

Who Would Likely Have Been Internally Reviewing or Managing This Data?

	Likely Role in Flood Study	What They Would Likely Review or Manage	Evidence / Indicators From Peer Review
Floodplain Management Team	Primary technical managers of the study	Oversight of hydrologic and hydraulic modelling, calibration review, flood mapping outputs, consultant coordination	The reports repeatedly discuss calibration acceptance, model assumptions, flood behaviour and ARR2019 compliance.
Water Engineering / Drainage Engineers	Technical review of stormwater and river modelling	Rainfall inputs, culverts, blockage assumptions, bridge structures, overland flow paths, hydraulic performance	Repeated references to culvert blockages, SX polygons, structure inverts and floodplain hydraulics.
Hydrologists / Flood Modellers	Internal technical assessment and consultant liaison	XP-RAFTS calibration, temporal rainfall patterns, gauge allocations, model calibration validity	WT repeatedly questioned rainfall allocation methodology, Theissen polygons and calibration consistency.
GIS and Spatial Mapping Team	Spatial data integration and flood overlay production	LiDAR integration, DEM preparation, flood extents, mapping layers, property overlays	Extensive references to DEM holes, LiDAR datasets, bathymetry surfaces and flood mapping outputs.
Strategic Planning / Land Use Planning	Assessment of planning impacts	Flood overlays, development controls, minimum floor levels, planning scheme implications	WT highlighted implications for development control and flood planning levels.
Development Assessment (DA) Teams	Application of flood mapping to approvals	Reviewing how revised flood levels affect development applications and existing approvals	Peer review raised concern about considerable increases in flood levels compared with prior studies.
Infrastructure Planning Team	Asset and infrastructure risk assessment	Roads, bridges, levees, drainage infrastructure and future infrastructure planning	WT discussed levee representation, bridge modelling and floodplain structures.
Disaster Management / Resilience Teams	Emergency and flood risk implications	Evacuation risk, flood intelligence, flood behaviour during major events	Calibration relied heavily on historical flood events including 1974, 1990, 2013 and 2017.
Executive Leadership Team (CEO, Directors)	Governance oversight and risk management	Whether the study could proceed toward adoption despite unresolved peer review concerns	WT stated the project was “not complete” and unresolved matters remained before adoption.
Legal / Governance Teams	Risk and liability assessment	Exposure relating to planning decisions, mapping adoption and public consultation	Significant increases in flood levels could materially affect property rights and development decisions.
Procurement / Contract Management	Consultant and scope management	Variations, deliverables, consultant responses and peer review close-outs	WRM stated additional rainfall gauge inclusion may constitute a project variation.

Environmental / Catchment Management Teams	Broader catchment understanding	Land use change, vegetation impacts, floodplain roughness and catchment conditions	WT repeatedly questioned land use assumptions and Manning's roughness allocations.
Survey / Spatial Data Officers	Data acquisition and terrain validation	Bathymetry surveys, cross sections, LiDAR validation and terrain corrections	WT requested raw bathymetry data, DEMs and survey cross sections.
Internal Review Panels / Technical Working Groups	Cross-disciplinary technical review	Reviewing whether peer review comments had been adequately resolved	The structure of the documents suggests iterative review loops between WT, WRM and Council officers.
Councillor Briefing / Portfolio Committees	Political oversight and policy implications	Impacts on residents, planning policy, flood overlays and community response	Because WT identified significant increases in flood levels and unresolved issues, councillors were likely briefed before adoption discussions.