

Charleys Creek

Charleys Creek Model Results to Support Basin Plan Requirements

Water Planning and Coastal Sciences

November 2018

Prepared by

Queensland Hydrology
Water Planning and Coastal Sciences
Science and Technology Division
Department of Environment and Science
GPO Box 2454
Brisbane Qld 4001

© The State of Queensland (Department of Environment and Science) 2018

The Queensland Government supports and encourages the dissemination and exchange of its information. The copyright in this publication is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia (CC BY) licence



Under this licence you are free, without having to seek permission from DES, to use this publication in accordance with the licence terms.

You must keep intact the copyright notice and attribute the State of Queensland, Department of Environment and Science as the source of the publication.

For more information on this licence visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/deed.en>

Disclaimer

This document has been prepared with all due diligence and care, based on the best available information at the time of publication. The department holds no responsibility for any errors or omissions within this document. Any decisions made by other parties based on this document are solely the responsibility of those parties. Information contained in this document is from a number of sources and, as such, does not necessarily represent government or departmental policy.

If you need to access this document in a language other than English, please call the Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS National) on 131 450 and ask them to telephone Library Services on +61 7 3170 5725

Citation

DES, 2018. Charleys Creek – Charleys Creek Model Results to Support Basin Plan Requirements, Queensland Department of Environment and Science, Brisbane.

November 2018

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Current model	3
1.2	Proposed Model	3
1.3	Basin Plan Requirements	4
2	Charleys Creek SOURCE Model	6
3	Model Scenarios	8
3.1	Current Cap IQQM (Case 1710A)	8
3.1.1	Storage Details and Assumptions	8
3.1.2	Management System	8
3.1.3	High Priority Demand	9
3.1.4	Medium Priority Demand	9
3.1.5	Unsupplemented Demand	9
3.2	Current Charleys Creek ROP IQQM (Case 1509P)	9
3.2.1	Storage Details and Assumptions	9
3.2.2	Management System	10
3.2.3	High Priority Demand	10
3.2.4	Medium Priority Demand	10
3.2.5	Unsupplemented Licensed Data	10
3.3	New Charleys Creek Draft WP SOURCE (Case 1812D)	10
3.3.1	Storage Details and Assumptions	10
3.3.2	Management System	10
3.3.3	High Priority Demand	10
3.3.4	Medium Priority Demand	10
3.3.5	Unsupplemented Licensed Data	11
3.4	New Charleys Creek Draft WP IQQM (Case 1809F)	11
3.5	Without Development Condition	11
4	Reconciliation with Murray–Darling Basin Plan Schedule 3	12
5	Conclusion.....	13
6	References.....	14
	Appendix A – Methodology and Data Differences.....	15

List of tables

Table 1 Detail of the Model Scenarios.....	8
Table 2 Resource Operation Plan Case 1710A – Former Area Licences.....	9
Table 3 Resource Operation Plan Case 1710A – Water Harvesting Allocations	9
Table 4 Long-Term Diversions for the Various Models (1895–2009).....	12
Table 5 Long-Term Flows at Charleys Creek Gauge 422343A (1895–2009)	12
Table 6 Long-term mean annual diversions from watercourses under water allocations and licences: comparison of model 1710A and 304A.....	13

List of figures

Figure 1 Model Extent.....	7
Figure 2 Charleys Creek ROP IQQM Network	10

1 Introduction

The Charleys Creek Model was developed using the SOURCE Model as a platform. A detailed background to the data used, methodology, calibration and validation of the model development is documented in *Condamine-Balonne River Basin Model, Volume 1 – Calibration of Hydrological Models – to St George (GS422201F) (DSITI, 2017)*.

1.1 Current model

In preparing a water resource plan (WRP) and a resource operations plan (ROP) under the *Water Act 2000* (Qld), the State of Queensland develops a hydrologic model to test management scenarios. The current plans, viz. the Water Resource (Condamine Balonne) Plan 2004 (current WRP) and the Condamine and Balonne resource operations plan July 2015 (current ROP), uses the Integrated Quantity Quality Model (IQQM) for the catchment models.

The current ROP model for the Condamine–Balonne also forms the basis for the audited Cap model which supports Cap Reporting requirements under the Murray–Darling Basin Agreement and in the transition to the Basin Plan Section 71 reporting. Note that the current ROP and Cap models use different simulation periods but are otherwise the same.

In the ROP and Cap models, Charleys Creek was represented as a branch in the Middle Condamine IQQM. However, this representation was not adequate to test trading of allocations along Charleys Creek and its tributaries, so a more detailed IQQM was developed.

