STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE



TASMANIAN STRATEGIC FLOOD MAP FURNEAUX STUDY AREA DESIGN FLOOD MODELLING

ADDENDUM TO CALIBRATION REPORT





MARCH 2023





Level 1, 119 Macquarie Street Hobart, TAS, 7000

Tel: (03) 6111 1726 Fax: (02) 9262 6208 Email: wma@wmawater.com.au Web: www.wmawater.com.au

TASMANIAN STRATEGIC FLOOD MAP FURNEAUX STUDY AREA DESIGN FLOOD MODELLING

ADDENDUM TO CALIBRATION REPORT

MARCH 2023

Project Tasmanian Strategic Flood Map Furneaux Study Area Design Flood Modelling	Project Number 120038
Client State Emergency Service	Client's Representative Chris Irvine
Project Manager Fiona Ling	

Revision History

Revision	Description	Distribution	Authors	Reviewed by	Verified by	Date
0	Addendum to calibration report	Chris Irvine, SES	Sarah Blundy, Holly Taylor, Evmen Wong	Daniel Wood	Fiona Ling	JUL 22
1	Report with minor revisions	Chris Irvine, SES	Sarah Blundy, Holly Taylor, Evmen Wong	Daniel Wood	Fiona Ling	MAR 23

TASMANIAN STRATEGIC FLOOD MAP FURNEAUX STUDY AREA DESIGN FLOOD MODELLING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF /	ACRONYN	//Siv	
1.	INTRODUCTION1		
2.	DATA	2	
	2.1.	Previous Flood Studies2	
	2.2.	Flow Data2	
	2.3.	Design Inputs2	
	2.3.1.	Design Rainfall Depths and Spatial Pattern2	
	2.3.2.	Temporal Patterns2	
	2.3.3.	Pre-burst	
	2.3.4.	Losses	
	2.3.5.	Baseflow	
	2.3.6.	Direct Rainfall	
	2.3.7.	Climate Change Rainfall Factors	
3.	OVERVIE	W OF METHODOLOGY4	
4.	CALIBRA	TION OF DESIGN LOSSES	
5.	DESIGN I	EVENT MODELLING	
	5.1.	Design Event Selection	
	5.2.	Design Event Results9	
6.	LIMITATI	ONS10	
7. REFERENCES			
APPEND	XA.	DESIGN EVENT DATA A.1	
APPEND	Х В.	DESIGN PEAK ERRORSB.1	



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Flow gauges used for FFA	.2
Table 2: Fitting method and distribution used for FFA	.5
Table 3: FFA and modelled peak flows	.6
Table 4: Adopted losses	.6
Table 5: Selected storms for each AEP with the number of sub-catchments best represented b	by
each set	.7
Table 6: Sub-catchment errors using the ARF-TP-duration sets shown in Table 5 for each AEP	9

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Flood Frequency Analysis Figure 2: Selected Temporal Patterns

APPENDICES:

Figure A 1: Design Rainfall Depths - 540 mins 2% AEP Figure A 2: Design Rainfall Depths- 540 mins 1% AEP Figure A 3: Design Rainfall Depths- 540 mins 0.5% AEP Figure A 4: Design Areal Temporal Patterns

Figure B 1: Percentage error in external hydrology peak flow 2% AEP Figure B 2: Percentage error in external hydrology peak flow 1% AEP Figure B 3: Percentage error in external hydrology peak flow 0.5% AEP

