



68 GRANUAILLE CRESCENT, BANGALOW, NSW HYDRAULIC ASSESSMENT Instant Steel Pty Ltd

Contact us to design the sustainable towns and cities of tomorrow.



FLOODWORKS

FLOODWORKS Lismore NSW m +61 474 793 362 e derek.mackenzie@floodworks.com.au www.floodworks.com.au Our Ref: FW00007 Date: 10 August 2024 Version 3.0

### **Important Note**

This report and all its components (including images, audio, video, text) is copyright. Apart from fair dealing for the purposes of private study, research, criticism or review as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part may be reproduced, copied, transmitted in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical or graphic) without the prior written permission of Floodworks.

This report has been prepared for the sole use of the client, for a specific site (herein 'the site') for the specific purpose specified in Section 1 of this report (herein 'the purpose'). This report is strictly limited for use by the client, to the purpose and site and may not be used for any other purposes.

Third parties, excluding regulatory agencies assessing an application in relation to the purpose, may not rely on this report. Floodworks waives all liability to any third party loss, damage, liability or claim arising out of or incidental to a third party publishing, using or relying on the facts, content, opinions or subject matter contained in this report.

Floodworks waives all responsibility for loss or damage where the accuracy and effectiveness of information provided by the Client or other third parties was inaccurate or not up to date and was relied upon, wholly or in part in reporting.



The Trustee for Engineering and Environmental Services Trading as FloodWorks ABN 57 619 124 369 PO Box 823 Lismore NSW 2480 T 0474 793 362 | office@floodworks.com.au

#### Version Register

Version	Status	Author	Reviewer	Change from Previous Version	Authorised Release	for
					Signature	Date
-	Draft	ТР	DM		D. Markengie	18/10/19
3.0	Final	NT	DM	Existing Case	D. Machengie	10/08/24

#### **Transmission Register**

Controlled copies of this document are issued to the persons/companies listed below. Any copy of this report held by persons not listed in this register is deemed uncontrolled. Updated versions of this report if issued will be released to all parties listed below via the email address listed.

Name	Email Address
Max Campbell	mca79997@hotmail.com
Peter Williams	peterw@sdscivil.com.au



## **Table of Contents**

1.	Intro	oduction	6
2.	Hydı	rology	8
	2.1.	Methodology	8
	2.2.	Hydrologic Model	8
		2.2.1. Configuration	8
		2.2.2. Hydrologic Routing	9
		2.2.3. Manning's Roughness	10
		2.2.4. Rainfall Losses	10
		2.2.5. Existing Conditions Parameters	10
	2.3.	ARR 2019 Hydrologic Results	11
	2.4.	Flood Frequency Analysis Comparison	12
3.	Ove	rland Flow Hydraulic Assessment	14
	3.1.	Objectives	14
	3.2.	2D Model Set Up	14
		3.2.1. Model Extent	14
		3.2.2. Resolution and Time Step	15
		3.2.3. Topography	16
		3.2.4. Roughness	17
		3.2.5. Inflows	18
	3.3.	Existing Case	18
4.	Sum	mary	27
5.	Refe	erences	28

# **Figures**

Figure 1 Subject Site	7
Figure 2 XP-SWMM Model Extents	9
Figure 3 1%AEP Box and Whisker Plot of Ensemble Results	12
Figure 4 TUFLOW Model Extents	15
Figure 5 Existing Case Surface Elevation Data	16
Figure 6 Existing Case Roughness Map	17
Figure 7 Existing Case Maximum Water Level – PMF EVENT99	19
Figure 8 Existing Case Maximum Water Depth – PMF EVENT	20



Figure 9 Existing Case Maximum Water Velocity – PMF EVENT	21
Figure 10 Existing Case Maximum Water Hazard – PMF EVENT	22
Figure 11 Existing Case Maximum Water Level– 1% AEP CC	23
Figure 12 Existing Case Maximum Water Depth– 1% AEP CC	24
Figure 13 Existing Case Maximum Water Velocity– 1% AEP CC	25
Figure 14 Existing Case Maximum Water Hazard– 1% AEP CC	26

## **Tables**

Table 1 XP-SWMM Hydrologic Model Parameters	10
Table 2 XP-SWMM and RFFE Peak Discharge	13



## 1. Introduction

Instant Steel Pty Ltd has requested a hydraulic assessment as part of a proposed Subdivision Development Application for 68 Granuaille Crescent, Bangalow, NSW, Lot 261 DP 1262316, Lot 11DP 807867 (the subject site). The proposed development includes the subdivision of lands into rural lots and associated roads/ancillary development, a bio-basin and a proposed causeway (4/1.2x1.8 RCBC).

