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The meeting of the Floodplain Risk Management Advisory Committee commenced at 8.35am.
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CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

CM-1 MEETING MINUTES - 5 FEBRUARY 2019

Recommendation:
On the Motion of R Prangnell and B Mahony
That the Minutes of the proceedings of the Floodplain Risk Management Advisory Committee held on 5 February 2019 be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No Declarations of Interest received.

REPORTS FROM STAFF

RP-1 PROJECT UPDATES

Recommendation:
On the Motion of R Prangnell and B Mahony
That the Committee
a receive and note the report
b request that community contact details and GRCHydro contact details be exchanged in relation to the VOFFS
c request that a revised Wagga Wagga Villages Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan schedule be distributed to the Floodplain Risk Management Advisory Committee as soon as possible
d recommend Council adopt the revised Wagga Wagga Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan which has been updated with Australian Rainfall and Runoff (AR& R) 2016 requirements so that Council's Planning staff can continue on with the updated information

CARRIED
**Discussion on the Projects:**

**Project 1793 – Main City Levee Upgrade**
Cr Keenan – have there been any complaints from the owners of the properties near the dog track works?

AM – No

Cr Kendall – What is the expected completion date?

AM – June 2020

CR – is the community information session set down for 30 May 2019 going ahead.

AM – Yes

Cr Keenan – the recent media event went really well and was well received by all outlets. Media was not aware of the complexity of the project.

RP – Are the business houses at the end of Fitzmaurice Street happy now that the Crampton Street carpark has been reopened?

AM – There has been no feedback since the car park was reopened a week earlier than planned.

**Project 2000 - Wagga Revised Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan**
PR – In relation to the North Wagga levee, staff in conjunction with OEH, are still in the process of developing the brief due to the intricacies of the combination of the two options. The brief will be prepared in house at Council with a draft to be reported to the next FLMAC meeting in June.

Cr Keenan – With the two North Wagga co-opted community members, will their roles be primarily that of a liaison nature between the committee and the community? Will they be involved in the preparation of the brief as that would be a good opportunity for them to provide input?

P Ross – That is not the intent of their role. Due to the intricate nature of the brief it is best to develop the brief to a point where it can be then brought back to the committee for discussion.

CA – Intention is to prepare the brief with the assistance of OEH and then bring a draft back to the Committee, due to the complexities around the recommendations. There will need to be a good understanding of the recommendations of the adopted plan to enable explanations to be given to committee members.

SM – OEH have provided some sample briefs to Council staff. OEH are happy to review the draft once it has been finalised.

CA – it is important that the draft comes back to the committee for review.
CR Kendall – Need to remember, as part of the flood studies, the preliminary investigations into flood water evacuation structures in respect to the time that flood waters stayed inside the North Wagga levee during the last event. This aspect was not looked at with the Main City levee.

CA – There was extensive conversations around this throughout the whole of the study with the recommendation being that a pump be installed to move the water faster.

CR Kendall – would suggest a more notable structure than a pump, something that lets the water out at the same time as the river is going down. If this item is not in the feasibility study it will not be captures in the budget at a later date.

SM – OEH would be happy to include this in the brief

**Flood Warning Systems**

PR – Council has submitted an application to review and assess current systems and make recommendations on additional needs.

SM – The original recommendation from the adopted Wagga Revised Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan was for a flood level gauge (dipstick) at Oura. It is now proposed to look at deficiencies for the whole system rather than just Oura.

**2019-2020 Floodplain Management Program**

PR – An application has been made in relation to flood studies for Mangoplah and Humula similar to those undertaken for the Villages flood studies for Uranquinty, Ladysmith and Tarcutta.

SM – OEH Grants area is currently assessing all applications and it is likely that approval for any projects will not be given until the end of this year.

**Project 18640 – Wagga Wagga Villages Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan**

PR – A number of responses were received in respect to the Villages questionnaire especially from Tarcutta where a large of number comments related to the effect of the RMS bypass road and bridge.

GRCHydro have requested information on the location of all levees in their study area as well as the contact details of community representatives for the villages.

