Proactive vs Reactive Floodplain Management

The Diverse Consequences of the 2011 Australian Floods

Arid Regions Conference 2013 16 October 2013, Scottsdale

Chris Huxley Senior Flood Engineer and TUFLOW Products Representative, BMT WBM





Background

BMT WBM

20 years flood risk management experience

Chris Huxley

- 10 years flood risk management consulting (BMT WBM, Brisbane Australia
- 20 major catchment flood risk studies in New South Wales and Queensland

State vs State

- 2011 and 2013 major flooding in both states (similar flood risk)
- So what's worked and what didn't?







Government Roles and Approaches

- Australian Government Roles
 - Federal government provides high level policy and funding
 - State governments provide policy, guidance and funding
 - Local governments (Councils) are <u>responsible</u> for flood risk management
- NSW has taken a very proactive approach to FRM for 30+ years
- NSW 2005 guidelines ~250 pages

(Download from www.environment.nsw.gov.au/floodplains/manual.htm)

- Queensland historically taken a passive approach
 - Some councils proactive
- QLD 2003 guidelines for floods, bushfires and landslides
 < 40 pages flooding related







1986

NSW Approach

NSW Government has provided guidance and incentives for +30 years

- Outlines a defined FRM framework
 - Best practice measures to improve level of flood information and manage existing and future flood risk
- Funds 2/3 of Council FRM studies
- Provides staff to oversee and review studies
 - To keep the consultants honest!
 - Ensures consistency across assessments
- Funds up to 80% of implementation costs for measures with a good BCR (with Federal assistance – 40/40/20)
- Hosts FRM conference every 18 months
- Actively helps Councils to
 - Manage and plan new development
 - Reduce the risk to established areas







Qld Approach

Qld Government in comparison has historically

- Not actively pursued / encouraged / funded FRM as a long-term strategy
- Provided minimal staffing to assist councils (particularly important for small councils)
- Missed out on federal funding (some proactive councils have received federal funds directly)
- Not hosted FRM conferences
- Let councils "do their own thing"

This approach has resulted in:

- Flood planning is largely the responsibility local Councils
- 63% of Councils in Queensland did not contain flood information in their planning schemes at the time of the 2011 floods!!



State Planning Policy Guideline

Mitigating the Adverse Impacts of Flood, Bushfire and Landslide

an artmont of Local Goup

June 2003







2011 and 2013 Floods

How did NSW and Qld fair?

Key areas of difference

- Community Preparedness
 - Did people know what to do?
- Flood Warnings
 - Were the warnings useful?
- Development Planning Controls
 - Were planning controls effective?







Community Preparedness

In many areas in QId before the 2011 floods preparedness was very poor

- People in general had little idea of what to do
- Those that experienced previous floods much more astute



If we were a prepared community would we have had this...







Community Preparedness



Or This?? The tangible flood damages associated with each of these pictures alone would cover the costs for a catchment flood risk management study...





Being Prepared – A Good News Story

Grafton, NSW

- 45 year old levee has never over-topped (if overtops flood depth up to 4m + 10,000 residents)
- We carried out a levee over-topping study some years ago to understand the risk
 - Defined potential overtopping locations
 - Flood risk relative to gauge levels (properties and evacuation routes affected)









Being Prepared

Grafton, NSW

- 2013 highest flood on record (over 170 years of records – started in 1839)
- 2013 flood forecast predicted 200mm overtopping with half the town inundated
- Overtopping points identified in flood study were sand-bagged
- Sector specific evacuation warnings issued
- Potential emergency averted!
- Event was a major test of model accuracy
 "we got it right" was the response! ©







Flood Warnings

- The Bureau of Meteorology (Federal Government) issues warnings as predicted levels at river gauges
- These warnings are relayed to
 - The community via the web/phone
 - The media who must quote verbatim
- But many (most) people did not know what a flood gauge height warning meant
 - Does 5.5m mean we get flooded? no idea?
 - When do we lose access? no idea?
 - Should we relocate possessions? no idea?
- Community Flood Education is a critical element of flood risk management









Flood Warnings

Forecasted gauge heights – let's make them mean something!