LIST OF DIAGRAMS

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AEP	Annual Exceedance Probability					
AMS	Annual Maximum Series					
ARF	Areal Reduction Factor					
ARR	Australian Rainfall and Runoff					
ATP	Areal Temporal Patterns					
Bureau/BoM	Bureau of Meteorology					
CC	Climate Change					
CFEV	Conservation of Freshwater Ecosystem Values (DPIPWE/DNRE)					
CL	Continuing Loss					
DEM	Digital Elevation Model					
DPIPWE	Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment					
DNRE	Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania					
	(formerly DPIPWE)					
DRM	Direct Rainfall Method					
DTM	Digital Terrain Model					
FFA	Flood Frequency Analysis					
FLIKE	Software for flood frequency analysis					
FSL	Full Supply Level					
GIS	Geographic Information System					
GEV	Generalised Extreme Value distribution					
HAT	Highest Astronomical Tide					
HSA	Human Settlement Area					
ICM	Infoworks ICM software (Innovyze)					
IL	Initial Loss					
IFD	Intensity, Frequency and Duration (Rainfall)					
Lidar	Light Detection and Ranging					
mAHD	meters above Australian Height Datum					
NTC	National Tide Centre					
PERN	Catchment routing parameter in RAFTS					
Pluvi	Pluviograph – Rain gauge with ability to record rain in real time					
PTP	Point Temporal Patterns					
R	Channel routing param in WMAWater RAFTS WBNM hybrid model					
RAF	RAFTS Adjustment Factor					
RAFTS	hydrologic model					
RCP	Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs) (CC scenarios)					
RORB	RORB hydrological modelling software					
SES	State Emergency Service					
TUFLOW	one-dimensional (1D) and two-dimensional (2D) flood and tide					
	simulation software (hydrodynamic model)					
TP	Rainfall Temporal Patterns					



1. INTRODUCTION

This report is an addendum to the Tasmanian Strategic Flood Map Furneaux Study Area Calibration Report (WMAwater, 2023). The study area, available data, model calibration, limitations and uncertainty statements are provided in the calibration report.

Due to the poor quality DTM available across this study area it was determined at the calibration stage that acceptable flood mapping could not be produced for this area using the regional flood methodology agreed for this project. Therefore, this report outlines the data, methodology and the results of running the external hydrological modelling for the design flood events for the Furneaux Study Area. If a better quality DTM becomes available, the inputs described in this report can be used for future modelling. No hydrodynamic design models have been run for this study area.



2. DATA

2.1. Previous Flood Studies

There were no previous flood studies provided to WMAwater as part of the project data library.

2.2. Flow Data

Flood Frequency Analysis (FFA) was performed on annual maximum series (AMS) from the one flow gauge within the study area. The gauge used for FFA is shown in Table 1. More detail on the quality of the gauge data is provided in the calibration report (WMAwater, 2023). The South Pats River gauge is a poor gauge for FFA as it is only a short distance downstream of Henderson Dam and historical lake levels are not available. A starting lake level of FSL has been assumed. As the dam's historic capacity was only 40ML (upgraded in 2021 or 2022 to increase capacity) the assumption of starting level of FSL should have relatively minor impacts on flood peaks in the upper regions of the AMS, for peak flows greater than 10m³/s or 860ML/d. The rating at this site is also uncertain as no information is available. The record length at this site is shorter than the recommended minimum length to undertake FFA described in the methodology (WMAwater, 2021a). Despite these limitations, it was considered that this was the best data available for use in the design study, as it is the only gauge data available in the study area.

Table 1:	Flow	gauges	used	for	FFA
----------	------	--------	------	-----	-----

Gauge number	Gauge name	River	Period of record	Number of points in AMS
1200-1	South Pats River @ Whitemark WS	Pats Rivulet	09/06/1969 - 06/11/1990	16

2.3. Design Inputs

The design inputs used in the study (Intensity Frequency Duration (IFD) depths, losses, pre-burst rainfalls, Areal Reduction Factors (ARFs) and temporal patterns) were obtained through the ARR Data Hub (Babister et al, 2016) and the Bureau of Meteorology website (Bureau of Meteorology, 2019).

2.3.1. Design Rainfall Depths and Spatial Pattern

Intensity Frequency Duration (IFD) information was sourced from the Bureau of Meteorology website (Bureau of Meteorology, 2019). IFD information was sourced for each individual subcatchment to provide a spatial pattern across the study area. Examples of sub-catchment rainfalls are shown in Figure A 1 to Figure A 3.

2.3.2. Temporal Patterns

ARR 2016 Book 2 Chapter 5 (Ball et. al. 2019) recommends the use of areal temporal patterns for catchments greater than 75 km². Therefore, for the flood frequency analysis, the areal temporal



patterns relevant to this location were downloaded from the ARR Data Hub. An example of the temporal patterns downloaded from the Data Hub is shown in Figure A 4.

