Design Modelling

Lower Purua, Lower WairuaBridge, Mangahahuru, Mangere, Waipao, Waiotu, Whakapara Catchment (M14)

Northland Regional Council

16 October 2025

Document Status

Version	Doc type	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date issued
01	Draft	Lachlan Inglis	Ben Hughes	25/05/2021
02	Final	Lachlan Inglis	Ben Hughes	16/10/2025

Project Details

Project Name	Lower Purua, Lower WairuaBridge, Mangahahuru, Mangere, Waipao, Waiotu, Whakapara Catchment (M14)
Client	Northland Regional Council
Client Project Manager	Sher Khan & Matt De Boer
Water Technology Project Manager	Bertrand Salmi
Water Technology Project Director	Ben Hughes
Authors	Alvin Mingjun Li, Lachlan Inglis
Document Number	M14_20010434_R02V02_Validation_Report

Cover Photo: Helen Beech (https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/350285/flooding-in-northland-forces-school-and-road-closures)

6 Churchill Place
Cambridge New Zealand 3434
Telephone +64 27 777 0989
NZBN 94290481 881 80

CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

Overview

Water Technology was commissioned by Northland Regional Council (NRC) to undertake a region-wide flood modelling study. The study area encompassed the entire Northland Regional Council area which covers an area of over 12,500 km^2, with the exclusion offshore islands. The aim of this project was to map riverine flood hazard zones across the entire Northland region and update existing flood intelligence.

Modelling approach

This project used a 2D Direct Rainfall (also known as Rain on Grid) approach for hydraulic modelling and has provided flood extents for a defined range of design storms. The hydraulic modelling software TUFLOW was used. TUFLOW is a widely used software package suitable for the analysis of flooding. TUFLOW routes overland flow across a topographic surface (2D domain) to create flood extent, depth, velocity and flood hazard outputs that can be used for planning, intelligence and emergency response. The latest release of TUFLOW offers several recent advanced modelling techniques to improve modelling accuracy which where practical, were tested and adopted in this project.

This study delineated and modelled 19 catchments, shown in Figure 1-1. To validate the adopted methodology and model parameters used in the design modelling, 9 catchments were calibrated against recent (and historic) flood events. The calibration/validation methodology is documented in a standalone report *NRC Riverine Flood Mapping - Calibration Report – R01* and is referred to throughout this document as the *Calibration Report*.

This report documents the design modelling methodology for Lower Purua, Lower WairuaBridge, Mangahahuru, Mangere, Waipao, Waiotu, Whakapara Catchment (M14), noting that this catchment was calibrated to the January 2011 flood event.



FIGURE 1-1 MODEL DELINEATION

2 STUDY AREA

The Model 14 catchment is an inland catchment, covering a total area of approximately 707 km^2. It consists of a number of smaller catchments including the Waiotu, Waiariki, Whakapara, Lower Purua, Mangahahuru, Lower Wairua Bridge, Mangere and Waipao catchments. Each smaller catchment outfalls to the Wairoa River with the overall catchment draining south-west. Figure 2-1 displays the study area of the catchment Model 14.



FIGURE 2-1 STUDY AREA

3 DESIGN MODELLING

3.1 Overview

A hydraulic model (TUFLOW) of the Lower Purua, Lower WairuaBridge, Mangahahuru, Mangere, Waipao, Waiotu, Whakapara catchment (M14) was constructed to model overland flooding. A range of storm durations were run and results for each Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) event were enveloped to ensure the critical duration was well represented across each part of the study area. The merged results captured the maximum flood level and depth of the range of design event durations modelled.

Table 3-1 and the following sections detail the key modelling information used in the development of the hydraulic model.

TABLE 3-1 KEY MODELLING INFORMATION

Terrain data	NRC 1m LiDAR without filling of sinks but includes the "burning of creek alignments' through embankments
Model type	Direct rainfall model
Model build	Build: 2020-10-AA-iSP-w64
Rainfall	See Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.4
Losses	See Section 3.2.3
Boundaries	See Section 3.2.4
Modelling solution scheme	TUFLOW HPC (adaptive timestep)
Modelling hardware	GPU
Modelling technique	Sub-grid-sampling (SGS)
Model grid size	10m with 1m SGS

3.2 Model Parameters

A range of model parameters were adopted based on the calibration of the January 2011 event for catchment M14. Details of these are outlined below.