1.2 Proposed Model

Queensland has developed a new model for Charleys Creek as part of the review of the current WRP and ROP and for the proposed Water Plan (WP) package being developed to comply with Basin Plan requirements. This new Draft WP model differs from the current model on the following points:

- There is a more detailed representation of the creek.
- Updated Methodology – Queensland has updated the model methodology based on the learnings from previous model builds to improve the robustness of the model. This update has come from model application, internal and external audits and developments external to technology. This is addressed in Appendix A. A key driver for this update was so that the model could be used to determine the sustainable diversion limit (SDL) and the baseline diversion limit (BDL) consistent with the Basin Plan requirements i.e. Chapter 10 and Position Statement 3 C Method for Determining Take.
- Better Data – With every review more data becomes available. This is particularly significant in the case of Charleys Creek where a new streamflow gauge at Chinchilla provided the capacity to better simulate the flows in the stream. This is addressed in Appendix A.

It needs to be noted that there have been changes to water allocations between the current and new Draft WP models because of trading.

1.3 Basin Plan Requirements

The Basin Plan prescribes requirements that Queensland needs to address to meet accreditation.

The key requirements that need to be addressed by the model are:

1. BDL – Baseline diversion limit of an SDL resource unit. The Baseline diversion limits are determined based on development conditions as specified in Schedule 3 of the Basin Plan. In general, the BDL is a sum of:
 - take from water courses
 - take from regulated river
 - take by floodplain harvesting
 - take by commercial plantation
 - take from basic rights.

The model provides a component of the take identified in Schedule 3 as the long-term annual average limit on the quantity of water that can be taken from the watercourse and from regulated rivers. The other forms of take are considered in the Water Accounting Methods Report (NRM, 2016).

2. SDL – Sustainable diversion limit of the Water Resource Plan area. The SDL is the long-term average sustainable diversion limit from an SDL resource unit as defined in Schedule 2 and 4 of the Basin Plan. Clause 10.10 of the Basin Plan specifies that the Water Resource Plan must set out the method for determining the maximum quantity of water that the plan permits to be taken for consumptive use during a water accounting period. This method may include the modelling. For the Condamine–Balonne SDL resource unit, Queensland prepared the IQQM Model to meet this requirement. As there are no SDL adjustment measures proposed for the Condamine–Balonne, the difference between BDL and SDL is achieved by Commonwealth water recovery. To simulate SDL in the model, the Commonwealth's water entitlements would have to be treated as inactive (i.e. not used for consumptive take).
3. Annual Actual Take – Determination of annual actual take must be specified. As per clause 10.15 of the Basin Plan, the determination of the quantity of water, actually or estimated, taken for the consumptive use by each form of take from each SDL resource unit will be determined after the end of a water accounting period. The method used to estimate the quantities should be same as used to determine BDL and SDL.
4. Environmental Water – Determination of the environmental water requirements of environmental assets and ecosystem functions. Clause 8.51, sub-section (1) and (2) of the Basin Plan list a number of measures to determine the environmental water requirements of an environmental asset and states that a method to estimate them may include a conceptual model.
5. SDL Adjustment Proposals – Models are an important tool for evaluating the SDL adjustment proposals. Chapter 7 of the Basin Plan states that the Authority can propose adjustments to the surface water SDLs if certain additional changes in infrastructure are proposed through the implementation of 'supply measures' and 'efficiency measures'.

Sections 10.22, 10.49 and 10.50 of the Basin Plan specify requirements that the WRP Package meet:

- a) Section 10.22 states that a water resource plan must describe what was done to comply with the requirements mentioned in Part 4, Chapter 10 of the Basin Plan.
- b) Section 10.49 states that:
 - A water resource plan must be based on the best available information
 - The water resource plan must identify and describe the significant sources of information on which the water resources plan is based.
- c) Section 10.50 states that:

“A water resource plan must identify any significant method, model or tool that has been used to develop the water resource plan.”

This report covers the requirements outlined above.

2 Charleys Creek SOURCE Model

The Charleys Creek Model was developed by using the SOURCE Modelling platform. A detailed background to the data used, methodology, calibration and validation of the model development is documented in Section 6.25 of *Condamine–Balonne River Basin Model, Volume 1 – Calibration of Hydrological Models – to St George (GS422201F) (DSITI, 2017)*. Figure 1 shows the extent of the model.