Co-opted members from Uranquinty have been appointed. No interest from Ladysmith and Tarcutta following advertisements in Council News and on Council’s webpage. Staff have since taken more steps to make both the Ladysmith and Tarcutta communities aware of the call for co-opted community members. It is anticipated that nominated representatives from both towns should be in place by the next FRMAC meeting.

Cr Keenan – there is a community consultation session being undertaken by Council at Ladysmith shortly, would be a good opportunity to include the request for coopted members on the agenda for discussion with community.
BM – It is reported that Council’s consultant has met with Council on the 17/04/19. Will the consultant be meeting with the Uranquinty community as the 17/04/19 was a wasted opportunity for consultation as there was no local input?

P Ross – The consultant may not have wanted to initially engage with the community as they may have wanted to inspect first hand to clarify aspects then come back and talk to the community at a later date. Consultation will definitely be undertaken with the community.

BM – In the project report it stated that the Stage 1 report has been distributed FRMAC members, is this going to happen?

PR – Apologies if this has not been done, will make sure that it does happen. Revised Stage 1 and 2 reports will be sent out to the committee.

Cr Kendall – All project reports would be well served to have a timeline chart, with indicative target dates that have been confirmed with the consultants included, as this would be good for when the committee are talking with the community.

Cr Keenan – what are the next steps for the VOFFS?

PR – GRC Hydro are reviewing the data that they have requested.

CA – Shaula Siregar worked with Councillor’s Master Scheduler to develop a schedule as part of our monthly reporting requirements. The most current report will be provided to each FRMAC meeting going forward.

SM – The consultant has been updating the modelling to reflect the 2016 AR & R which has caused a slight delay. The next progress report will summarise all work to date as well as community consultation plans. A revised schedule maybe required depending on the impact of the 2016 AR & R review as the Grant finishes at the end of September 2019.

BM – Is there something concrete that the community/coopted members can do to connect with the consultant?

PR – 1. We will get the contact details of all community coopted members to the consultant and vice versa.

2. We will look at a timeline update if required and communicate to the Committee.

Councillor Keenan left the meeting at 9.05am, Councillor Kendall took over as Chairperson.

Project 19555 – Flood Mitigation Option Feasibility Study for North Wagga and Floodplain Residents

No discussion
Project 1753 – Wagga Wagga Major Overland Flow Flood (MOFF) Risk Management Study and Plan

PR – An application has been made for an extension in time and an increase in funding for this project

SM – Quite confident that the original increased amount of funding that was requested will be reinstated due to clarification relating to the sensitivity study aspect.

Cr Kendall – Updates have occurred in November 2018 and January 2019 – have we made a decision to put a line under it? If we keep making updates we may never get the work finished.

SM – There are not going to be any more changes.

Presentation made to Committee by WMAwater – Cath Goonan – copy of presentation to be distributed the committee with the meeting minutes.

C G - All models have been updated with the 2016 AR & R.

Cr Kendall provided an explanation in respect to flood modelling losses to the community committee members in attendance.

Cr Kendall - 2012 was a large event that came after significant wetting of the catchment, do the latest loses take into account the lead up to events? Does the modelling now include this impact?

C Goonan – Advised that they have undertaken extensive mapping of soil types across NSW and considered other factors such as Antecedent conditions and continuing losses.

SM – Antecedent Moisture Control - in calibration of design floods, need to make assumptions. Wrong for Wagga, assumed there was no lead up moisture in the soil.

BOM have data hub – factors way too high for inland NSW – not a lot of inland monitoring stations compared to that along the coast. OEH flagged these issues - applying guidelines that considered increased losses.

Cr Kendall – with modern computing can you do modelling on certain storm durations?

SM – There is new technology – “Rainfall and Grid” analysis which does this better but doesn’t work for urban catchments however worked well at Ungarie.

BM – Does this apply in outlying areas – 80mm event – pretty minimal effect. 80mm over two weeks soaking rain – sheets of water everywhere.

SM – Difficulty with modelling – need to work out a standard

BM – Uranquinty flooding event - not related to the Wagga Wagga event – very localised

SM – Are we at a point where we can assess mitigation options?
CG – Yes we can, have been through them before, still have our ideas from previous meetings.

