



# Legislative Council Environment and Planning Committee

**Hearing Date:** 21 November 2023

**Question[s] taken on notice**

**Directed to:** Bureau of Meteorology

**Received Date:** 23 May 2024

### 3. David ETTERS HANK, page 58-9

**Question Asked to Chantal DONNELLY/Peter STONE:**

We have got one of those alternate reality, parallel truth-type things happening. I am going to ask you to come back to us, so take this on notice. Justice Pagone did an inquiry for Melbourne Water on the floods, and at paragraph 73 he starts a history of this. What he basically concludes from this chronology is that on the morning of the 13th you had issued a major flood warning for the Maribyrnong. At 3:24 in the afternoon you downgraded that...

“ But clearly there is this disconnect, and we are interested to make sure this does not happen again, okay? I will just finish this, and then by all means – I am conscious of time as well. And then at 2:25 am, again, based on updated data, it went back to a major flood. But of course by 2:25 am most people are well and truly tucked into bed. And then the next thing they know of course is it is at the door. So we would be very interested to have the bureau’s response to this analysis provided to us in writing.

The second one is that the report also makes a very specific criticism of the bureau when it talks about, in paragraph 124, the need for more timely forecast data from the bureau, okay? We would really like your response to that chronology at 73 to 74. We would really like your response to paragraph 124 – the need for more timely updates.

Chantal DONNELLY: What was the first paragraph?

David ETTERS HANK: You will get all this in writing. Then we would also like any other response that you would care to make to the Pagone report in writing by 4 December, if you could, before we have our next lot of witnesses come in, if that is all right. I do not know if there is anything in particular you wanted to –

Peter STONE: Yes, just a couple of things. Look, we are unlikely to provide detailed commentary on paragraphs 73 and 74, was it?

David ETTERSANK: Seventy-two and 73, yes.

Peter STONE: Seventy-two and 73. I mean, they are just statements of fact, and they are actually questions for Melbourne Water. We publish – so we do not issue, we publish; there is a difference – the information that they decide to provide as a warning, so we really do not have anything to comment on on those paragraphs.

**Response 14 December 2023:**

The question asked does not relate to the parts of the document cited. The Bureau is unable to respond to this question.

**Amended response after clarification 23 May 2024:**

*At the time of the 2022 flood event, the Bureau of Meteorology was responsible for publishing (making public) flood observations and warnings issued (created) by Melbourne Water. Table 2 (Pages 73–75 of the Maribyrnong River Flood Event Independent Review) does not make this clear because it is incomplete.*

*It does not show that publication of revised flood advice by the Bureau of Meteorology was in every instance preceded by receipt of revised flood advice from Melbourne Water. Additionally, points 118 and 119 (Page 75 of the Maribyrnong River Flood Event Independent Review) use the term "issued" for both creation and publication of flood advice - these are 2 separate functions performed by 2 different accountable authorities.*