Figure 1 Model Extent

3 Model Scenarios

In this section, the model scenarios are described. The details of the model scenarios are described in Table 1.

Table 1 Detail of the Model Scenarios

Case Number	Model Name	Description	Simulation Period
1710A	Current Cap IQQM	This IQQM model was developed for MDBA Cap Reporting.	1895–2017
1509P	Current Charleys Ck ROP IQQM	This IQQM model was developed to give a better representation of the allocations along Charleys Creek using flows from the Gen 1 IQQM.	1895–2014
1812D	New Charleys Ck Draft WP SOURCE Model	This SOURCE model was developed to underpin the second generation Water Plan representing all of the Water Allocations and licences in the basin.	1889–2011
1809F	New Charleys Ck Draft WP IQQM	This IQQM model was developed to mimic the SOURCE model to assist identify the cause of differences between the SOURCE and IQQM platforms.	1889–2011

All of the model scenarios cover a period greater than the Basin Plan (1895–2009) so they are able to fulfil the Plan’s requirements. All results in this report are provided for the Basin Plan period.

These scenarios were used to simulate the extractions (BDL) under the Resource Operation Plan for the Charleys Creek System.

The model simulated the flows and extractions by water allocations.

3.1 Current Cap IQQM (Case 1710A)

A current Cap case (case 1710A) was simulated using the current Middle Condamine Cap IQQM. The inflows to the Charleys Creek catchment were estimated by scaling the residual inflow for the catchment between Chinchilla and Cotswold gauges in proportion to the catchment area.

3.1.1 Storage Details and Assumptions

Chinchilla Weir with a capacity of 250 ML was included in the model.

3.1.2 Management System

Charleys Creek is an unsupplemented system with no supplemented management of water.

3.1.3 High Priority Demand

A town water supply demand of 200 ML/annum was extracted from the weir.

3.1.4 Medium Priority Demand

There is no medium priority demand supplied from Charleys Creek.

3.1.5 Unsupplemented Demand

The unsupplemented demands along Charleys Creek were represented by two nodes in the IQQM. The details of the allocations can be found in the spreadsheet called 'Charleys Creek Allocations Case 1710A.xlsx' and are summarised below. The former Area Licences were represented with no infrastructure limit and an annual volumetric limit. The water harvesting allocations were represented with their storage. Storage details were supplied from the notification process carries in the Generation 1 planning process.

Table 2 Resource Operation Plan Case 1710A – Former Area Licences

IQQM Node Number	Nominal Volume (ML)	Volumetric Limits (ML/year)	Max Rate for Taking Water (ML/day)	Flow Conditions	Special Conditions
559	1,454.6	1,522.6	95.2	Nil	Nil

Table 3 Resource Operation Plan Case 1710A – Water Harvesting Allocations

IQQM Node Number	Nominal Volume (ML)	Storage Volume (ML)	Max Rate for Taking Water (ML/day)	Flow Conditions (ML/day)	Special Conditions
576	2,757	2,793	754.6	12 to 345	Nil

3.2 Current Charleys Creek ROP IQQM (Case 1509P)

A more detailed IQQM of Charleys Creek was developed for this case. The network is shown in Figure 2. The inflows at various locations in the model were estimated by scaling the flow sequence estimated at the Charleys Creek gauge by the catchment area upstream of the allocations represented in the model. There was no routing or losses in the model because there was insufficient information to determine appropriate values. Details of the Resource Operation Plan IQQM are presented below.

3.2.1 Storage Details and Assumptions

Chinchilla Weir with a capacity of 250 ML was included in the model.

3.3.5 Unsupplemented Licensed Data

Details of the allocations in the model can be found in the spreadsheets called 'Condamine_Balonne_WMA_Allocations-from RCS - QA.xlsx'. The former Area Licences were represented with no infrastructure limit and an annual volumetric limit. The water harvesting allocations were represented with their storage.

3.4 New Charleys Creek Draft WP IQQM (Case 1809F)

The New Charleys Creek IQQM ROP model is a copy of the New Charleys Creek SOURCE ROP model converted to the IQQM platform. Because the IQQM model used the same flow and model network as the SOURCE model, it could be used to identify the differences caused by the change in the modelling platform.

3.5 Without Development Condition

Because the flow estimated at the Charleys Creek gauge (422343A) as the inflow to the model, the without development flows are simply this flow. As there is no routing or losses in the Charleys Creek model, there was no need to develop a Without Development model. The flows estimated at the Charleys Creek gauge were used as the inflow to the Middle Condamine Without Development models.

