$Appendix\ F$

PRIORITISATION RESULTS - SUMMARY

Settlement						FWN a	sses		Rating						
Name	Target flood			n gau					tream				FWN score	Flood hazard	Priority
	warning time			atial	Reli	ability		Spatial distribution				ability		score	
	time		aistr	ibutio		Г		di	Stribui	ion		<u> </u>	(1=poor,	(1=low,	
			,							es			5=excellent)	5=high)	
			Catchment density		ity	ons			ea	Presence of gauges	ity	ons	,	3 /	
		ce	nt de		ivers	icati	ce	(D)	d ar	ot (ivers	icati			
		Importance	hme	imity	ge d	mur	ortan	erag	ange	ence	ge d	mur			
		lmpc	Catc	Proximity	Gauge diversity	Communications	Importance	Coverage	Ungauged area	Pres	Gauge diversity	Communications			
ABERCORN	9	80%					20%						3	4	High
ABERGOWRIE	9	80%					20%						4	2	Very low
ADAVALE	6	100%					0%						4	4	Low
ALPHA	9	80%					20%						2	4	Very high
ALTON	9	80%					20%						2	2	High
AMBERLEY	9	80%					20%						5	3	Very low
AMBY	6	100%					0%						1	4	Very high
ARAMAC	6	100%					0%						1	3	Very high
AUGATHELLA	9	80%					20%						2	4	Very high
AURUKUN	9	80%					20%						2	3	High
AVONDALE	9	80%					20%						4	2	Very low
AYR	6	100%					0%						5	4	Very low
BAFFLE CREEK	6	100%					0%						4	3	Low
BARALABA	9	50%					50%						3	4	High
BARCALDINE	6	100%					0%						4	3	Low
BARRON RIVER DELTA	6	100%					0%						4	2	Very low
BEAUDESERT	6	100%					0%						4	3	Low
BEDOURIE	9	20%					80%						3	3	Moderate
BEENLEIGH	12	80%					20%						5	4	Very low
BELYANDO CROSSING	9	50%					50%						3	1	Low
BEMERSIDE	9	50%					50%						4	2	Very low
BENARABY	9	80%					20%						3	3	Moderate
BIBOOHRA	6	100%					0%						5	3	Very low
BILOELA	6	100%					0%						2	4	Very high
BILWON	6	100%					0%						5	2	Very low
BIRDSVILLE	9	20%					80%						2	3	High
BIVOUAC JUNCTION	9	50%					50%						2	1	Moderate
BLACKALL	9	80%					20%						3	4	High
BOLLON	9	80%					20%						2	4	Very high
BON ACCORD	9	50%					50%						4	1	Very low
BOOLBURRA	9	20%					80%						4	2	Very low
BOONAH	6	100%					0%						5	4	Very low
BOREEN POINT	6	100%					0%						4	4	Low
BOULIA	9	50%					50%					0	2	3	High
BOWEN	6	100%					0%						5	4	Very low
BOYNE ISLAND	9	80%					20%						3	3	Moderate
BRISBANE	24	50%			0		50%			0			4	4	Low
BUNDABERG	24	20%					80%						5	5	Very low
BUNGADOO	9	50%					50%						4	2	Very low
BUNGUNYA	9	50%		0			50%					0	4	2	Very low
BURKETOWN	9	80%					20%						2	4	Very high
BURNETT HEADS	12	20%					80%				0	0	4	3	Low
CALLIDE	6	100%		0	0		0%				0		3	3	Moderate
CAMOOWEAL	9	80%					20%						1	4	Very high
CARAVONICA/LAKE PLACID	6	100%		0			0%				0		4	3	Low
CARDOWAN	6	100%					0%						2	2	High
CECIL PLAINS	9	50%					50%						4	3	Low
CERATODUS	9	80%					20%						3	1	Low

