

Coochiemudlo Island Shoreline Erosion Management Plan

Community Reference Group

Meeting #9 Record

27 February 2020 – 2.00 pm - 4.00 pm
Redland City Council – Hope Room, Library Building

Version control

	Circulation date	Amendment date
Version 1	16/03/2020	-
Version 1	9/06/2020	10/06/2020
Version 2	15/06/2020	16/06/2020

Invitees:

Name	Present	Apology	Name	Present	Apology
Dr Mark Pillsworth		✓	Ray Burton		✓
Kevin Childs		✓	Graeme Roberts-Thomson	✓	
Dr Michael Gourlay		✓	Russell Austerberry		✓
Peter Richardson	✓		Joel Bolzenius		✓
Denise Foley			Sel Sultmann		✓
Keith Stebbins	✓		Gay Deacon		✓
Tammy Holcroft		✓	Luke Bekker		✓
Chris Leonard	✓		Deputy Mayor Lance Hewlett	✓	
Kate Brooks			Michael Holland	✓	
Vivienne Roberts-Thomson	✓		Rod Powell	✓	
Nikki Cornwall		✓	Jenn Meyer	✓	
Katrina O'Malley-Jones (BMT)	✓		Lachlan McClure	✓	
Jessie Cullen (BMT)	✓		Wayne Matthews	✓	

Housekeeping and meeting record endorsement

- Cr acknowledged Traditional Owners
- Cr asked if everyone can introduce themselves
- LM ran through meeting agenda and requested confirmation of adoption of meeting 8 record
- VRT asked if requested amendments to meeting 8 record were made
 - JM confirmed meeting 8 record has been amended RE comments made by MG, MP and MA about “no external source of sand for eastern side of island”
- CRG agreed to adopt meeting 8 record

Actions arising from previous meeting record:

- Provide a copy of Victoria Point sediment analysis to SEMP consultant
 - Completed. Analysis was incorporated into Shoreline Erosion Study (SES) (updated version will be circulated after this meeting)
- Contact Steve Wallace regarding dredging at Coochie
 - Completed. No concerns were reported

- Share State's topographical map with CRG
 - LM said if map hasn't been circulated, he will circulate QLD Globe map which is also available online
- Provide status update on Norfolk Beach seawall application
 - LM said Alistair Michell provided update in November 2019
 - LM will provide another update later in meeting
- Confirm beach names for SEMP
 - LM confirmed lots of correspondence between Alistair and CRG members – final outcome is that because there were different views on beach naming, we will continue to refer to beaches by their geographical location i.e. north, east etc

Update since last CRG meeting

- LM said SES was circulated, lots of feedback was received and incorporated by JC in to updated SES
- Alistair delivered SES to DES for review, feedback was received and also incorporated
- LM said JC has completed some preliminary work on the SEMP's multi-criteria analysis (MCA)
- Alistair provided update RE Norfolk Beach seawall development application in November 2019 outlining correspondence received from DES indicates they could not currently support the application because of conflict with state code 8. Decision on application has been extended out until finalisation of SEMP
- Foreshore monitoring survey update
 - MH confirmed survey commenced last week
 - Council was required to outsource contractor due to the large area being monitored
 - Survey can be replicated in future years and be used as a natural monitoring tool
 - Technical advice was received from survey team and BMT
 - It's been requested that the transect lines be replicated on Norfolk Beach and Main Beach
 - MH will be requesting quantitative or semi-qualitative data to use it as a measuring tool over time and understand how the beach is changing and where sand is moving to and from
 - More 'intense' surveys will take place at points 3 and 4 to provide more quantitative data about what's happening in that particular area
- VRT said there is a very old monitoring post at southern-end of Norfolk Beach hidden behind bushes – asked if monitoring team could look for it and include in their specifications as it is very significant
 - MH said he will ask monitoring team to look for it and incorporate findings
- GRT asked how long surveys will be conducted
 - MH confirmed they are done annually
- KOJ asked if MH could request that surveys be conducted at the same time, every year
 - MH confirmed he would
- VRT asked if surveys will determine sand volume
 - MH said at each of the transect line they will be able to provide sand analysis
- KOJ suggested installing a monitoring post that has a mobile phone cradle for taking photos - to be used as a beach/erosion monitoring tool by residents and visitors
 - LM asked if BMT could provide Council with most valuable spots to install post