3.2.1 Rainfall Intensity-Duration-Frequency

Intensity-Duration-Frequency (IDF) tables were developed by NIWA through the High Intensity Rainfall Design System (HIRDSV4)[1]. Design rainfall totals for durations from 10 minute up to 120 hours were developed for design modelling and weredeveloped at 179 rainfall gauge sites across the wider study area. The IDF tables cover a range of magnitude events from 1 in 1.58 ARI through to 1 in 250 ARI along with climate change predictions (Representative Concentration Pathway 4.6, 6 & 8.5) up to the year 2100. For this catchment, ten rainfall gauges were used with a spatially weighted grid of rainfall totals created for design modelling. Figure 3-1 shows the 12-hour cumulative rainfall grid for the 1% AEP event along with the rainfall gauge locations used to create the grid.

[1] Accessed via https://hirds.niwa.co.nz/



FIGURE 3-1 EXAMPLE OF DESIGN RAINFALL GRID (12-HOUR, 1% AEP RAINFALL) FOR M14

3.2.2 Design Rainfall Temporal Patterns

Design temporal patterns (rainfall hyetographs) were provided by NRC for design modelling. These were developed by HIRDS and subsequently reviewed as part of a project undertaken by Macky & Shamseldin (2020)[2]. The project aimed to provide multiple design hyetographs and a better representation of rainfall variability across the Northland region, replacing the single set of design hyetographs previously developed.

The HIRDS design temporal pattern is recommended for design modelling of Northland catchments[2]. Hence, the design hyetographs for the rainfall gauges were developed using the rainfall IDF data at available rainfall gauges for the catchment. Although a 12-hour hyetograph is suitable for design modelling for most Northland catchments as suggested[2], a range of durations were selected; including 1-hour, 6-hour, 12-hour and 24-hour for each of the following AEPs:10%, 2% and 1% AEP to ensure that the event critical duration was identified across the catchment. The shorter durations were critical in the upper parts of the catchment, while the longer 24-hour durations were critical in the lower catchment, where flood volumes are generally the critical factor in generating peak flood levels.

Table 3-2 summarises the 1% AEP rainfall depth (based on IDF from HIRDSV4) for different event durations at each rainfall gauge and Figure 3-2 shows the design cumulative rainfall across the different gauges for the 12-hour duration event. Considering a single temporal pattern is assigned (i.e. HIRDS hyetograph), the proportional amount of rainfall applied through time for a given duration (e.g., 6-hour) is generally consistent (as shown in Figure 3-2) across the catchment area.

[2] Macky & Shamseldin (2020) - Northland Region-wide Hyetograph review

TABLE 3-2 1% AEP DESIGN RAINFALL DEPTH

Gauge location	1% AEP (mm)			
	1-hour	6-hour	12-hour	24-hour
Hatea at Glenbervie Forest_546301	72	185	253	329
Hikurangi_A54622	71	167	223	293
Kokopu at Kokopu_Block_Rd_547212	66	138	178	224
Ngunguru at Dugmores Rock_546416	76	199	268	341
Okarika at Rowland Road_546216	65	136	172	211
Ruatangata_A54613	65	147	194	250
Ruatanga No2_A54623	66	138	178	224
Towai_A54411	71	153	197	247
Waipao at Draffin Rd_547119	62	125	157	194
Whakapara at Puhi Puhi_545201	82	218	295	382



FIGURE 3-2 TEMPORAL PATTERN FOR DESIGN RAINFALL OF 12-HOUR, 1% AEP EVENT

A climate change scenario (for the 1% AEP events) was modelled for the 2081-2100 timeframe, for the RCP 8.5. This is based on the increases in rainfall intensity of 35%, 30%, 26% and 22% respectively for 1-hour, 6-hour, 12-hour and 24-hour duration events.