For selection of the final design runs applicable to the entire study area, areal and point temporal patterns were downloaded from the ARR Data Hub. Temporal patterns were filtered for embedded bursts and in some cases patterns with large, embedded bursts causing significant outliers were removed. When assessing the reference critical flow for each sub-catchment (as described in the Hydrology Methods Report), point temporal patterns were used for sub-catchments with an upstream area of less than 75 km² or used to assess shorter storms if the critical duration on a larger catchment was identified as 12 hours (the shortest duration available with areal temporal patterns).

2.3.3. Pre-burst

Pre-burst rainfall depths were taken from the ARR Data Hub as a ratio of the IFD depths. As ILs calibrated to the FFA were greater than 0 there was no need to include sensitivity to adding a preburst temporal pattern for this study area, as the pre-burst has effectively been removed from the IL with some IL depth remaining.

2.3.4. Losses

Initial values for sub-catchment initial loss (IL) and continuing loss (CL) were derived from the unpublished Hydrologic Soil Groups of Tasmania data that was provided for use in this project (DPIPWE 2019).

2.3.5. Baseflow

Baseflow was calculated for the calibration event and was found to be less than 5% of the event peak. In line with ARR 2016 Book 5 Chapter 4 (Ball et. al. 2019), where baseflows of less than 5% are considered a small component compared to runoff, a simplified approach to baseflow calculations was used. Hydrodynamic modelling of the calibration events showed that large flood events in this study area were peak rather than volume driven. Baseflows will be a small component of the hydrograph for the AEPs of interest (2%, 1% and 0.5%) and therefore baseflow was not included in the design events.

2.3.6. Direct Rainfall

Two hour direct rainfall storms were created using each sub-catchment's IFD depths using the method described in the Hydrodynamic Method Report (WMAwater, 2021b).

2.3.7. Climate Change Rainfall Factors

Climate change factors for the study area were downloaded from the ARR Data Hub. ARR recommends the use of the RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 values, however the Tasmanian Interim Planning Scheme recommends the use of RCP8.5 and this has been adopted for this project. Using RCP8.5 results for the year 2090, gives a rainfall scaling factor of 16.3% to the IFDs.

3. OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGY

The hydrological and hydrodynamic design modelling methodology has been outlined in the Hydrology Methods Report (WMAwater, 2021a) and the Hydrodynamic Methods Report (WMAwater, 2021b). Details on the methods are only included in this report where they deviate from the methods described in these reports or are specific for this catchment.

Due to the poor quality DTM available across this study area it was determined at the calibration modelling stage, that acceptable flood mapping could not be produced for this area using the regional flood methodology agreed for this project. Therefore, this report outlines the data, methodology and the results of running the external hydrological modelling for the design flood events for the Furneaux Study Area. If a better quality DTM becomes available all the inputs can be used for further modelling. No hydrodynamic design models have been run for this study area.

The modelling method for the design events includes the following steps.

- Data preparation
 - Fitting FFA to suitable flow records
 - Extraction of design data IFDs, temporal patterns, pre-burst rainfalls from ARR DataHub (automated in the modelling process), derivation of direct rainfall storms
- Hydrologic modelling
 - Identification of flow gauge locations
 - o Identification of dam and diversion locations
 - Sub-catchment delineation
 - Include dam storage and spillway ratings where required
 - Event calibration for PERN parameter and event losses, using automated WMAwater RAFTS modelling tool, IDW rainfall surfaces and available flow data.
 - Output event sub-catchment rainfalls, routing parameters and event losses for input to hydraulic model
 - Calibration of design losses to FFA using automated WMAwater RAFTS model
 - Run design events in WMAwater RAFTS modelling tool, with design data, calibrated routing parameters and design losses. Outputs design sub-catchment rainfalls for input to hydrodynamic model.
- Hydrodynamic modelling
 - o Not undertaken
- Mapping
 - o Not undertaken

4. CALIBRATION OF DESIGN LOSSES

FFA was undertaken at the gauge identified in Table 1. The results of the FFA are shown in Figure 1. The fitting method and distribution that provided the best fit to the data at each site is shown in Table 2.