The hydraulic assessment will determine the existing landform including the flooded extent, velocity, peak depth and hazard assessment of the subject site.

The key objectives of the project are:

- Reduce flood risk where possible
- Develop a Hydrology model of the catchment to Australian Rainfall and Runoff (ARR2019) methodology
- Calibrate model to Regional Flood Frequency Estimation Tool (RFFE) and anecdotal data
- Construct a base case 1D/2D TUFLOW Hydraulic model of the subject site to ARR2019
- A hydraulics assessment will be undertaken to determine the flooded extent of the subject creek. Additional information will include velocity, peak depth and hazard assessment
- The 1%AEP\_CC (100Y ARI+ Climate Change) and PMF (Probable Maximum Flood) design events have been assessed

The principal objective of this hydraulic assessment is to identify existing maximum water levels, maximum depths, maximum hazards and maximum velocities for the subject site. Detailed 1D/2D modelling has been undertaken to confirm the above objectives.

The land area of the subject site (Figure 1) is approximately 4.1ha, with an ephemeral creek running north to south through the eastern portion of the subject site.





Figure 1 Subject Site



## 2. Hydrology

#### 2.1. Methodology

The XP-SWMM runoff-routing model has been used to estimate design flood discharges within the study area. The model represents the sub-catchments as a network of nodes linked to either the 1D pipe drainage network or the 2D Digital Terrain Model (DTM) geometric base. The node is defined by its pervious and impervious areas, fraction impervious and average catchment slope. The net rainfall is routed through the network after appropriate losses (initial and continuing) and roughness factors are applied, resulting in a surface runoff hydrograph for each sub-catchment.

The XP-SWMM model was used to estimate the 1% AEP design runoff as per Instant Steel Pty Ltd requirements. The hydrologic assessment has been completed to the Australian Rainfall and Runoff 2019 (ARR2019) methodologies.

A numerical check was performed using the Regional Flood Frequency Estimation model (<u>https://rffe.arr-software.org/</u>) and compared to the XP-SWMM results.

### 2.2. Hydrologic Model

#### 2.2.1.Configuration

Figure 2 illustrates the extent of the XP-SWMM model. The contributing catchment was modelled as 7 sub-catchments with a total area of 58.6ha. These sub-catchments were delineated to represent the inflow location within the subject site accurately.





Figure 2 XP-SWMM Model Extents

#### 2.2.2.Hydrologic Routing

Hydrologic modelling has been undertaken using the Laurenson runoff routing method. The Laurenson method requires the catchment to be divided into pervious and impervious



portions. A fraction impervious of 0% has been applied to the pervious fraction and 100% to the impervious fraction.

#### 2.2.3. Manning's Roughness

Manning's roughness (n) values represent the undeveloped and developed portions of the catchment. XP-SWMM allows a range to be applied to describe the varied degrees of roughness that could be expected within the catchment.

The Manning value was used as a calibration tool to compare peak flow from XP\_SWMM and the ARR Regional Flood Frequency Estimation (RFFE) model.

#### 2.2.4. Rainfall Losses

Initial Loss (IL) and Continuing Losses (CL) were sourced from the Australian Rainfall and Runoff (ARR) Data Hub (<u>http://data.arr-software.org/</u>) and were applied to the modelling. The catchment has been modelled as approximately 100% pervious with only a small percentage of roofed area relative to the catchment size. The following loss rates have been adopted:

> Undeveloped Catchment IL = 12.1mm CL = 0.0mm/hr.

#### **2.2.5. Existing Conditions Parameters**

Table 1 summarises the XP-SWMM parameters adopted for the existing catchment conditions. The catchment's equal area slope was calculated directly from the Digital Terrain Model.

The percentage impervious was determined using the Queensland Urban Drainage Manual (QUDM) guidelines for the fraction impervious for a rural undeveloped as 0% Impervious (QUDM, 2013).

The total contributing catchment is 58.6ha. The hydrologic factors adopted have been summarised in Table 1.

