

1 December 2017

Version 2.0

Coochie SEMP Community Reference Group Meeting 1

When: Thursday 26 October 2017, 4:30-6:30pm

Where: Coochie Public Hall, 346 Victoria Pde South, Coochie

Attendees: Cr Hewlett (Chair), Mick Holland (Project Manager), Keith Stebbins, Chris Leonard (apologies), Kate Brooks, Vivienne Roberts-Thomson, Nikki Cornwall, Ray Burton, Graeme Roberts-Thomson, Russell Austerberry, Joel Bolzenius, Dr Mark Pillsworth, Kevin Childs, Dr Michael Gourlay, Peter Richardson, Dr Rachael Krinks, Denise Foley, Rod Powell, John Dujmovic.

Notes

Introductions: Chair / all

Presentation: The presentation by Michael Holland identified:

- Relevant source studies (including the Norfolk Beach Shoreline Erosion Study, last year's Bathymetric survey of eastern coastal water, and the semi-regular beach profile surveys of Norfolk Beach),
- The important role of Community Reference Group (CRG) members in the process (sharing local knowledge, experience of events etc),
- That a Cultural Heritage application process was underway for Coochie,
- That the Coochie SEMP was a component part of the city-wide Draft Coastal Adaptation Strategy,
- That the process of drafting a SEMP:
 - was governed by compliance requirements, legislation and Acts,
 - was based on scope and methodology provided by EHP,
 - followed the same process as followed for the Amity Point SEMP,
 - requires CRG members to agree to Terms of Reference,
 - involves state agency involvement
 - requires CRG and other stakeholder input
 - will require regular CRG meetings (probably monthly)
- Outcomes will include:
 - A draft by June 2018 (ideally)
 - Implementation strategies (and resources)
 - A plan with a 25 year horizon

Questions to Council reps:

Q. Is there a requirement to meet Financial Year deadlines?

A. No.

Q. When will the consultant be appointed?

A. Ideally before Christmas, but potentially early in the new calendar year.

Q. Is the 2004 Coochiemudlo Island Land Management Plan going to be considered?

A. Yes.

Q. Are the Quandamooka people 'landowners' as referred to in Coochie SEMP documentation?

A. There are current Native Title and Cultural Heritage claims. RCC to provide an update.

Q. Will the SEMP create hazard zones?

A. Yes

Q. Will the SEMP consider Storm Tide overlay mapping?

A. A SEMP is intended to consider current hazards, and the Storm Tide overlay maps a risk that factors in 0.8m sea-level rise by 2100. The SEMP will consider current storm surge mapping.

Q. Will the SEMP reflect that Coochie is in a marine Park?

A. Yes

Q. Why doesn't the SEMP cover the whole island?

In principle it could, but Council will reserve its position until the costs are identified.

Q. What can we do now? We've had the original SEMP for 4 years?

A. The first step will be review of the existing report. Also, the new self-assessable code means we can deal with small events, and issues without permits. For instance sand replenishment is now occurring around the gum on Moorwong, at the James St access way, and Control Point 4.

Note: The Norfolk Beach study did not meet the accepted requirements for SEMP, and only covered a portion of the island. The current planning study may have broader, potentially whole-of-island, focus.

Questions to the Community Reference Group (CRG):

Q. Does the group acknowledge the working rules set out in the Terms of Reference (TOR)?

A. Inclusion of 'RCC established policy of retreat' was questioned by members.

A. Basing the TOR on the Amity Point SEMP TOR was questioned, (it was suggested that they are two different situations ie it was suggested that Coochie has no individual property owners).

Council to review the draft TOR against the original Coochie SEMP TOR from 2014 to make sure there are no key differences, and report back to the CRG.

Q. What times suit the group for meetings?

A. Generally members were ok with the 4:40pm-6:30pm window (which made it possible for one member who would otherwise not have been able to attend, to do so). A small number of members would prefer that the meeting was earlier. It was also noted that it would be difficult to secure after hours attendance by State agencies, and that consequently meeting times should be flexible as required. Google Calendar functionality to be considered as a useful tool in planning meeting times.