Gauge number	Gauge name	Fitting method	Distribution
1200-1	South Pats River @ Whitemark WS	Bayesian	Log Pearson III

Table 2: Fitting method and distribution used for FFA

The calibrated external hydrologic model for each study area was run through the solver and the initial and continuing losses that best matched the results of the FFA were estimated. As the events of relevance to this study are of 2% AEP or larger, the results were weighted to this end of the FFA curve. However, given that the period of record was shorter than preferred at this gauge, the more frequent AEPs were given further consideration during loss calibration. The catchment-average continuing loss was distributed across the study area using the hydrological soil group final infiltration rates.

The percentage differences between the FFA and the modelled peak flow for the 2% and 1% AEP events are shown in Table 3. The modelled data provided a good fit to the FFA 1% and 2% AEP peak flows.

Calibrated continuing loss (CL) appears to be very high for this study area. As the critical duration at the gauge was only 120 mins, a high CL does not result in as large a volume as it would for longer events. Higher IL and lower CL values were trialled, however this resulted in a very poor fit to more frequent events, which were given some weighting for this gauge due to the short record length. There are a number of potential explanations for the high CL. Flinders Island is known for its granite sandy soils so it is possible CL is actually very high here. Alternatively, calibrating to a gauge with a dam upstream could have increased losses if the dam did impact on the peak of observed flows. Also, the observed FFA is highly uncertain both due to rating curve uncertainty and the short record length. Losses are significantly higher than calibrated losses, however the calibration event in 1970 was less than a 1 EY event and had no sub-daily rainfall data available within 100km of the study area, so the true flood behaviour was not necessarily well represented. Additionally, the rainfall during this calibration event was persistent drizzle over approximately 4 days, which is significantly different to the 2 hour critical burst modelled in these design events.

Table 3: FFA and modelled peak flows

	South Pats River @ Whitemark WS			
Parameter	2% AEP	1% AEP		
FFA peak flow (m³/s)	38	44		
Modelled peak flow (m ³ /s)	37	45		
Peak flow difference (%)	-3.3%	1.5%		

The adopted loss values are shown in Table 4, and comparisons to site FFA is shown in Figure 1.

Table 4: Adopted losses

Initial Loss (mm)		Continuing Loss (mm/h)		
	Soil Type A	Soil Type B	Soil Type C	Soil Type D
11	11.0	5.72	2.64	1.32

5. DESIGN EVENT MODELLING

5.1. Design Event Selection

Design inputs were run through the hydrological model across the entire study area with a range of ARFs to select representative ARFs, storm durations and temporal patterns. The selected storms and the number of sub-catchments best represented by each are shown in Table 5. The temporal patterns for each selected run are shown Figure 2 and Figure A 4.

Table 5: Selected storms for each AEP with the number of sub-catchments best represented by each set				
AEP	Storm duration (min)	ARF bin	# sub-catchments	
2%	120	25	7	

ALF	Storm duration (mm)		# Sub-catchinents
2%	120	25	7
2%	270	25	13
2%	540	45	33
2%	720	45	17
1%	120	25	7
1%	270	25	15
1%	540	45	32
1%	720	45	16
0.5%	120	25	7
0.5%	270	25	16
0.5%	540	45	33
0.5%	720	45	14

Diagram 1 shows which ARF-duration-TP set gives representative flows for each sub-catchment, and also shows headwater sub-catchments where only direct rainfall would be applied.



Diagram 1: ARF set relevant for each sub-catchment for the 1% AEP event

The selection of four ARF-duration-TP sets per AEP does introduce errors when compared to running the ideal ARF-duration-TP set through the hydrodynamic model for each sub-catchment (if a hydrodynamic model based on improved DEM is developed in future), however running thousands of runs of a hydrodynamic model is not computationally feasible. The percentage errors for each sub-catchment are shown in Figure B 1 to Figure B 3 and a summary of the magnitude of the errors is shown in Table 6. Each sub-catchment's absolute percentage error is calculated using the following equation:

SC_Q_Peak_{ref} = Sub-catchment peak flow run with ARF from that sub-catchment's ARF bin, with critical duration calculated at this gauge, and TP above the mean selected.