There is a flood planning area for Council to use re flood risk when looking at potential development areas. This is way for Council to use information that WMAwater has.

AS – This will be helpful from a strategic planning process – informative – stay away from high risk areas.

SM – A crucial part of the project is to look at new development areas to determine if they are appropriate – use the WMAwater tool.

AS – the timing is perfect

CG – Looked at Riverine floodplain areas as well

Cr Kendall – land use maybe open space in a high risk area – not knocking out whole area – how do you do your land use planning?

Cr Kendall – Council has previously adopted the outcomes of the MOFFS. Now that levels have been revised does Council need to readopt the study? Should a formal report go to Council?

AS – we will discuss this afternoon.

Cr Kendall – Would be handy if it is adopted

CG – If reported would it need to go on public exhibition?

SM – Lake Albert – surcharging the Lake re mitigation – temporary structure downstream. Stringybark/Crooked Creek – enhance flows into Lake Albert - Is this something Council wants to look at?

PR – Issues of creeks – redirecting water from Tatton Drain – Council would have to get a permit and a licence.

Cr Kendall – This would not a permanent diversion only a flood mitigation measure

PR – Would need to be careful so that roads are not flooded – level would need to be considered – issue would have to be discussed with NRAR

SM – Have recently seen a planning proposal for west of the Lake.

SM – Any community suggestions?

CG – Glenfield drain upgrade

Cr Kendall – Lake Albert feeding channels would make diversion more beneficial – could be secondary benefits – Lake Albert more usable

PR – there are contrary views to this
Cr Kendall – more consistent – diversion less likely to be breached – more likely more water to go into Lake Albert – secondary benefits

SM – The focus is to reduce the effect in residential areas

CG – This would be an operational issue.

SM- Limitations on infrastructure around the Lake – work out how high you could go – bike path inundation is likely

Cr Kendall – were there any other options?

C Goonan – Comments from community related to more so to stormwater movements – had to guide them – the issues were bigger than this

Cr Kendall – Plumpton Rd drainage – Can we achieve extra capacity within the inflows at the top of the Lake.

P R – One creek – 1 in two years storm frequency, the other 1 in 5yrs frequency – then both flows bypass the lake

Cr Kendall – increase to 1 in 20 would make a difference

CG – Lake Albert was looked at as a system when looking at community responses

SM – Committee to look at updated report, provide comments and options back through the committee

Cr Kendall – can the report and presentation be distributed to the committee.

SM – Other option – Wollundry Lagoon – use it as a detention basin?

Cr Kendall – this is currently in the operational plan – drop level when storm due – pumps have been installed for this – can the capacity of the pumps be provided to WMAwater?

CG – Is there a minimum level required for Council’s air conditioning system?

AM – Have in house information, will provide

Cr Kendall – Storage increase at Flowerdale?

AM – there are proposed concepts at Flowerdale to separate Vestey Street drainage

CG – Will chat with AM re affected roads and culverts – maybe more depth markers and flashing lights are required

AM – Part of the Main City levee upgrade will look at all flood pumps. The aim is to upgrade to larger permanent pumps with potentially going to a single size/design of pumps such as 8 inch pumps across all permanent pump locations, the number of pumps may vary but the pump is consistent.
Cr Kendall – Need to look at invert levels, pumps could have secondary benefits

SM – Only look at a reduction in damages

BM – upgrading pumps, will this be for all areas?

Cr Kendall – same will be done for villages

SM – looking at upgrading levees

GG – will this also include drains under railway bridges?

SM – will be looking at is as part of the villages study

CG – any opportunities for piggy backing onto a major Council project?

SM – Special Activation Precinct has not been modelled completely – the impacts may be included into SAP – expand Overland Flow area to include Bomen down the track to ensure that it is appropriately developed. MOFFS may need to be expanded to include Bomen – 5/10 years down the track

CG – report 1 and 2 to be presented to Council?

PR – Need to determine how to accept the report results pending adoption of final report

GRCHydro will be attending the next meeting on 4 June 2019.

**QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE**

No Questions With Notice were received.

The Floodplain Risk Management Advisory Committee rose at 10.10am.