Settlement					FWN a	asses	smen	Rating							
Name	Target flood		Rai	n gau	ges			St	ream	gaug	jes		FWN score	Flood hazard	Priority
	warning time			atial	Reliability			Spatial distribution			Relia	ability		score	
	time		distr	ibutio		T		di	stribut	ion			(1 poor	(1 low	
			_							es			(1=poor, 5=excellent)	(1=low, 5=high)	
			isus		ity	suc			ea	Jang	ity	suc	o oncomonly	5 mgm,	
		ce	nt de		vers	icati	ce	a	d are	of g	vers	icati			
		ırtan	hme	mity	ye di	mun	rtan	rage	agnı	ence	je di	mun			
		Importance	Catchment density	Proximity	Gauge diversity	Communications	Importance	Coverage	Ungauged area	Presence of gauges	Gauge diversity	Communications			
CHARLEVILLE	12	50%					50%						3	4	High
CHERBOURG	9	80%					20%						4	4	Low
CHINCHILLA	24	50%					50%						4	4	Low
CLARE	9	20%					80%						4	4	Low
CLERMONT	6	100%					0%						4	3	Low
CLONCURRY	12	80%					20%						2	4	Very high
CONDAMINE	9	20%					80%						4	3	Low
COOLADDI	6	100%					0%						1	2	High
COOMINYA	9	50%					50%						5	3	Very low
COORAN	6	100%					0%						5	4	Very low
CORDELIA	9	50%					50%						4	4	Low
CUNNAMULLA	9	20%					80%						4	4	Low
DAINTREE	6	100%					0%						1	3	Very high
DALBY	24	50%					50%						4	5	Moderate
DARADGEE	6	100%					0%						4	2	Very low
DIRRANBANDI	9	20%					80%						4	4	Low
DOOMADGEE	9	50%					50%						1	4	Very high
EAGLEBY	12	80%					20%						5	4	Very low
EIDSVOLD	6	100%					0%						5	3	Very low
EINASLEIGH	9	80%					20%						2	3	High
ELECTRA (PINE CREEK)	9	50%					50%						4	2	Very low
EMERALD	24	50%					50%						3	5	High
EROMANGA	6	100%					0%						1	4	Very high
EULO	9	50%	0				50%		0				2	4	Very high
EURAMO	6	100%	_				0%					0	4	4	Low
FERNVALE	12	80%		0	<u> </u>		20%		0		0		4	4	Low
FLINTON	9	80%	_				20%		0		0	0	2	3	High
FLYING FISH POINT	9	80%			<u> </u>		20%	<u> </u>			0		4	2	Very low
FOREST HILL	6	100%					0%				0		5	3	Very low
FRESHWATER CREEK	6	100%					0%				0		4	2	Very low
GATTON	9	80%					20%				0		4	4	Low
GAYNDAH	9	80%					20%						3	4	High
GEORGETOWN	6	100%					0%						3	4	High
GIRU	9	80%					20%						4	4	Low
GLAMORGAN VALE GOONDIWINDI	9	80%					20%						4	2	Very low
	24	50%					50%						4	4	Low
GOOVIGEN	6	100%	_				0%						2	3	High
GORDONVALE	6	100%					0%						5 4	3	Very low
GRANTHAM	6	100%					0%								Low
GREENVALE	6 9	100%					0%						2	3	Moderate Moderate
GREGORY DOWNS GYMPIE	6	50%					50%						3 4	5	Moderate Moderate
	9	100%					0%								
HALIFAX HARLIN	9	50%	_				50%						4	2	Low Very low
HARRISVILLE	6	80%	_				20%						4	3	Low
HEBEL	9	100%					0%						4	4	Low
HOLLOWAYS BEACH	6	20% 100%	_				80%						4	3	Low
	12						0%						4	4	Low
HOME HILL	12	20%					80%						4	4	LUW

Settlement						FWN a	asses	smer	nt						
Name Target floo														Rating Flood hazard	Priority
	warning time	Spatial		Reli	ability		Spatial		Reliability		FWN score	score			
	ume		distr	ibutio				di	stribut	ion			/4	(4.1	
			_							SS			(1=poor, 5=excellent)	(1=low, 5=high)	
			nsit		ty	Suc			g	and	ty.	Suc	3-cacilenty	3-mgm	
		e ce	nt de		versi	icatio	Se	۵.	d are	of g	versi	icatio			
		rtano	ıme	mity	le di	nuni	rtano	rage	nge	eoue	le di	nuni			
		Importance	Catchment density	Proximity	Gauge diversity	Communications	Importance	Coverage	Ungauged area	Presence of gauges	Gauge diversity	Communications			
HOWARD	6	100%					0%						5	4	Very low
HUGHENDEN	9	80%					20%						3	4	High
HUNGERFORD	9	50%					50%						3	3	Moderate
IDERAWAY	9	80%					20%						3	3	Moderate
IMBIL	6	100%					0%						5	4	Very low
INGHAM	24	50%					50%						4	4	Low
INGLEWOOD	9	80%					20%						4	4	Low
INNISFAIL	6	100%					0%						4	4	Low
IPSWICH	12	80%					20%						4	4	Low
ISISFORD	9	50%					50%						3	3	Moderate
JAMBIN	9	80%					20%						4	3	Low
JERICHO	6	100%					0%						2	4	Very high
JONDARYAN	6	100%					0%						5	3	Very low
JULIA CREEK	6	100%					0%						2	2	High
JUNDAH	9	20%					80%						3	3	Moderate
KAGARU	9	80%					20%						4	1	Very low
KAJABBI	9	80%					20%						2	1	Moderate
KAMERUNGA	6	100%					0%						4	3	Low
KANDANGA	6	100%					0%						4	3	Low
KARUMBA	9	20%					80%						4	3	Low
KAWANA	6	100%					0%						5	4	Very low
KENILWORTH	6	100%					0%						5	3	Very low
KIDSTON	6	100%					0%						3	1	Low
KOAH	6	100%					0%						4	2	Very low
KOWANYAMA	6	100%					0%						2	2	High
KOWROWA	6	100%											4		Very low
KURANDA	6	100%	_				0%						5	2	Very low
KYNUNA	9	80%											1	2	High
LAURA	6	100%	_				20%						2	1	Moderate
LINVILLE	6	100%					0%						4	3	Low
LOGAN CENTRAL	6	100%					0%						5	4	Very low
LONGREACH	6	100%					0%						2	2	High
LOWOOD	12	80%	_				20%						4	4	Low
MACALISTER	9	80%	_				20%						4	2	Very low
MACKAY	9	80%					20%						4	5	Moderate
MACKAY NORTH	9	80%	_				20%						4	3	Low
MACKNADE	9	50%					50%						4	4	Low
	9												3	2	Moderate
MALMOE MAREEBA	6	80% 100%	_				20%						5	4	Very low
MARYBOROUGH	12	80%					20%						3	5	High
MCKINLAY	6						20%						4	3	Low
MIARA	9	100%											4	1	Very low
		80%					20%								,
MILES	6	100%					0%						3 5	3	Moderate
MILLMERRAN	9	80%	_				20%							3	Very low
MIRANI	6	100%					0%						4	4	Low
MITCHELL	9	80%					20%						2	4	Very high
MIVA	9	80%					20%						3	2	Moderate
MOGGILL	12	50%					50%						4	3	Low