Main issues of discussion

Draft Multi-Criteria Analysis presented by Jessie Cullen

- GRT asked if it should say -1 instead of -2 under 'negative' and 'very negative'
 - JC said yes – typo
- CRG said they are not familiar with a MCA or how it works
 - JC said it's a way to weigh up options that address different concerns and how they compare to each other, as well as capture all potential impacts –negative or positive, in order to make decent assumptions on how management options will work
- LM said MCA will be used by BMT to review the various options for erosion management – CRG will provide input into draft MCA
- KOJ said this draft MCA is a fairly simplistic kind of MCA – 'traffic-light analysis' aims to filter un/necessary options – does not mean a particular option will not be considered further
- JC said Social Community Impact column needs input from CRG – are the categories/weighting appropriate?
- KS commented homes that are subject to flooding or high tides – homes and stores by Main Beach were impacted during last storm therefore 'homes' could be included in 'Tourism/Local Businesses' category
- VRT asked if JC could provide an example of another project that has used same weightings as she feels weightings have not been distributed correctly – there's only 50% under 'Environment'. VRT said she thought SEMP would be focussing on values and believed there was doubling-up
- JC said that is the purpose of today's meeting, to review the draft MCA
- KOJ said the variation between different communities is massive and she has seen MCAs where they weigh the cost at 70% while others weigh it at 20% - it's unique to every community
- VRT asked why they want the CRG to make decisions when they were told they would get the SES before they got the matrix
- LM said the CRG were given the draft SES last year and it was discussed at the last meeting. The only change that was made to the draft SES was based on the CRG's feedback
- JC explained that 'Effectiveness' means will it solve the problem - whether it is erosion or something else, 'Technical Viability' is about can it actually be done at that location?
- Cr Hewlett said biggest issue for him and the rest of the community are the environmental issues
- Cr Hewlett attested to the popularity of Coochiemudlo's beaches with 36,500 passenger movements noted for the ferry (excluding the barge) for the month of January 2019
- LM said all management options will be subject to Council's budget
- JC said the purpose of the MCA is not to limit options based on a financial cost but rather have the option that doesn't cause any more environmental issues and still retains beach amenity
- KOJ said if costs aren't that important, while it's still a factor, perhaps it's only minor
- VRT said it's a consideration for BMT if CRG were to work through marine, terrestrial, heritage, business and community values
- JC said 25% weighting is not fixed –meeting is being held to review weighting percentages

- VRT said it's important to consider what the impacts if the option is to 'retreat'. Looking at the impacts of retreating will help BMT select a different option
- LM said that is one of the options, as listed in 'Summary of Potential Management Options'
- JC said there won't be only one option, it is likely that there will be more than one management option per area
- LM said they are seeking feedback on the list of potential management options
- KS Heritage' category needs heavier weighting
- LM said Council is not in a position where it has infinite resources – there are a range of priorities. The cost of options will need to be considered by Council.
- LM said BMT wants CRG advice on the list of 'Potential Management Options' that have been based on previous feedback – the options they feel need to be considered?
- MH said we shouldn't be limited to only Council's budget but we should look at alternative sources for grants
- LM said that the costing should not make people think that a particular management option has been ruled out because it's deemed too expensive – what costing does is let BMT compare different options – expensive options might permanently reduce ongoing long-term maintenance costs i.e. of beach nourishment
- RP said we definitely need to consider funding.
- MH is the costing a one-off capital cost or is it a life-cycle costing?
- LM said in terms of the operational management BMT is developing for these options, should we consider the delivery of some of these options to be made by Coast Care and/or other environmental groups – no written rule that it needs to be Council-funded
- VRT said funding for the Pumicestone Passage project, that was delivered by an environmental organisation, came through the landcare funding stream
- GRT said first management option is unacceptable
- VRT asked if we can use words rather than percentages
- KOJ said this is about comparing – we need to have a meaningful way to compare the different categories
- JC said we need a way to filter things
- KOJ said pairwise comparison can compare an option with any criteria so you're asking yourself which one is more important? Am I more worried about the environmental impacts of a seawall? Or the amenity feature? This also has a weighting system, can be subjective, but can be meaningful.
- KS said getting the information from e.g. the Port of Brisbane to help CRG decision-making stage as to which is the best option – why are we losing the sand from certain areas? Winds? What is driving the system that is creating the problem?
- JC said they weren't able to identify the causes behind ongoing shoreline erosion
- KS said sand on the eastern beach is not returning
- JC said based on all modelling evidence shows big events like large consistent flows of sand in one dominant area of the beach contributes to erosion
- GRT said now that the control points have gone the sand goes straight down the beach and around the corner and is filling in the big hole