4 Reconciliation with Murray–Darling Basin Plan

Schedule 3

The Basin Plan places limits on water extractions within the SDL resource units. The model 304A is proposed to estimate the available water, specifically the take from watercourses for water allocations and licences. This will support the Water Accounting Methods proposed in the Water Accounting Methods Report (NRM, 2016) for the other forms of take and classes of water access right. For the details on these proposed methods, see the report cited above.

The following section provides the comparison of the long-term diversions between the various model scenarios, using the Basin Plan simulation period 1895–2009.

Table 4 provides a comparison between the long-term diversions of the water allocations in the model scenarios while Table 5 presents the mean annual flow at the Charleys Creek gauge (422343A).

Table 4 Long-Term Diversions for the Various Models (1895–2009)

Demand	Current Cap IQQM (1710A) (GL)	Current Charleys Creek ROP IQQM (1509P) (GL)	New Charleys Creek Draft WP SOURCE Model (1812D) (GL)	New Charleys Creek Draft WP IQQM (1809F) (GL)
Town Water Supply	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Unsupplemented Demand	4	4	4	4
Total	4	4	4	4

Table 5 Long-Term Flows at Charleys Creek Gauge 422343A (1895–2009)

Current Cap IQQM (1710A) (GL)	Current Charleys Creek ROP IQQM (1509P) (GL)	New Charleys Creek Draft WP SOURCE Model (1812D) (GL)	New Charleys Creek Draft WP IQQM (1809F) (GL)
52	54	53	53

The more detailed representation of the catchment did not cause a significant increase in the long-term diversions. The new flows derived for the SOURCE model gave slightly lower flows and similar diversions. The new flows were based on more than 10 years of gauged flows at the Charleys Creek gauge, so it is expected that the new flows would give a better estimate of the long-term diversions for the system. A discussion of the reasons for the difference between the results of the models is given in Appendix A. A more general discussion of the differences between the IQQM and SOURCE model platforms can be found in DES (2018).

5 Conclusion

The new model for the Charleys Creek catchment has benefited from additional information that has become available to update the legislative models that support the Queensland Water Resource Planning process and Murray–Darling Basin Plan requirements. The models have benefited from:

- new climatic and streamflow data
- updated methodology
- longer simulation period and better representation of climatic variability.

The Basin Plan has a simulation period from 1895 to 2009 which differs from both the current Resource Operation Plan (2006) and the new Resource Operation Plan (2016), causing some of the variation in the diversion figures between Basin Plan and State Plan. When a consistent period is applied, it is possible to compare take from watercourses by allocations for the two plans, as shown in Table 6. There are no CEWH entitlements in the Charleys Creek catchment.

Table 6 Long-term mean annual diversions from watercourses under water allocations and licences: comparison of model 1710A and 304A

Mean annual diversions (1895–2009)	Current CAP IQQM (1710A)	Draft WP SOURCE Model (1812D)
Total	4.0 GL	3.9 GL
CEWH entitlements only	0.0 GL	0.0 GL

As can be seen in Table 6, the Draft WP SOURCE model (304A) estimates of mean annual diversions are the same as the estimates provided by the Current Cap IQQM (0902A) model. The main difference between the two models is the new streamflow station that provides information on the flows within the catchment that was not available when the first model was developed. There were also some slight differences caused by the different modelling platforms that have been discussed in more detail in Appendix A and DES (2018).

The new model demonstrates Queensland's commitment to improve on the previous model's robustness and defensibility. All future models will build on the new model and use the latest information, methodologies and technology available at the time when the next new model is developed.

6 References

DES 2018, *Differences Between the Source and IQQM Modelling Platforms*. Department of Environment and Science.

Department of Natural Resources and Mines (2016), *Water Accounting Methods Paper for Warrego-Paroo-Nebine Water Resource Plan, State of Queensland, February 2016*.

Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation (2017), *Condamine-Balonne River Basin Model, Volume 1 – Calibration of Hydrological Models – to St George (GS422201F)*.

ROP (2008), *Condamine and Balonne Resource Operations Plan December 2008 Amended July 2017 (Revision 5)*. Department of Natural Resources and Mines, State of Queensland.

WRP (2004), *Water Resource (Condamine and Balonne) Plan 2004*. State of Queensland.