Tweed River, NSW

TUFLOW populates each property with information on warning time and gauge heights for when:
✓ access is cut-off;
✓ ground flooding occurs; and
✓ flooding above floor level will occur,

9m

Gauge Height of up to





Making Flood Warnings Useful

For at Risk Buildings

- Critical gauge heights for each building placed somewhere permanent (eg. inside the electricity box)
- Send messages to residents and owners
- Residents/owners can make an informed decision on the action to take
- Flood education/awareness => warning response









Flood Totems

The Next Step on from Gauge Heights

- Links Response Modification Measures (Flood education and warning)
- Help solves communication problems
- Being trialled in Innisfail, North Queensland (a proactive council)







Cathie

Development Controls NSW Approach

Risk Based Development Controls (Consequence vs Likelihood)

- Quantify the risk
- Assign development controls accordingly

Example – New Mechanics Garage

- High hazard depth
- Flood planning controls (eg. FPL= 59.3 mAHD)



TABLE 2-3: RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN URBAN AREAS

			Flood Hazard Category			Additional Constraint ²	
Controls	Development / Building Type	No Hazard	A Flood Fringe	B High Hazard Depth	C High Hazard Floodwau	D Extreme Hazard	E Rare E z treme Hazard
Floor Level	New Ancillary Building (eg shed, carport)	N/A	F1	F1	F1		F1
	New Commercial or Industrial Building	N/A	F2	F2			F2
	New Habitable Building	N/A	F3	F3			F3
	Building Extension	N/A	F4a	F4b			F4a
	New Emergency Services (eg hospitals, etc) /Critical Infrastructure (eg major telephone exchange, etc)	N/A	F5				
	New Other Community Service (School, etc) /Special Evacuation Needs (eg aged care)	N/A	F5a				





QId Approach to Development Controls

- Varies widely from sound risk-based approach to a minimalist approach
- Prior to 2011 some Councils using a 25 year event for setting residential planning levels!
- Improved since 2011 with Councils changing approach/policies









Reactive Flood Risk Management

After the 2011 flood, Brisbane City Council, QLD

- Raised minimum floor level to 2011 flood levels
- Relaxed building height restrictions so houses could be raised higher







Post 2011 Queensland Reconstruction Authority

- Created by the Qld Government in response to 2010-11 natural disasters
- Remit to part fulfil the Qld Floods Commission of Inquiry
 - To rebuild
 - Improve the State's preparedness for future events
- Flood hazard mapping program underway
- Qld are reacting (positively) to the 2011 floods
- If they had been proactive.....





Qld Flood Hazard Mapping Program

QFMP

- > 100 townships modelled in several phases and work bundles (3 Phases)
- All consultants except one used TUFLOW ©
- Phase 1 and 2 are complete







Qld Flood Risk Management Studies

Flood Risk Management
 Studies in QLD



Western Downs Floodplain Risk Management Study

Barry Rodgers

Western Downs Floodplai Risk Management Study



14 May 2013





In Hindsight...

NSW's +30 years of proactive flood risk management paying off

- NSW also experienced major flooding events in 2011 and 2013 (of an equivalent magnitude to QLD)
 Did we hear about these? "No News is Good News" or "No News is Good FRM!"
- Still much work to be done, but by being proactive the overall risk before the floods came was lower

Qld historically took a passive approach and is now in a reactive phase (some proactive councils excepted)

- Becoming proactive through flood risk mapping and risk mitigation studies
- Will now hopefully pursue a long-term flood risk management process



Toowoomba Chronicle





Conclusion

A proactive approach

- keeps future developments
 - out of the floodplain, or
 - "high and dry"
- minimises the existing flood risk before the floods come
- Increases a communities level of flood awareness /preparedness.
 Enabling appropriate response to warnings during an event

A passive/reactive approach will just keep cleaning up the mess



Piles of household goods damaged in the Brisbane flood littered suburban streets after an army of volunteers turned out to clean up Australia's third-largest city. PHOTO: Eddie Safarik AFP

Thanks