 $SC_Q_Peak_{sel} = Sub-catchment peak flow run with ARF, storm duration and TP from the selected pattern as shown in Diagram 1$

Absolute subcatchment percentage error =
$$\left| \frac{(SC_Q_Peak_{sel} - SC_Q_Peak_{ref})}{SC_Q_Peak_{ref}} \right| \times 100$$

Table 6: Sub-catchment	errors using the	ARE-TP-duration sets	shown in Table	5 for each AFP
	onoro doling the			

	Absolute sub-catchment error				
AEP	Mean across sub- catchments	90 th %ile across sub- catchments	Max of all sub- catchments		
2%	2.38	10.264	14.76		
1%	3.35	9.254	17.81		
0.5%	2.56	9.045	21.17		

5.2. Design Event Results

As discussed in the calibration report (WMAwater, 2023) and the methodology (Section 3), the DEM covering this study area is largely limited to the 'Default DTM' of the state-wide 10 m DEM. In calibration, this resulted in very poor representation of flooding with flow not following obvious flow paths on aerial imagery, especially in the flatter regions to the east and south of Flinders Island. Therefore, flood maps have not been produced for this study area.



6. LIMITATIONS

A detailed uncertainty assessment of the data, hydrological calibration and hydrodynamic model is contained in the Furneaux Calibration Report (WMAwater, 2023).

Due to the poor quality of the DEM flood mapping has not been able to be undertaken across this study area.

The flood frequency analysis for this study area relied on a short period of record at the South Pats River gauge. It is believed that this site has been reinstated in recent years, however the data for this was not provided for this study and is not publicly available. The gauge is also downstream of a dam, and no information was available on the quality of the rating at this site. There is therefore a very high level of uncertainty in the FFA at this gauge. If mapping is to be undertaken in the future it would be beneficial to redo the FFA using a longer record period if possible.



7. REFERENCES

Babister, M., Trim, A., Testoni, I. & Retallick, M (2016): The Australian Rainfall & Runoff Datahub 37th Hydrology and Water Resources Symposium Queenstown NZ, 2016 available at <u>http://data.arr-software.org/</u>

Ball J, Babister M, Nathan R, Weeks W, Weinmann E, Retallick M, Testoni I, (2019): Editors Australian Rainfall and Runoff: A Guide to Flood Estimation Commonwealth of Australia, Australia, 2019

Bureau of Meteorology (2020). Rainfall Map Information. Bureau of Meteorology, Victoria, Australia URL: <u>http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/austmaps/about-rain-maps.shtml</u>

Bureau of Meteorology (2019). 2016 Rainfall IFD Data System. Bureau of Meteorology, Victoria, Australia URL: http://www.bom.gov.au/water/designRainfalls/revised-ifd/

DPIPWE (2019) Hydrologic Soil Groups of Tasmania (Unpublished). Department of Primary Industries and Water, Hobart, Tasmania. Created March 2019

WMAwater (2021a): Tasmanian Strategic Flood Map Hydrology Methods Report, August 2021. Report for State Emergency Service, Tasmania.

WMAwater (2021b): Tasmanian Strategic Flood Map Hydrodynamic Methods Report, August 2021. Report for State Emergency Service, Tasmania.

WMAwater (2023): Tasmanian Strategic Flood Map Furneaux Catchment Model Calibration Report, March 2023. Report for State Emergency Service, Tasmania.







FIGURE 1 South Pats River at Whitemark WS



FIGURE 2 SELECTED DESIGN TEMPORAL PATTERNS ALL AEPS BY STORM DURATION AND ARF AREA







WMA water

APPENDIX A.

DESIGN EVENT DATA

FIGURE A1 DESIGN RAINFALL DEPTHS 540MIN 2%AEP



FIGURE A2 DESIGN RAINFALL DEPTHS 540MIN 1%AEP



FIGURE A3 DESIGN RAINFALL DEPTHS 540MIN 1IN200AEP



FIGURE A4 DESIGN AREAL TEMPORAL PATTERNS DURATIONS FROM 2 TO 12 HOURS











APPENDIX B.

DESIGN PEAK ERRORS

Figure B1 Furneaux Catchment Percentage error in peak flows using selected runs 2% AEP



Figure B2 Furneaux Catchment Percentage error in peak flows using selected runs 1% AEP



Figure B3 Furneaux Catchment Percentage error in peak flows using selected runs 1in200AEP

