

Wakool River Association

Comments on the ADFO Modification Application.

This long running issue of attempting to develop options to drain the Koondrook/Perricoota after a managed watering event while minimising the third party impacts has not only been challenging but also severely frustrating for a number of our members and other Community members especially those directly affected that are downstream or on the boundary of the scheme. Well before construction began on the scheme local Landholders and Community members have continuously emphasised the fact that the planned method of draining the scheme after a managed event would create major social and environmental problems, especially the condition of being limited to a maximum of 250ML/day down the Barbers Ck.

The main reason that I have mentioned the issue above is to not only highlight the importance of listening to locals but probably more importantly acting on their practical suggestions and taking on board their solutions. While the majority of our local Community can see great merit in the scheme, they have been consistently opposed to operating the scheme until the outstanding concerns are addressed and third party impacts mitigated.

We commend the Forestry Corporation for actively attempting to overcome the issues by investigating other options to address the third party impacts and improve the long and short term outcomes of operating the scheme. While we accept the need to increase the outflows from a managed event, we do not believe that this suggested ADFO modification puts a framework in place to addresses the Communities main concerns of third party impacts.

- While it is pleasing to see this proposal recommending a new bridge over the Barbers Ck., there does not appear to be any funding to overcome the block bank issues on the Barbers Ck. The same concern is expressed for the low level crossings on the Wakool River and the regulator on the Thule Ck., that would be required to allow the extra flow
- While we are supportive of any initiative to address the block bank issues, we are not convinced that the suggestion to construct permanent block banks without any flow through structure, (eg box culvert) is a good idea. Some of the reasons why: -- stagnate water developing in the water pools.
 - impedance of natural flood flows
 - a number of access issues are not addressed.

Outside this suggested section 75W modification there are a number of other management issues that the WRA is concerned about the long term consequences of the flood enhancement project:

- Being able to mitigate hypoxic blackwater events
- The massive borrow pits becoming ideal Carp nurseries and eventually becoming large flood runners
- The effect on regional groundwater rise
- Exacerbating the consequences of natural large floods
- The huge volume of water required for a maximum event (ie. 645GL) that are proposed to occur on average every 4 years
- The long duration of some of the proposed events.

The WRA long standing policy that they are opposed to any managed watering of the K/P until the outstanding third party impacts are addressed

Thank you. for allowing us the opportunity to comment on the proposal

John Lolicato

Chairman