

Attachment 2

to report 19.1 – **Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority** Charter
dated 21 November 2016

Attachment Under Separate Cover

Report to Adelaide Plains Council Meeting of 21st November, 2016
by Cr A Picard (Board Member)
re:- recent meetings of Gawler River Floodplain Management Authority

Given that the CEO has been unable to attend the last two meetings I am providing this report to Council regarding the nature of the discussions that have been held and the potential longer term ramifications for the Adelaide Plains Council.

Following the recent Gawler River September 2016 flood events a Special Meeting of GRFMA was convened on Thursday, 13 October 2016 at Gawler.

The Minutes state:

“

4. *DEBRIEF ON RECENT FLOODING*

4.1 *Council Report on damages*

Adelaide Hills Council

Substantial damage first storm in September, estimated to be \$5M damage to Council assets, in particular damage to Montacute Road (\$1.5M).

Second storm in October incurred substantial damage to roads and fords.

Council is seeking funding assistance from State Natural Disaster Relief Committee.

Adelaide Plains Council

Currently undergoing an audit of the damage.

Amount expected to be known within next day or two.

Barossa Council

Estimated damage to Council assets estimated to be approximately \$ 1M.

Gawler Council

Estimated damage approximately \$250,000.

Three fords inundated and damaged.

Light Regional Council

Damage to rural road network.

Playford Council

Main flooding occurred north of the township of Virginia.

Extensive flooding north of Angle Vale Road.

Flooding west of Port Wakefield Road.

Significant damage to the horticultural crops in the area.

4.2 *General comments:*

- *The successful use of Facebook in keeping the public informed*
- *Concerns about SES being less than equipped to handle the situation*
- *The success of the Bruce Eastick North Para Flood Mitigation Dam in controlling the flow of water*
- *Process needs to be revised and the need to use people who are familiar with the area*
- *Need to validate that the current mapping is reflective of what actually occurred on*

- the ground. Mapping may require being fine-tuned.*
- *Who has the authority to allow the opening of any of the reservoirs to allow water to go through towns and under what authority can they do that?*
 - *The food bowl to the north is a key economic driver for the State*
 - *Should the Charter of the Authority be extended?*
 - *The Mitigation Options Report needs to be reviewed*

4.3 GRFMA Flood Mitigation Options Report

Following the recent flooding, the Technical Assessment Panel will be reviewing the Mitigation Options Report within the next two weeks. Alex Zimmermann, Northern Plains Recovery Officer will be in attendance to discuss options that have been suggested to him by members of the community.

4.4 Adelaide Plains Council Motion - LGA Annual General Meeting 2016
Members noted the following recommendation being forwarded by the Adelaide Plains Council to the AGM of the Local Government Association on 21 October 2016, "That the Annual General Meeting requests the LGA to investigate whether there is sufficient evidence across Local Government to liaise with the State Government in order to develop guidelines and/or appropriate legislation to enable local government to control and manage flooding caused by rivers and creeks on private land.

Board members discussed the proposed motion and agreed that when putting the motion at the Local Government Association's Annual General Meeting that the words "local government" second occurring being deleted from the resulting resolution if supported."

GRFMA Technical Assessment Panel, 25 October 2016

The following motion was carried.

"Moved: Mr Lipp Seconded: Ms Bloss

That it is recommended to the Board that Australian Water Environments be engaged to:-

- 1. Carry out a hydrological review of the 2016 Flood, with rainfall and streamflow data from across the Gawler River, North Para and South Para catchments to be collated and summarised so that a description of the flood can be developed and its magnitude characterised at key locations across the catchment*
- 2. Evaluate floodplain model performance by utilising the results for the hydrological review and feed these into the floodplain model so that its performance could be evaluated against the recorded flood extent information for the 2016 flood*
- 3. Review options for mitigation in Lower Gawler River, including community consultation.*

CARRIED"

The Minutes also state:

"Discussion ensued regarding the opportunity to meet with the Stormwater Management Authority (SMA) to pursue potential funding for the work outlined. Steve Morton confirmed that opportunity would be extended for the next meeting of the SMA to be held on 7 December 2016."

On 1st November, 2016 GRFMA Board Members received an email from Dean Gollan, CEO of GRFMA, attaching Technical Assessment Panel Minutes along with a letter from AWE dated 21 October, 2016 (reference resolution number 16/0004) supporting a specific course of action.