Sub-Catchment	Area (ha)	Impervious (ha)	Pervious Area (ha)	Equal Area Slope (%)
CAT_01	27.964	0.933	27.030	27.964
CAT_02	15.886	1.150	14.736	15.886
CAT_03	3.267	0.718	2.549	3.267
CAT_04	2.104	0.274	1.830	2.104
CAT_05	1.956	0.018	1.937	1.956

#### Table 1 XP-SWMM Hydrologic Model Parameters



CAT_06	5.357	0.550	4.807	5.357
CAT_07	2.026	0.382	1.644	2.026

#### 2.3. ARR 2019 Hydrologic Results

The XP-SWMM ARR Storm Generator allows importation of the ARR Data Hub information, including rainfall global database, infiltration global database, and global storm definitions, into XP-SWMM. Information such as the ARR Data Hub Text File, ARR Temporal Patterns Increments File, and Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) IFD table files are used to produce the Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) and all of the durations for the given location, which are then analysed in the application.

Ten (10) temporal patterns were assessed per duration for each design event, with the results displayed in a box-and-whisker plot to determine the critical storm duration and temporal pattern for the catchment. The box-and-whisker plot displays information about the results' range, median, and quartiles. This plot can easily demonstrate whether a distribution is skewed and whether there are potential outliers in the data set, especially for a large number of observations.

Figure 3 below demonstrates that the highest median storm duration for the 1%AEP, or the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) design event, is the 2-hour storm using the standard temporal pattern 1 and producing a peak discharge of **18.3** m<sup>3</sup>/s.



🗱 Box and Whisker Plot	_		×
Selected AEP: 1% Show Inner Points Show Outliers Show Mean Marks Show Mean Line Display:	None	v	:

Comparison of Storm Ensembles of different durations for AEP = 1%



Figure 3 1%AEP Box and Whisker Plot of Ensemble Results

### 2.4. Flood Frequency Analysis Comparison

The ARR Regional Flood Frequency Estimation (RFFE) model has replaced the rational method for comparing XP-SWMM's calculation to the 1%AEP design event.

The tool requires the geographical coordinates of the catchment centroid and outlet. The tool produces a statistical estimate of peak discharge based on regional rainfall data at gauged locations near the site.

The tool has the following limitations:

- The RFFE tool cannot be used for urban catchments, areas where large-scale land clearing has occurred or where dams or other significant hydraulic controls have significantly affected the natural hydrology (ARR)
- RFFE is not accurate for catchments smaller than 0.5km<sup>2</sup> or larger than 1000km<sup>2</sup>
- Catchments that are located more than 300km from a gauging station used by the tool

Table 2 and Figure 4 summarise the comparison of the RFFA tool and XP-SWMM peak discharges for the sub-catchment at the outlet.



18.262

Event	Discharge	Lower Confidence	Upper Confidence	XP_SWMM (ARR2019)

Limit (5%) (m<sup>3</sup>/s)

4.28

#### **Table 2 XP-SWMM and RFFE Peak Discharge**

\* Based on Medium Ensemble Storm

1%AEP

(m<sup>3</sup>/s)

14.2

#### Conduit Dum from CAT\_06 to Out

Limit (95%) (m<sup>3</sup>/s)

47.1



#### Figure 4 Critical Storm Duration And Temporal Pattern For The Outlet Catchment



## 3. **Overland Flow Hydraulic Assessment**

#### 3.1. Objectives

This overland flow assessment aims to demonstrate that the proposed pad does not significantly increase risk within the floodway.

1D/2D TUFLOW has been used for this analysis. The TUFLOW software models the design terrain (i.e. Digital Terrain Model) of the study area as a series of grid points (2D cells). This allows flows in excess of the channel capacity or pipe network to break out and continue along the floodway in the 2D domain, as the topography dictates. The hydraulic structures (i.e. the minor culvert network) have been represented as 1D elements (ESTRY), which are dynamically linked to the 2D elements. The TUFLOW model computes the capacity of the 1D element and once exceeded, the surcharged flow is transferred to the 2D model. Flood levels, discharge and velocity can be extracted from the model as functions of time at required locations.

TUFLOW is an industry-standard two-dimensional river analysis model used to estimate flood characteristics such as flood level, velocity, and depth.

### 3.2. 2D Model Set Up

#### 3.2.1. Model Extent

The model extents for the TUFLOW model are presented in Figure 4. The extents were set at an appropriate distance from the subject site. The downstream boundary will be normal depth downstream of the railway bridge opening.





Figure 4 TUFLOW Model Extents

#### 3.2.2.Resolution and Time Step

The TUFLOW model used a grid size of 2m and a time step of 1 second for all scenarios. The grid size is based on model efficiency and size constraints for the extent of the model.



#### 3.2.3.Topography

Lidar 1m (2010) data was used as the base topography for the TUFLOW model. The topography used in the pre-development is shown in Figure 5



#### Figure 5 Existing Case Surface Elevation Data



#### 3.2.4. Roughness

Figure 6 show the Manning n roughness values adopted in this assessment.