tlement	Rating FWN score Flood hazard Priority			
me	ood hazard Priority			
	score			
	/1 low			
	(1=low, 5=high)			
	5g,			
NDURE	2 Very low			
ORE	3 Low			
ORE PARK	3 Low			
RANBAH	Wery high			
URA	3 Moderate			
URILYAN	3 Low			
LGILDIE	2 Very low			
NDUBBERA	4 High			
NGINDI	3 Low			
RGON	3 Moderate			
TTABURRA	3 High			
OLA	2 Very low			
NANGO	3 Low			
RANG	3 Very low			
IDIGULLY	3 Moderate			
CCUNDRA OSAVILLE	1 High 4 Low			
RMANTON	4 Low 4 Very low			
/ANYILLA	3 Moderate			
RT STEWART	2 High			
ATTEN	3 Low			
OSERPINE	4 Low			
ILPIE	3 Very high			
DLYNCH	3 Low			
CHMOND	3 High			
CKHAMPTON	5 Moderate			
CKINGHAM	3 Low			
LLESTON	3 High			
MA	4 High			
SEWOOD	4 Very low			
PPHIRE	2 Moderate			
LLHEIM	3 High			
MERSET DAM	2 Very low			
UTH BINGERA	2 Very low			
UTH YAAMBA	3 Low			
UTHWOOD	2 High			
GEORGE	4 Low			
ONEHENGE	2 High			
RAT	3 Low			
LWOOD	2 Very low			
MBORINE	3 Very low			
NNUM SANDS	3 Moderate			
	, ,			
ROOM WANTIN XAS ALLON ANGOOL ARGOMINDAH	5 M 3 Lo 4 V 3 Lo			

Settlement						FWN a	sses	smen	Rating						
Name	d Rain gauges						St	ream	gaug	jes		FWN score	Flood hazard	Priority	
	warning time		atial ibutio		Reliability			Spatia stribut		Relia	ability		score		
		Importance	Catchment density	Proximity	Gauge diversity	Communications	Importance	Coverage	Ungauged area	Presence of gauges	Gauge diversity	Communications	(1=poor, 5=excellent)	(1=low, 5=high)	
THEODORE	9	50%					50%						4	4	Low
TIARO	9	80%					20%						3	3	Moderate
TOOBEAH	9	50%					50%						4	2	Very low
TOOGOOLAWAH	9	80%					20%						4	4	Low
TOWNSVILLE	6	100%					0%						5	5	Very low
TREBONNE	9	50%					50%						4	3	Low
TULLY	6	100%					0%						5	3	Very low
TULLY HEADS	6	100%					0%						4	3	Low
URANDANGI	9	50%					50%						1	3	Very high
WALKERSTON	6	100%					0%						4	4	Low
WALLAL	9	50%					50%						3	2	Moderate
WALLAVILLE	9	50%					50%						4	3	Low
WALLOON	6	100%					0%						5	3	Very low
WARRA	9	80%					20%						4	3	Low
WARWICK	6	100%					0%						5	5	Very low
WATERFORD	12	80%					20%						5	4	Very low
WINDORAH	6	100%					0%						4	2	Very low
WINTON	9	80%					20%						2	4	Very high
WOODFORD	6	100%					0%						5	3	Very low
WOORABINDA	6	100%					0%						3	3	Moderate
WYANDRA	9	50%					50%						3	4	High
YAAMBA	9	20%					80%						4	4	Low
YELARBON	6	100%					0%						2	4	Very high