3.2.3 Losses

Each model cell was assigned a Manning's "*n*" (surface roughness), initial loss and a continuing loss based on land use types and importantly hydrological characteristics. Table 3-3 summarises the adopted roughness and loss parameters. It should be noted these parameters were calibrated to a historic event where streamflow gauges were present within the catchment. Figure 3-3 displays the roughness layer based on the land use type, showing most land use is forest and grassland.

TABLE 3-3 DESIGN MODEL PARAMETERS

Hydrological areas	Land use types	Manning's n	Initial loss (IL) - mm	Continuing loss (CL) – mm/hr
Upstream catchment of Purua	Forest	0.10	25	2.5
	Grassland	0.08	25	2.5
Upstream catchment of Cableway	Forest	0.10	40	4.5
	Grassland	0.08	40	4.5
Other catchment areas	Forest	0.10	55	6.5
	Grassland	0.08	55	6.5
Entire M14 catchment areas	Cropland – perennial	0.04	20	2
	Cropland – annual	0.04	20	2
	Wetland – open water	0.04	0	0
	Wetland – vegetated	0.05	10	1
	Urban areas	0.10	5	1.5
	Waterways	0.06	0	0
	Other	0.06	15	1.5



FIGURE 3-3 HYDRAULIC MODEL MATERIAL LAYER

3.2.4 Boundaries

As the catchment M14 is an inland catchment, a stage and discharge (i.e. HQ) outflow boundary was applied to the downstream of Wairua Bridge gauge at the south of the catchment for both the design and calibration modelling.

There is no upstream inflow coming from upstream catchments applied in this catchment model.

4 MODELLING RESULTS

4.1 Modelled Result Processing/Filtering

Design modelling consisted of running the model for four storm durations (1-hour, 6-hour, 12-hour and 24-hour) with the results enveloped for each design event (i.e. 1%, 2% and 10% AEP) to ensure the critical duration was well represented across each part of the catchment. Each model run produced gridded results, including depth, water surface elevation (WSE), flood hazard (Z0) and velocity. Several post-processing steps were required to produce the final design modelling outputs. These are described as follows:

Step 1:

- The modelling results are firstly merged to produce a single data set for each AEP from the storm durations modelled. For example, the flood depth output is produced by merging the depth results of the four different durations within each AEP. This allows for the critical storm duration across each part of the catchment to be represented (i.e. the short intense storms in upper reaches and longer duration storms in the lower parts of the catchment).

Step 2:

- The maximum gridded results are then remapped to a finer DEM grid using LiDAR data resampled to a 5-m grid resolution. This allows the flood extent to be more accurately displayed on the map and the higher resolution gridded results (i.e. same resolution as the 5-m DEM) to be produced.

Step 3:

- Finally, the remapped results are post-processed by filtering out depths below 100mm and puddle areas less than 2000m^2 as agreed with NRC.

Figure 4-1, Figure 4-2 and Figure 4-3 respectively show the final post-processed flood depths, velocity and hazard of the 1% AEP design event modelled for M14. Figure 4-4 shows the flood depth map zoomed in at Hikurangi as an example. It is noted that the hazard classification is based on the following criteria:

TABLE 4-1 FLOOD HAZARD CLASSIFICATION

Hazard classification	Hazard – VxD (m^2/s)
Low	< 0.2
Low to Moderate	0.2 to 0.4
Moderate	0.4 to 0.6
Moderate to High	0.6 to 0.84
High	> 0.84



FIGURE 4-1 DESIGN MODELLING OF 1% FLOOD DEPTH



FIGURE 4-2 DESIGN MODELLING OF 1% AEP FLOOD VELOCITY



FIGURE 4-3 DESIGN MODELLING OF 1% AEP FLOOD HAZARD



FIGURE 4-4 DESIGN MODELLING OF 1% AEP FLOOD DEPTH ZOOMED AT HIKURANGI

5 VERIFICATION OF DESIGN FLOWS

Flow lines were included at gauge locations in the hydraulic model as 2D Plot Output (2D PO) for calibration and design events. This allows flow hydrographs and peak flows to be extracted at these locations. Figure 5-1 displays the location of streamflow gauges in the Lower Purua, Lower WairuaBridge, Mangahahuru, Mangere, Waipao, Waiotu, Whakapara catchment.