Appendix A – Methodology and Data Differences

Methodology and Data Differences 1995 to 2013

The IQQM developed for the first Water Resource Plan was completed in 1998 with a simulation period from 1922 to 1995. The period of simulation was extended from 1895 to 2006 for the CSIRO Sustainable Yield Study and was then extended to 2009 for the Murray–Darling Basin Plan modelling. The Sacramento models developed in the 1990s were used to extend the period of simulation back to 1895.

In 2013, a new set of models were developed for the Condamine–Balonne using the SOURCE platform. These models used an extended data set, which included new gauging stations, as well as new methods for model calibration. Consequently, the flows in the SOURCE models are different from the flows in the original models.

There are also differences between how the SOURCE and IQQM models perform certain processes, which can give different simulated diversions and flows especially in complex systems.

An attempt was made to isolate the differences between the two modelling platforms by setting up an IQQM mode with the same flows and routing and loss parameters as the SOURCE model. It was found that most of the differences could be attributed to the differences in the flows.

A general discussion of the main points of difference between the two models is given below.

Rainfall and Evaporation

Different rainfall and evaporation data were used. Some of the rainfall stations used in the original model have been closed, so it was necessary to use another near-by station in the SOURCE model. SILO patched point data, which is recorded station rainfall infilled with SILO data drill (grid) data at that location, was used.

In the Sacramento modelling, new techniques were used to select rainfall stations in the calibration. Stations were chosen that gave the best agreement between the modelled and measured streamflow.

In the SOURCE modes, evaporation data from the Warwick site were used for all of the catchment even though it is located in the northern section. This site had the best metrological data for the estimation of the lake and potential evaporation in the catchment. It was best to use this data rather than data extrapolated from this site. The evaporation at Warwick would be fairly similar to evaporation in these catchments and any errors are unlikely to have a large effect on the model.

Flow Data

Recorded flow data used to develop the original IQQM and the SOURCE models have varied in a number of ways:

- Different and additional gauges used.
- Longer records with flows associated with more extreme weather conditions.
- Rating changes. This will change earlier flow records if the rating curves change.
- Data may have been extracted differently. Variations include use of different time offsets and different conversion calculations used to generate flow data from levels.

In the original IQQM, stream gauges on the main stream were mainly used for estimating flows. In the SOURCE model, more tributary gauges and new gauges were used to improve the estimation of the flows.

Sacramento Calibrations

The latest Sacramento models are different to the original ones. They use different catchment areas, rainfall, evaporation and flow data (residuals were developed on numerous different modelling assumptions and for different time periods and, in some cases, flow data were extracted differently).

The main difference was the use of the FORS method to determine both catchment parameters and the rainfall stations. This methodology resulted in better agreement between the modelled and measured flows. The Sacramento models were calibrated over a longer calibration period that included a major drought and record floods, which should improve the ability of the model to predict these events.

Use of Historical Diversions in Flow Calculations

There are very few measured diversions in this catchment. The derived inflows can only be accurately adjusted if daily diversion data are available. As this data were not available, it was considered better to not include them in the estimation of inflows.

Flow Adjustment Explained (using DMM)

Once the full length inflow sequences for the whole model were included, further adjustments were made to the Sacramento parts of them to obtain a better match between the model and the long-term recorded flow data in the catchment. The program DMM was used to make the adjustments.

DMM is an adjustment process applied across multiple reaches. It is used to adjust Sacramento data in multiple reaches upstream of a long-term gauge, to bring the modelled and recorded flows into alignment. Recorded head water inflows and calculated residual inflows are not adjusted.

DMM first calculates the difference between modelled and recorded flows at the downstream gauge being adjusted to. The differences are caused by inaccuracies in Sacramento inflows due to inaccurate spatial and temporal rainfall and evaporation representation, and also by the averaging of lag and routing, and losses. DMM adjusts the Sacramento parts of the inflow sequences to produce sequences which together with the calibrated model's assumptions, will result in better alignment of the modelled and gauge flows at the long-term gauges. It does multiple iterations to converge towards a best set of adjusted inflows and then the user decides which iteration's inflows give the best result overall. The program usually modifies Sacramento data by scaling in proportion to the differences between the modelled and measured flow at a downstream gauge. If there is gauged flow but no modelled flow, the program distributes the measured flow over the upstream sub-catchments using a scaling factor based on the catchment area of the sub-catchments weighted by the mean annual rainfall on the sub-catchment.

DMM can be applied to align the model to multiple long term gauges. In this case the adjustment is done to the next long-term downstream gauge and the adjusted inflow data is then excluded from adjustments to gauges further downstream.

The final residual reach inflows are used in the model validation and model simulation runs.