Figure 6 Existing Case Roughness Map



#### 3.2.5. Inflows

The inflows within the TUFLOW model were extracted directly from the XP-SWMM Hydrology model (ARR 2019). See Figure 5 for inflow locations.

#### **3.3.** Existing Case

The existing case 1 %AEP\_CC (Climate Change) and PMF (Probable Maximum Flood) design event peak water level, depth, velocity and hazard are shown in Figure 7 to Figure 14 below.

The peak water level for the 1%AEP\_CC is 46.28 – 47.58mAHD, and the PMF is 47.75 – 48.04mAHD.

The peak water velocity for the 1%AEP\_CC is 0.01 – 0.6m/s, and the PMF is 0.18 – 1.09m/s.

The peak flood hazard for the 1%AEP\_CC and the PMF is H1 (low hazard) to H5 (high hazard) within the primary conveyance channel.





Figure 7 Existing Case Maximum Water Level – PMF EVENT





Figure 8 Existing Case Maximum Water Depth – PMF EVENT





Figure 9 Existing Case Maximum Water Velocity – PMF EVENT





Figure 10 Existing Case Maximum Water Hazard – PMF EVENT





Figure 11 Existing Case Maximum Water Level- 1% AEP CC





Figure 12 Existing Case Maximum Water Depth- 1% AEP CC





Figure 13 Existing Case Maximum Water Velocity- 1% AEP CC





Figure 14 Existing Case Maximum Water Hazard– 1% AEP CC



### 4. Summary

Floodworks has completed a Hydraulic Assessment for 68 Granuaille Crescent, Bangalow, NSW (the subject site).

An XP-SWMM hydrology model was developed to estimate the 1%AEP (Annual Exceedance Probability), 1%AEP\_CC (Climate Change), and PMF events used within the TUFLOW hydrodynamic model. The hydrologic assessment has been completed according to the Australian Rainfall and Runoff 2019 (ARR2019) methodologies, with results comparing well to the Regional Flood Frequency Estimation tool.

A dynamic 1D/2D linked TUFLOW flood model was developed for the existing case, including the existing Hinterland Way culverts and the downstream rail bridge opening. The TUFLOW model provided maximum height, velocity, peak depth and hazard assessment for the 1%AEP\_CC and the PMF design events.

The peak water level for the 1%AEP\_CC is 46.28 - 47.58mAHD, and the PMF is 47.75 - 48.04mAHD.

The peak water velocity for the 1%AEP\_CC is 0.01 – 0.6m/s, and the PMF is 0.18 – 1.09m/s.

The peak flood hazard for both the 1%AEP\_CC and the PMF is H1 (low hazard) to H5 (high hazard) within the primary conveyance channel.



### 5. References

- BOM (2018) Rainfall IFD Data System
- IPWEA 2013, Queensland Urban Development Manual (QUDM)
- Ball J, Babister M, Nathan R, Weeks W, Weinmann E, Retallick M, Testoni I, (Editors), 2019, Australian Rainfall and Runoff: A Guide to Flood Estimation, Commonwealth of Australia
- Elevation Foundation Spatial Data from http://elevation.fsdf.org.au/



## Appendix A Australian Rainfall & Runoff Data Hub – Results

River Region	
Division	South East Coast (NSW)
River Number	3
River Name	Richmond River
+ eArec	$- a \left(Area^b - c \log_{10} Duration ight) Duration^{-d} \ a^f Duration^g \left(0.3 + \log_{10} AEP ight) \ Area rac{Duration}{1440} \left(0.3 + \log_{10} AEP ight) ight] ight\}$

Zone	а	b	С	d	e	Ť	g	h	I	
East Coast North	0.327	0.241	0.448	0.36	0.00096	0.48	-0.21	0.012	-0.0013	

Short Duration ARF

$$egin{aligned} ARF &= Min \left[ 1, 1 - 0.287 \left( Area^{0.265} - 0.439 ext{log}_{10}(Duration) 
ight) . Duration^{-0.366} \ &+ 2.26 ext{ x } 10^{-3} ext{ x } Area^{0.226} . Duration^{0.125} \left( 0.3 + ext{log}_{10}(AEP) 
ight) \ &+ 0.0141 ext{ x } Area^{0.213} ext{ x } 10^{-0.021 rac{(Duration - 180)^2}{1440}} \left( 0.3 + ext{log}_{10}(AEP) 
ight) 
ight] \end{aligned}$$

#### Storm Losses

Note: Burst Loss = Storm Loss - Preburst

Note: These losses are only for rural use and are NOT FOR DIRECT USE in urban areas

Note: As this point is in NSW the advice provided on losses and pre-burst on the NSW Specific Tab of the ARR Data Hub is to be considered. In NSW losses are derived considering a hierarchy of approaches depending on the available loss information. The continuing storm loss information from the ARR Datahub provided below should only be used where relevant under the loss hierarchy (level 5) and where used is to be multiplied by the factor of 0.4.

