

From: Danny & Caitlin Bourke
To: [Water Markets \(DELWP\)](#)
Subject: Submission - DE & CV Bourke
Date: [REDACTED]

EXTERNAL SENDER: Links and attachments may be unsafe.

Submission regarding the Lower Broken Creek Trade Review

As a Lower Broken Creek Irrigator I have two main concerns with the Trade Review:

1. If the preferred option is to be adopted, it is important that if you have a 1A 6B water entitlement that was unbundled during 'unbundling' (2007), that we can exchange this for a 6B water entitlement as it is stated in the Trade Review.
2. In the review there seems to be a lot of references to the Lower Goulburn River health. I believe there should be as much consideration to the health of the Lower Broken Creek as what there has been to the Goulburn River. Two examples include the deterioration of Creek banks e.g. undercutting of the bank and secondly the amount of trees falling into the Creek.

In closing, I believe there should not be any change to the Lower Broken Creek because physically it lends itself to versatility in water use to and from different Zones.

Regards

Danny Bourke

Caitlin & Danny Bourke

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]