- VRT said during storm event a few weeks ago and the creek burst out from the wetlands, the remains of 30-40 mangroves appeared down the beach that had been uncovered by sand. Evidence of vegetation many metres from the current tree-line
- LM said if you have suggestions for erosion management option for any of the beaches to let us know – it will be considered
- JC said to also let them know about generic suggestions as some may end up being applicable – JC said they will considering all management options applicable to relevant erosion issues
- VRT asked if control point five will be considered
 - JC said the option are likely to fit into those categories – decision will be made when it is assessed
- VRT said she thinks a groyne option should be on the list
- VRT said request to remove a tree at control point four has been with David Katavic for eight months. Tree is about to fall and remove a whole lot of vegetation from area – Luke Bekker said it is fine for it to be removed – WM asked VRT to send another email with request to remove tree to David Katavic – CC Cr LH and WM
- KS asked if ‘groynes’ can be included as a viable option
 - JC said they will need to assess area but not likely due to impact of storms
 - KS said they are relatively low-cost, could be installed and trialled
 - JC said they did have groynes on the list as a separate option, separate from reinforce the control points – it’s going to be difficult to get permits for works like this
 - LM said we can consider that option
 - JC said the island just doesn’t have the volume of sand it requires to be of use, hard to do as a trial, however BMT recognises the importance of existing control points
- LM confirms that CRG agree structural reinforcement of control points as an option
 - JC agreed – should not call them anything other than what they actually are
- VRT asked JC to explain Sel Sultmann’s comment regarding there were no comments made about control point five which is critical for beach alignment and sand transport
 - JC said they have updated the report to address Sel’s comment
 - VRT said Sel also said it is important to note the beaches on the eastern-side are not embayed between the control points, indicating very low net transport roads – what does this mean?
 - JC said an example are the beaches in Sydney and the headlands on either side – this is called an embayed. Coochie is different though, beaches are relatively level with the control points on either side
- VRT raised concerns over the number of large beach rocks removed for landscaping around the island and sought feedback on the possibility of returning this natural material to the beach enhancing the line from the mid to upper beach at Control Point Two - discussion of an amnesty for locals to return rocks and assistance with re-instating rocks on the upper breach to be sought with QYAC involvement
- JC asked if CRG agrees to submit feedback via email
- LM asked if CRG is happy to agree, they can provide feedback on MCA objectives via email over the next week – all feedback will be collected and sent to BMT/JC

Meeting #9 Record – Coochiemudlo Island SEMP CRG

- MH asked if BMT can provide an example of the MCA
 - JC said she can do that but won't be specific
- GRT asked if the cost figures will stay the same
 - MH said we benchmarked figures on what we can expect from recent budget requests for current similar works
- VRT said stormwater run-off continues to run through geo-textile sandbags and onto beach

Actions from today's meeting	Responsible
Investigate how to install 'mobile phone photo monitoring posts'	LM
Recommend locations to install 'mobile phone photo monitoring posts'	JC
Provide examples of MCR criteria	LM/JC

Meeting closed: 4.00pm

Next meeting: Tuesday 16 June 2020