FIGURE 5-1 AVAILABLE STREAMFLOW GAUGES WITHIN LOWER PURUA, LOWER WAIRUABRIDGE, MANGAHAHURU, MANGERE, WAIPAO, WAIOTU, WHAKAPARA CATCHMENT

The modelled peak flow for the 1% AEP design flood was compared with hydrological estimates, including FFA, the Rational Method and the SCS Method, as well as observations from 2011 and historic maxima from streamflow gauge records.

5.1 Flood Frequency Analysis

A Flood Frequency Analysis (FFA) was undertaken for streamflow gauging stations with at least 25 years of record. The length of record for can affect the reliability of the FFA especially for the estimation of major flood events (e.g. 1% AEP). The design flow estimates provided additional verification against the design hydraulic modelling results. The streamflow gauging stations that were selected for FFA and the corresponding 1% AEP flow estimates can be found in the Calibration Report (R01).

The annual series (maximum streamflow values for each year of gauge record) were calculated and input into FLIKE. FLIKE is a software package used for FFA and provides five different probability distributions for fitting the historical records. Log Pearson III distribution is commonly used across New Zealand and south east

Australia to fit streamflow records and was used for all gauges within the study area. The FFA results showed that the probability distribution had a relatively good fit at all stations.

An example flood frequency curve fitting the annual maximum streamflow values with the Log Pearson III distribution is shown in Figure 5-2. The design curve generated by the probability distribution shows a good fit with the historic records in more frequent events (i.e. 1 in 10 year or more frequent) but may slightly overestimate the design flows for rare events (e.g. 1% AEP flow). The flattening of the historic points may also suggest limitations with the current rating curves. Overall, the design curve shows a good fit with the tight confidence intervals indicating low uncertainty within these estimates.



FIGURE 5-2 EXAMPLE OF FLOOD FREQUENCY CURVE OF LOG PEARSON III DISTRIBUTION FIT

5.2 Regional Estimation Methods

For catchments where a suitable streamflow gauge record was not available, additional estimation methods were used to provide design flow verification. These methods are based on empirical estimations using catchment area and design rainfall totals to estimate peak design flows. These methods were checked for each streamflow gauge location within the study area and are described below.

5.2.1 NIWA New Zealand River Flood Statistics Portal

The New Zealand River Flood Statistics portal[3] provides peak flood estimation at streamflow gauging stations and the entire river system in New Zealand completed in 2018. The design estimates can be extracted from the portal are:

- Flood Frequency estimates (at flow gauge).
- Flood Frequency estimates, noted as Henderson & Collins 2018 (at river reach).

[3] NIWA Flood Frequency tool, accessed via: https://niwa.co.nz/natural-hazards/hazards/floods

- Rational Method HIRDS V3 (at river reach).

The flood frequency estimates given by the portal are determined using the Mean Annual Flow method developed by Henderson & Collins (2018)[4].

5.2.2 SCS method

The Soil Conservation Service (SCS) method, first developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service, calculates peak flood flow based on rainfall and land-cover-related parameters. It is the recommended method for stormwater design in the Auckland region, providing a useful comparison. The peak flow equation is:

$Q = (P – Ia)^2 / (P – Ia + S)$

where:

- Q is run-off depth (millimetres)..
- P is rainfall depth (millimetres)
- S is the potential maximum retention after run-off begins (millimetres).
- Ia is initial abstraction (millimetres), which is 5 millimetres for permeable areas and zero otherwise.

The retention parameter S (measured in millimetres) is related to catchment characteristics through:

S = (1000/CN – 10) 25.4.

The value of the curve number (CN) represents the run-off from 0 (no run-off) to 100 (full run-off) and it is influenced by soil group and land use. A CN value of 50 was used for the SCS estimation of this catchment.

The run-off depth (Q) is then converted to a peak flow rate using the SCS unit hydrograph.

5.2.3 Rational Method

The Rational Method is widely used across both New Zealand and Australia. The equation is based on catchment area and design rainfall. The equation is:

Q = C i A /3.6

where:

- Q is the estimate of the peak design discharge in cubic metres per second
- C is the run-off coefficient
- i is rainfall intensity in mm/hr hour, for the time of concentration
- A is the catchment area in km^2.

