[redacted]

From: Chloe Cross
Sent: Monday, 21 February 2011 8:26 AM
To: John Tibaldi
Subject: 18 Feb Meeting Notes.docx
Attachments: 18 Feb Meeting Notes.docx

Hi John

Please find attached the meeting notes from Friday. There is also a list at the bottom of who had copies of the report for review.

Thanks,

Chloe Cross
Dam Safety & Emergency Response Support Officer
Queensland Bulk Water Supply Authority *trading as* Seqwater

seqwater
WATER FOR LIFE

Ph [redacted]
Unit 1/ 68 Junction Road, Karalee QLD 4306
PO Box 2437, North Ipswich QLD 4305
Website | www.seqwater.com.au

QFCI

Date: 7/2/12 JM

Exhibit Number: 1088

Flood Event Report – Meeting
Friday 18 February 2011

Executive Summary:

- Tibaldi: Appendix U – includes list of Wivenhoe reports re hydrology
- Somerset – pmf = structural issues, Wivenhoe – pmf = failure
- Inc comparisons with 74
- Ayre: graph- only shows Wivenhoe inflow? Perhaps not sure light blue line?

Review of Wivenhoe Full Supply Level:

- Set by DERM legally – section outlines this
- Question why in report – requirement to outline all flood relevant matters
    - Pruss: will discuss offline

Report Conclusions:

- Tibaldi: Conclusions need correcting
- Shannon: 4th point- if discretion was used, in accordance with manual? – to discuss offline
    - Discretionary issues? Discuss with reviewers
    - Shannon: if you did step outside manual, show you did what was necessary
- Fiona: Outline Wivenhoe Dam successfully absorbed first peak, not 2nd peak 30 hours later?
- Foster: Re BOM – statement about our interaction with BOM? Actions not determined by forecasts? – Conclusion about forecasting?
    - Tibaldi: Will talk about in review - maybe worth adding to conclusion.
    - Malone: BOM not commenting on how big event was

Recommendations

- Change index to match title
- Includes only the key recommendations – not all, inc in review
- 2nd point: refer the manual review is required after every significant event (re-sets clock on when due next)
- Drury: 3rd point – participate in review including protocol? Expand, include others then protocol? Recommend it has to be reviewed
    - Foster- Protocol not signed off, issue? What went to the public and what didn't?
    - Section 11 – mention protocol hasn't been signed off – draft version
- Fiona: Brian Cooper's report supports us in complying with protocol
    - Pruss: Make reference to this in report?
- Malone/Foster: Issues with resources?
    - Tibaldi: Report addresses this
    - Shannon: Need at least 2 or more senior flood operations engineers. Manual only outlines need for "1 or more"
    - Ruffini: Need to talk to Peter Allen on where he stands with this?
- Shannon: thought about why manual wasn't upgraded between 2004-2009 when there was an upgrade of Dam?
    - Tibaldi – will need to think about this. Fair point that needs addressing. Should have been revised after Fuse Plug upgrade – needs to be talked about in more detail.
    - Foster: What process to get Fuse Plug upgrade included in manual?

Expert Review Process:

- Spent last 3 days with us – relatively happy but want more graphs
- Ayre: Modelling reasonable for purpose at hand.
    - Issues re interpretation with some of the data – design approach and what is used operationally
    - Event significance more work?
- Question on if there will be a broader review on whole document.
- Shannon: re diagrams – all been in terms of hydrographs?
    - Malone – in appendix
    - Tibaldi: in event significance add new section= Event Volumes
- Pruss: Are we at a point to start getting document out? Need broader timelines on progress.
    - Over weekend – report to be reviewed, come back on Monday to discuss comments
    - **Copies have been given to:**
        1. Mike Foster
        2. Legal
        3. Legal
        4. Jim Pruss
        5. Tony Lake
        6. Rob Drury
        7. Brian Shannon
        8. Rob Ayre
        9. Col
        10. John Ruffini
        11. Terry Malone