



WEE WAA FLOOD LEVEE

* FLOOD OF RECORD (1971) + 1 metre

		LEVEE
	<u>193·09</u>	DESIGN FLOOD LEVEL*
	192.95	ACTUAL LEVEL
00	X 1	FIELD DENSITY TEST
	O1	FIELD PERMEABILITY TEST

FIGURE 1



PLAN SCALE: HORIZONTAL SCA	NOT TO SCALE						<u>APPROVED</u> :		Narrabri	46-48 MAITLAND STREET NAR
VERTICAL SCALE	:						DESIGN SERVICES MANAGER DATE	IE .		TOWNSHI
DATUM	SURVEYED: G.P.LATHAM	А	22-11-2010	ISSUED FOR COMMENT	GPL		<u>NS LUNSTRUCTED</u> :		A CONTRACTOR OF	Top of Leve
AHD	DRAWN: G.P.LATHAM	REV.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	DES.	APP.	DIRECTOR ENGINEERING SERVICES DATE	TE	Heart of the North West	SI

WWL-067-0

The "Narrabri – Wee Waa Flood Study" verified the Mike 11 model by plotting the observed flood levels at Gunidgera against Mike 11 modelled flood levels as shown in Figure Appendix C-1 (Appendix G of the Narrabri – Wee Waa Flood Study).



Figure Appendix C-1 Narrabri – Wee Waa flood study verification results

URS tried to replicate Figure Appendix C-1 to verify the Mike 11 model received from Council was the same as the one used for the "Narrabri – Wee Waa Flood Study". This was done to ensure the hydrographs that were extracted from Mike 11 and used as the TUFLOW inflow hydrographs are accurate. However when the Mike 11 model received from Council was run, URS could not replicate the results shown in Figure Appendix C-1 (taken from Appendix G of the "Narrabri – Wee Waa Flood Study"). The cross section reportedly used to extract the Mike 11 results used in the Flood Study report was not present in the received model. Therefore two MIKE 11 chainages were picked to represent Gunidgera; chainage 33006 which is closest to that used in the Flood Study; and 31512 which was used because it appears to be located in close proximity to the Gunidgera flood gauge.



Appendix C - Mike 11 model



Figure Appendix C-2 Narrabri – Wee Waa flood study verification results compared to Mike 11 URS and TUFLOW results.

As shown in Figure Appendix C-2 cross section 31512 results show the best correlation to the observed and TUFLOW modelled flood levels, however it over-estimates them both by approximately 0.3m. This is considered a sufficient match for the data to be used for comparisons in this study.

Given that the results from the flood study could not be replicated using the Mike 11 model there is a degree of uncertainty over the input hydrographs used for the TUFLOW model. However the correlation between the TUFLOW model and observed flood levels are a relatively good fit and do not appear to have suffered from this uncertainty.

Appendix D 1% AEP flood inundation extents over time



C













Appendix E Flood Extents and Hazard Mapping

URS

Ε