The resolution from the Technical Assessment Panel mentioned above was the course of action being considered. Members were asked for support or otherwise for the actions identified in the resolution. Four board members did reply by email, including one from me.

The concern I raised was that due to the future cost implications on the various Councils, and particularly the cost apportionment between the councils (APC being 28.5%), I would be happier if the decision to go ahead with investigations into flood mitigation measures for the Gawler River itself was put to individual Councils for comments prior to a definite decision to go ahead.

I also pointed out the long held problems that the river is mostly privately owned and mentioned the recent LGA AGM where the motion regarding creeks and rivers on private land, from our Council, was passed.

I also wrote, "I still see the major problem with flood mitigation options along the Gawler River being that it is mostly a privately owned river. Comments made to me following this last flood events (from local residents) are that it is thought essential the river be cleaned out, the levee banks reformed and/or strengthened, and most importantly the ownership of the river channel and its banks, be vested in government hands and not be the responsibility of the current owners."

GRFMA Meeting, 10th November, 2016 at Mallala

The Board received a presentation from HortEx. The Chairman of this organisation, Dino Musolino spoke on the devastation to the horticultural area by the floodwaters which broke out on the southern side of the Gawler River. Similar flooding occurred during 2005.

He emphasised that despite the 2005 event, the subsequent building of the Bruce Eastick Flood Mitigation Dam in 2007 and works on the South Parra Reservoir wall, flooding of the lower Gawler River still occurred. It was generally accepted that further flooding would not occur following these works, but it has.

Barry Ormsby a landscape architect also spoke of the problems. He is to send a copy of a report he has done to the GRFMA.

Alex Zimmerman noted context has changed since the formation of the GRFMA with respect to lower Gawler River to retain flow in existing river and cater for extreme flows via floodway. He mentioned suicide being a risk issue and wants the focus to shift from protection of towns to protection of horticulture. He also said a Reinvestment Industry Task Force is in place but needs a model to address issues. Therefore the need for immediate action and haste.

John Burgaman (?) showed a number of aerial photos he had taken around the mouth of the Gawler River and he suggested channel works could improve the problem at that place. He specified Lido Road near Penrice pumping station where the river channel becomes a flat pan. Some of the other Gawler River and flood problems mentioned were,

- Despite previous solutions being put forward since 96 none have been actioned.
- Mark 2 should have had a better outcome.
- Emphasis has been on urban protection and not protection of horticultural land.
- Railway line and the railway bridge across the Gawler River cause a bottleneck.

- Levee banks have been neglected.
- Lack of maintenance and access to levee banks.
- Need to get the flood waters out to sea.
- Raising height of present dam on the North Para would be ineffective as it did not over top on this occasion and did do what it was supposed to do.
- Lower river channels need to be increased or by pass channels constructed.
- Easements, reserves by an appropriate authority to control flow paths needed.
- Possible compulsory acquisition of land for this.
- River between railway line and highway particularly problematical.
- Old Port Wakefield Road to highway previously looked at for flow paths, wetlands, etc not supported at the time as being too expensive. (Gawler River Open Space Strategy study).
- Need to start floodway east of the railway bridge.
- Questions asked as to who is currently responsible for levee banks along the river.
- Re funding options, 80/20 split between Government and Councils mentioned.
- Government reported to be prepared to fast track funding in light of flooding. Therefore a current window of funding opportunity so need to move fast!
- Need for any reports to be finalised in 4 weeks to forward for government funding. (14/12/2016)
- Cost to the community, eg suicide, etc not previously looked at.
- Any changes to the river channel itself is problematical, erosion, etc.

After considerable discussion the recommendations suggested by the Technical Panel were passed, with slight variation to the wording of number 3 to allow the Technical Assessment Panel to co-opt stake holders.

I expressed some concern regarding Part 3 of the motion because it did not contain any costings or estimates, however Dean Gollan assured the Board that funding for the study would be available through GRFMA funds currently held.

Verbal comments regarding potential ball park figures of \$15,000 for each of Options 1 and 2 and \$40,000 to \$50,000 for Option 3, with the suggestion that GRFMA funds and grant funding would be available to cover these costs.

As I understand it the 80/20 split funding model and the current 28.5% APC contribution will result in our Council being called upon to provide just under 6% of the total cost of any new infrastructure works which may result from this study. I expressed my concerns at the meeting and Council should be aware of this situation.

Additional costs to the Board will be a substantial re-build to the up-stream access to the dam due to wash away caused by the flooding event. Costing unknown at this stage.