MORETON GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES PTY. LTD.

[redacted]

A.C.N. 055 833 120
A.B.N. 24 055 833 120

14 February 2011

The Commissioner
Qld Floods Commission of Inquiry
G.P.O. Box 1738
Brisbane 4001

Dear Commissioner,

Re: **SOUTH EAST QUEENSLAND FLOOD OF JANUARY 2011**

The following are comments and matters that I believe require consideration at your Inquiry:

1. the non-technical public in general have no idea what flood levels mean to them e.g. 4.5m at the Brisbane gauge, 19.0m at Ipswich etc. A flood map or similar e.g. on Google, Nearmap or similar which is easily obtained from the Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) website, with some explanations of flood level history at each recording station etc, etc, is I believe a minimum requirement for public information in future.

2. news reports mainly gave the levels that the Brisbane and Bremer Rivers were expected to rise to during the floods, e.g. could go higher than 22m (AHD) in Ipswich. People who were flooded in 1974 or are familiar with AHD levels on their properties wanted to know the actual level that the waters had reached at each time period to clearly establish whether the waters were still rising, stabilising or falling. This information should also be placed on the BOM website. People without electricity could get this information by telephone, from friends or on an SMS system.

3. serious consideration needs to be given to installing barrage or similar flood control devices on the Bremer River and Lockyer Creek and other problematic areas in Queensland. These devices would have flood gates that close or rise to hold back water for a few days to a week or so before then lowering the dammed levels back to the usual river levels, i.e. not permanent dam walls but temporary flood mitigation storage with the waterways operating as normal after the flood period has passed. These structures would be good investments even if only used say once in 30 – 50 years.

4. Wivenhoe Dam undoubtedly did a magnificent job. Unfortunately everyone knows that if it had been operated as originally intended, i.e. for flood mitigations purposes only, then the flooding would have been significantly less than what eventuated. Even if water storage is now a new part requirement then why wasn't the dam level lowered 3 – 5 days earlier when it was known that large rainfalls were going to occur?

5. flood levels for development (e.g. 1 in 100) are not properly understood by most people. Is there a better way of presenting this information?

Regards

Ken Grubb
M.App.Sc., MIE Aust., CP Eng., RPEQ 2811