ID	2345.0
Storm Initial Losses (mm)	44.0
Storm Continuing Losses (mm/h)	2.1



## Interim Climate Change Factors

	RCP 4.5	RCP6	RCP 8.5
2030	0.869 (4.3%)	0.783 (3.9%)	0.983 (4.9%)
2040	1.057 (5.3%)	1.014 (5.1%)	1.349 (6.8%)
2050	1.272 (6.4%)	1.236 (6.2%)	1.773 (9.0%)
2060	1.488 (7.5%)	1.458 (7.4%)	2.237 (11.5%)
2070	1.676 (8.5%)	1.691 (8.6%)	2.722 (14.2%)
2080	1.810 (9.2%)	1.944 (9.9%)	3.209 (16.9%)
2090	1.862 (9.5%)	2.227 (11.5%)	3.679 (19.7%)

## Probability Neutral Burst Initial Loss

min (h)\AEP(%)	50	20	10	5	2	1
60 (1.0)	24.2	13.2	12.3	12.0	10.8	7.7
90 (1.5)	25.1	14.7	13.3	12.0	10.2	8.3
120 (2.0)	22.4	13.4	13.0	11.1	10.3	6.1
180 (3.0)	21.9	13.7	12.6	10.2	9.6	5.2
360 (6.0)	19.9	12.8	12.2	10.9	11.1	3.5
720 (12.0)	21.9	15.3	15.0	12.2	13.8	4.5
1080 (18.0)	25.8	19.1	19.6	14.9	16.7	5.4
1440 (24.0)	29.9	21.7	21.4	16.5	14.3	5.9
2160 (36.0)	35.3	26.4	24.8	19.6	17.9	6.2
2880 (48.0)	37.4	27.7	26.6	23.7	23.2	7.0
4320 (72.0)	42.3	32.6	32.1	29.6	27.3	11.7



## Appendix B Box and Whisker Plots

Box and Whisker Plot	_		×
Selected AEP: 1% Show Inner Points Show Outliers Show Mean Marks Show Mean Line Display:	None	v	

Comparison of Storm Ensembles of different durations for AEP = 1%





## Appendix C Regional Flood Frequency Estimation (ARR2019)



AEP (%)	Discharge (m³/s)	Lower Confidence Limit (5%) (m <sup>3</sup> /s)	Upper Confidence Limit (95%) (m³/s)
50	2.85	1.21	6.71
20	5.03	2.21	11.5
10	6.80	2.82	16.5
5	8.76	3.32	22.9
2	11.7	3.89	35.0
1	14.2	4.28	47.1

# Statistics

Variable	Value	Standard Dev		Correlation		
Mean	1.034	0.529		1.000		
Standard Dev	0.642	0.303		-0.330	1.000	
Skew	0.074	0.029		0.170	-0.280	1.000
Note: These statistics come from the nearest gauged catchment. Details.			Note: These statistics are common to each region. Details.			





Shape Factor vs Catchment Area







# Intensity vs Catchment Area

# Bias Correction Factor vs Catchment Area





Appendix D TUFLOW Results







## FIG 02 PRE- DEVELOPMENT TUFLOW MODEL MANNING MAP

PROJECTION: GDA94 / MGA ZONE 56 PROJECT: FW00007 68 Granuaille Crescent, Bangalow DATE: August 2024

























#### **FIG D05 EXISTING CASE** LEGEND **1% AEP CLIMATE CHANGE** Model Extent Subject Site Cadastral **FLOOD WATER LEVEL** RKS www.floodworks.com.au Downstream Extent of Model Interrogation Point FLOOD $\bigcirc$ Layout Contour Ground **Instant Steel Pty Ltd** PROJECTION: GDA94 / MGA ZONE 56 PROJECT: FW00007 68 Granuaille Crescent, Bangalow DATE: August 2024

DISCLAIMER: This figure and its contents are electronically generated, are confidential and may only be used for the purpose for which they were intended. Flood Works will not accept responsibility for any consequences arising from the use of the figure for other than its intended purpose or where the drawing has been altered, amended or changed either manually or electronically by any third party.

<u>Client</u>











