmens</i></b>	Duck Creek - apology
<b><i>Bree Agar –</i></b>	CWCMA Nyngan
<b><i>Ray Thompson –</i></b>	CWCMA Nyngan
<b><i>Jessica Brown</i></b>	CWCMA
<b><i>Shona Whitfield</i></b>	CWCMA
<b><i>Tony Church</i></b>	SKM
<b><i>Dennis Cho</i></b>	SKM
<b><i>Jack Knowles (Chair)</i></b>	Hassall & Associates

---

**Quambone Workshop – Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> February**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representative Organisation</b>
<b>Rick Reid</b>	Macquarie Customer Service Committee
<b>John Baker</b>	
<b>Chris Veech</b>	
<b>Peter Veech</b>	
<b>Katy-Rose Hunt</b>	Warren Shire Council
<b>Eric Fisher</b>	
<b>Bert Bartholemew</b>	CWCMA Aboriginal Reference Group
<b>Andrew Blair</b>	
<b>John Baker</b>	
<b>Chris Priestley</b>	
<b>Bill Masman &amp; Mrs Masman</b>	
<b>Ray Jones</b>	Department of Environment & Conservation
<b>Tom Fitzgerald</b>	
<b>George Thornton</b>	
<b>Doug Andrews</b>	
<b>Adam</b>	
<b>Simon</b>	
<b>Shona Whitfield</b>	CWCMA
<b>Tony Church</b>	SKM
<b>Dennis Cho</b>	SKM
<b>Jack Knowles (Chair)</b>	Hassall & Associates