Q. Are members ok with their email address being known by other group members?

Yes.

What do members want to get out of the SEMP?

Deal with priority areas, and do a cost benefit analysis. One concern is that resources are directed to protect small properties, trees etc that might simply have been unwisely located - instead of dealing with important at risk transport and other infrastructure.

That the SEMP considers economics, property values, and the economic value of foreshore areas etc "where the sand is, is where the visitors go".

That the consultant's brief considers inputs available through the small island researches network / other.

That the study relies on science, studies, and evidence of sand movement in the system. (See Dr Gourlay's notes about sand movement, etc along Coochiemudlo beaches in Norfolk Shoreline Study Appendix G.

Find out why the north east part of the island is eroding.

Stabilise the eastern beach. It was suggested that these works might even deliver cost savings in the form of reduced dredging costs, barge ramp scraping etc - and that the SEMP should consider the potential savings associated with works.

That all issues are fully identified in the consultants brief.

A solid public document that considers the historical story of Moreton Bay's storms.

A document that considers our heritage and historic values, our emerald fringe, and protects our key beaches.

An investigation of sand movements, that ultimately helps us manage our island's beaches effectively.

That the SEMP draws on the existing Norfolk Beach Shoreline Erosion Study, and that we start operational works now (at control point 5, where need most). That the consultant be appointed prior to the cyclone season- so they can see things happen.

Council advised the number of approved sites (beaches) for beach nourishment in Council's 10-year Marine Park Permit (MPW2015/MBMP0089) is 82 (includes mainland, SMBI, NSI and Coochiemudlo Island). Of that total, 5 sites are on Coochiemudlo Island.

To understand the system, the big picture - and enjoy working with this group.

Make sure the consultant is on the island to see what it is like at the high tides and during strong winds, and that we try things before it is too late.

To be completely transparent. To involve the community and identify outcomes that address all the various state and other stakeholder interests, and deliver outcomes the community can live with.

I don't want to see trees fall into the sea, and I'd like to engage the community through technology - something like an instagram page, so they can post historical pictures to show what has happened.

That the SEMP recognises the Quandamooka peoples management of the island, and addresses immediate problems in ways that are respectful of past custodianship, and heritage values. That the SEMP has clear lines of site for implementation.

I want the SEMP to consider historic events and losses, and use that understanding as the starting point for addressing current issues.

To act quickly and stop the losses, and involve the rest of the community.

Find a cost-effective pathway to address the degradation of Norfolk beach.

Consider the whole island, its history, and scientific processes. Communicate these issues with locals and visitors. Balance conservation with cost effectiveness.

Bring the community along with good factual information. I don't want to see money thrown at something that will have no effect. I'm interested in protection and science. I want the SEMP to look at the whole island, and not just react to specifics.

Need a scientific study of the whole bay, a wider context, which looks into the future - including the impacts of climate change and sea level rise. It must work with nature, consider island and bay systems. Identify the levers that might through small interventions provide big results. Take what we can from this group back to the community, and encourage a diversity of inputs.

Consultant must be made to meet all the requirements of the brief, and tick them off point by point.

To preserve significant items of cultural and heritage value.

Schedule

Re-issue to CRG for feedback.

It was suggested that the CAS Steering Committee be engaged at same time as state agencies.

Avoid Tourism Committee meeting date for next Coochie SEMP CRG meeting date.

CRG participation in engaging the technical consultant

Two CRG members were invited to participate in the process of engaging the technical consultant (two people as a commercial process, requiring working hours involvement, attendance of meetings, and quite a bit of work). Ideally with some experience:

Graeme Roberts Thomson, and Mark Pillsworth were nominated.

Close	Actions	Changes
--------------	----------------	----------------