

RE: Gwydir Cap v WSP Scenario

From: Andrew Brown
To: FPr Simpson _____ Marina Sivkova
 Richard Beecham
 Linda Holz

Date: Thu, 21 Jan 2021 03:46:49 +0000

Interesting.

Remember that it isn't the BDL until we propose it to MDBA formally, and they accept it (formally).

That will also trigger a WRP resubmission, new APT etc etc.

Andrew Brown
Principal Water Modeller

Water Analytics | Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Level 1, 11 Farrer Place, Queanbeyan NSW 2620 | PO Box 189, Queanbeyan NSW 2620
www.dpie.nsw.gov.au

From: FPr Simpson _____
Sent: Wednesday, 20 January 2021 5:33 PM
To: Marina Sivkova _____ Richard Beecham _____
 Andrew Brown _____ Linda
 Holz _____
Subject: Gwydir Cap v WSP Scenario

People,

Just wanted to note that the Gwydir modelling has the Cap scenario 1.9% lower than the "WSP scenario", so it becomes the PPlan Limit (and BDL I presume).

One interesting outcome is that the FPH component of the Plan limit under Cap is 104 GL/year, instead of 138 GL/year under the WSP scenario. We have calculated that the reduction in FPH to bring total diversions back within the Plan Limit is 30% (37% of non-exempt FPH), which is 52 GL/year. This would bring the total FPH back to 122 GL/year.

If the WSP Scenario was slightly higher the Cap, this would mean we could only lower FPH to 138 GL/year instead of 122 GL/year (Border Rivers has set precedent that FPH will not be reduced below its Plan Limit component), and the remaining reduction would need to come from a growth in use action for metered use (GS + Supp).

Either way, water users get the cut, but the current situation means the cut is solely borne by FPH entitlements. I note these things because Cap and the WSP scenario are so close together, and someone may figure this out and question the department at some point about how well the WSP and Cap scenarios have been calibrated in the new FPH model (we don't document this in the model build reports).

Cheers

Pri
Pva Simpson
Privacy

