REMINDER

Danube Floodplain

Expert Meeting of Working Package 3

Floodplain evaluation

Szeged, 10th and 11th of January 2019

Day 1 – 10.01.2019.

DATA STRUCTURE:

- **FTP** is used for data handling.

- Partners provide **contact person** details for data sharing (**deadline**: 18 January)

- USZ will provide access to contact person and gives the data how to use the FTP.

- **AGREEMENT** on data publishing:

  - **Danube level** data should be published in DanubeGIS

  - **Tributaries, pilot area level** data should be published in DFGIS

  - Easily understandable, short summary information on floodplains needed (several levels of publishing the results, e.g. Maps, PDFs, detailed texts)

  - DFGIS must handle **different types of data** (e.g. shp, pdf, data fields and txt)

  - **Maps** should be generated, as it is important for decision makers

- Active floodplains at present are determined on the basis of HQ100 and position of dykes originating from the Danube Floodrisk Atlas.

FLOODPLAIN DELINEATION:

- 3 criteria for the **Danube**:

  1) **ratio factor** (width of the floodplain/river): to identify the starting and the end point of a floodplain. If ratio is higher than **1** -> floodplain

  2) minimum size of an active floodplain (to avoid too many small floodplains) **500 ha**

  3) **hydraulically connected floodplain** (should represent natural flow characteristics) **by check**

- 3 groups of floodplains for the Danube:

  1st group: floodplains larger than 500 ha, and evaluated by FEM // BOKU delineated 51 floodplains along the Danube. //

  2nd group: smaller than 500 ha, displayed in the Danube GIS, but not evaluated by FEM

  3rd group: riparian zones smaller than the river width, but morphologically and ecologically valuable.

- BOKU will provide the outer boundary to partners. Partners can give feedback and modify**.**
- Concerning floodplains **on border sections a bilateral approval** is needed.
- **On tributaries threshold** between first and second group **should be adapted** to the size of the river.

- **Nomenclature** should be clarified and agreed e.g. unrealistic or potential; realistic or potentially restorable floodplains.
- Realistic or potentially restorable floodplains should be suggested by the partners.
- HQ1000 lines can be handed to partners to use it to delineate potential floodplains.
- USZ will upload to the ftp site the following data for partners to make the delineation process easier:

  For active floodplain delineation:

  > HQ100 Outline (data source: Danube FloodRisk)
  > Dykes (data source: Danube FloodRisk)
  > Polygons of active floodplains (BOKU)
  > Borders of active floodplains (BOKU)

  For potential floodplain delineation:

  > HQ1000 polygons (data source: Danube FloodRisk raster to vector)

  Danube channel polygons (data source: digitized based on high resolution Satellite images, this is planned to be updated with map from Danube Sediment project)

- **AGREEMENT** on the methodology by all partners. No objections.

- Capitalisation of **Danube Sediment data** (revised version of dykes, river polygon) for the final analyse. USZ will contact Slovakian colleagues in Danube Sediment project

- Where floodplains are dissected by or related to **reservoirs**, they need to be differentiated (upstream/downstream) a, b. (Example: FP17).
- Nomenclature suggestion: in case of islands, the category of '**island floodplains**' should be introduced.
- A floodplain check list will be sent for partners (18 January).
- How to step forward (see detailed GANTT as well):
  - **15 February**: approving the start and end point of the floodplains.
  - the final boundary of the floodplains must be approved by the partners primarily based on their revised **HQ100** data and secondarily based on other criteria considered to be important.
  - resend the finalised version for final check. Following that there is no way to change the floodplain units!!
- Jaroslav Cerni Institute will provide method for avoiding duplication of the floodplain already applied in the Danube GIS

FEM parameters (minimum set)

- Feedback on FEM minimum parameters is needed from the partners – whether parameters are viable, or should be modified (alternatives?) - evaluation
- feedback on available hydrological/hydraulic models relevant to floodplains.

- Four levels of data quality were identified in terms of hydrological/hydraulic parameters (go for best possible):
    - parameter obtained from a 2D model,
    - parameter obtained from a 1D model,
    - parameter obtained on the basis of engineering approaches
    - parameter obtained on the basis of expert judgement.
- a parameter evaluation excel sheet will be prepared in which partners can provide their suggestions concerning the parameters and the availability and quality of data.

Day 2 – 11.01.2019.

FEM parameters (medium and extended set)

- Feedback on FEM medium and extended set of parameters is needed from the partners – whether parameters are viable, or should be modified (alternatives?) - evaluation

- Proposing the consideration of **Natura2000** species and habitats as part of the **minimum set of FEM parameters**. Since non-EU countries do not have Natura 2000, it cannot be taken as mandatory.

- "**Inventory of measures**" documentation needs further feedback from the partners. The document will be sent back to the partners to revise and finalize their collection of measures.

Floodplain assessment on selected tributaries

- **Similar** presentation of the results should be aimed for the floodplains of the **Danube** and the tributaries.

- The **parameters for the Danube and tributaries should be harmonised** to have one same methodology within the project. Critical review is required from all partners.

- **Size criteria** of floodplain delineation should be **adjusted to the tributaries**. As a first approximation **500 ha for large tributaries** (Tisza, Sava) and **100 ha for smaller tributaries** (e.g. Morava, Krka).

- **Tributaries are investigated only along the sections identified in the application form** (e.g. Sava in Serbia and Croatia). Coordination of work on transboundary tributaries has to be solved.

Tasks and schedule of the following period

- A Gantt table is prepared with the tasks and deadlines agreed. Find it attached to the reminder of the meeting.

- Realistic deadlines are necessary. Quality of results must be ensured, thus rather later deadlines should be given.

- **ICPDR requires continuous feedback on project progress and results**.