[4]Henderson, R.D., Collins, D.B.G., Doyle, M., Watson, J. (2018) *Regional Flood Estimation Tool for New Zealand Final Report Part 2*. NIWA Client Report

5.3 Verification Results

Table 5-1 summarises the comparison of 1% AEP peak flow estimates with the modelled values at seven streamflow gauging stations in catchment M14 and the differences between the estimation methods and modelled results can be visualised in Figure 5-3.

The Rational Method and the SCS Method are only applicable for relatively small catchments, with the SCS method limited to 12 km².The catchment sizes for these gauges range from 20 to 700 km^2. These equations are also subject to great uncertainty in summarising catchment characteristics.

As shown in Figure 5-3, the modelled design flows at most of these gauges tend to sit at a reasonable range of the design flow estimates with the exception to the County Weir gauge and Purua gauge. Modelled peak flows at these two gauges are noticeably smaller than the design flow estimates. In contrast, the modelled flow at Knight Rd gauge tends to be greater than those estimates. However, it was found that the gauge ratings at the County Weir gauge and Knight Rd gauge are subject to uncertainty in high flows as detailed in the calibration report.

The use of empirical method estimations provides an additional degree of verification for streamflow gauges. It is also noted that the calibration process identified uncertainty with the streamflow records for high flows. The uncertainty of high flow extrapolation at these gauges could result in further uncertainty of flow estimate methods that rely solely on streamflow gauge data.

TABLE 5-1 SUMMARY OF 1% AEP PEAK FLOW COMPARISON

Gauge location	Hydraulic model (m^3/s)		Records at gauge (m^3/s)		Empirical estimates (m^3/s)			NIWA Flood Frequency Tool 2018 (m^3/s)		
	Critical duration	Modelled peak	Jan 2011 peak	Highest on record	FFA	SCS	Rational method	NIWA – FF at gauge	NIWA – Rational method	NIWA – H&C 2018
Waiotu at SH1 bridge	24 hr	445.1	217.9	237.6	261.62	366.1	165.6	270	N/A	303
Whakapara at Cableway	24 hr	266.0	365.9	428.4	594.6	480.3	217.3	N/A	N/A	422
Mangahahuru at County Weir	1 hr	17.8	33.8	33.8	37.22	89.3	124.3	N/A	201.69	123
Wairua at Purua	24 hr	77.2	244.8	312.9	1585.1	850.0	471.5	N/A	N/A	1015
Mangere at Knight Rd	12 hr	335.3	116.4	116.4	126.5	117.3	86.2	149	N/A	167
Waipao at Draffins Rd	6 hr	84.9	28.3	28.3	30.7	73.4	63.6	32	N/A	96
Wairua at Wairua* Bridge	24 hr	326.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	743.3	476.6	N/A	N/A	1271

*This gauge has no record available



FIGURE 5-3 VERIFICATION OF DESIGN MODELLING RESULTS AGAINST HYDROLOGICAL ESTIMATES

6 SUMMARY

The Lower Purua, Lower WairuaBridge, Mangahahuru, Mangere, Waipao, Waiotu, Whakapara catchment model (M14) was calibrated to the January 2011 flood event. The design modelling of this catchment consisted of four storm durations (1-hour, 6-hour, 12-hour and 24-hour) for each design AEP (i.e. 1%, 2% and 10% AEP). Design flood extents and gridded results, including depth, water surface elevation, velocity and hazard were produced and delivered to NRC.

The modelled 1% AEP design flows were verified against several design flood estimation methods at seven streamflow gauging stations. The comparison of design flows provides a general validation check of the modelled results given the accuracy of these estimation methods can be constrained by the reliability of gauged flow records (where used) and general limitations with empirical design estimates. Overall, the modelled design flow at most of the gauges assessed within the study area provided a reasonable fit to design flow estimates.

When considering the scope and the scale of this project, the current modelling results are considered fit for use. Modelling outputs can be used to identify flood hazard and potential flood risk. It can also inform planning decisions, infill flood mapping between detailed flood studies and provide a basis for broad emergency management exercises.