

Coochiemudlo Island Shoreline Erosion Management Plan

Community Reference Group

Meeting #10 Record

16 June 2020 – 10.00 am - 12.00 pm
Redland City Council – Skype Meeting

Version control

	Circulation date	Amendment date
Version 1	29/06/20	6/07/20
Version 2	6/07/20	7/07/20
Version 3	8/07/20	

Invitees

Name	Present	Apology	Name	Present	Apology
Dr Mark Pillsworth	<u>✓</u>		Ray Burton		<u>✓</u>
Kevin Childs	<u>✓</u>		Graeme Roberts-Thomson	<u>✓</u>	
Dr Michael Gourlay	<u>✓</u>		Russell Austerberry		<u>✓</u>
Peter Richardson		<u>✓</u>	Joel Bolzenius	<u>✓</u>	
Denise Foley		<u>✓</u>	Sel Sultmann		<u>✓</u>
Keith Stebbins	<u>✓</u>		Gay Deacon		<u>✓</u>
Tammy Holcroft		<u>✓</u>	Luke Bekker		<u>✓</u>
Chris Leonard	<u>✓</u>		Cr Lance Hewlett	<u>✓</u>	
Kate Brooks		<u>✓</u>	Michael Holland	<u>✓</u>	
Vivienne Roberts-Thomson	<u>✓</u>		Rod Powell	<u>✓</u>	
Nikki Cornwall		<u>✓</u>	Jenn Meyer	<u>✓</u>	
Malcolm Andrews (BMT)	<u>✓</u>		Lachlan McClure	<u>✓</u>	
Jessie Cullen (BMT)	<u>✓</u>		Emma Smith	<u>✓</u>	

Housekeeping and meeting record endorsement

- Cr acknowledged Traditional Owners
- LM outlined meeting agenda and requested confirmation of adoption of meeting 9 record; meeting 9 record includes suggested amendments
- VRT asked whether her comment about issues with storm water running through sandbag area was added to meeting record – comment was recorded
- CRG agreed to adopt meeting 9 record
- VRT requested previous meeting records be uploaded to Your Say page

Actions arising from previous meeting record:

- LM confirmed all actions from previous meeting were carried out:
 - Investigate the installation of ‘mobile phone photo monitoring posts’
 - BMT recommended locations to install ‘mobile phone photo monitoring posts’
 - Examples of MCR criteria emailed to CRG following last meeting

Update since last CRG meeting

- LM provided updated on SEMP progress
- GRT requested timelines for SEMP
 - LM said feedback from CRG is required within a week before it is sent to BMT to review and consider in finalising SEMP. SEMP will need to go to Council workshop followed by a General Meeting of Council later in the year.
- KC asked what Council's adoption process is?
 - LM said he draft a brief internal summary report to accompany the BMT SEMP and it will have recommendations for Council.

Main issues of discussion

Draft SEMP report presented by Jessie Cullen and Malcolm Andrews

- Morwong Beach
 - Recommend removing damaged ramp
- NE Norfolk Beach
 - Falling trees to be removed and then replanted to provide some shoreline protection – permits are required
- Norfolk Beach
 - Remove falling/fallen trees
 - Remove seawall
 - Material to be placed offshore
- Wetlands
 - Repair damaged track and replace it with a flexible structure
 - Dredged material to be placed offshore
- Main Beach
 - Extra sand to be placed on Norfolk Beach
 - Storm water management
 - Beach access to receive flexible structures
- VRT said a survey was undertaken in early 2020 – what are the results? They were meant to be included, otherwise, we're relying on data from 2018. The draft SEMP does not acknowledge erosion at eastern beaches yet the SES Report notes there's no inflow of sand to these beaches. This is significant as the only sand feeding Morwong and southern beaches comes from erosion of the eastern shoreline.
- VRT questioned whether we would have ever been told the truth about the lack of sand for the eastern beaches if Mark Pillsworth hadn't raised it at Meeting 8 in August 2019. This was agreed to in discussion between Michael Gourlay and Malcolm Andrews. This fact hadn't been included in the draft SES report circulated days beforehand. The final SES wasn't distributed until after CRG meeting 9 (six months later) and is the lack of sand is noted on Page 63 of the amended SES, February 2020.
- MP referred to p53 of the draft SEMP: *'This section of beach was surveyed in 2016, 2017 and 2018. Survey quality and duration of survey program was insufficient to determine trends'*
 - Responsibility of RCC to provide this survey to an accuracy '0.5 +/- contour height gradation to -2m AHD', this appears not to have been done

- BMT was to review existing data for information gaps to ensure '*... sufficient accuracy (of surveys) for computation of the transportation of off-shore generated waves inshore of -2m AHD contour*'
- MP said BMT must have identified existing survey accuracy as a problem as RCC then commissioned new surveys, and knows that new surveys were undertaken between Norfolk Beach and the north-east tip of the island
- From the comment in the draft SEMP report p53, it follows that survey then available was still insufficient to complete the brief i.e. to model 'Sand movement around the CI foreshore' and determine '*... transformation of off-shore generated waves inshore of -2m AHD contour*'
- This beach is crucial in understanding erosion processes on Norfolk Beach and no trends in sand movement are available because of the failure of RCC performed/commissioned survey
- MP said this is a fundamental flaw in the management of the SEMP contractual requirements and needs to be explained
- KC asked how does BMT profile the beaches/where does the methodology come from
 -
- KC asked will sand be moved from one beach to another
 - JC said BMT has not recommended relocating/recycling beach other than what is done at the moment. JC said this could have a knock-on effect of erosion at those beaches
- Cr asked why it is recommended that the seawall be removed
 - MA explained existing seawalls have not been approved by DES - BMT were involved. The seawalls were a process, they happened
 - Cr asked will Norfolk Beach continue to erode
 - MA recommended implementing a monitoring program at the beach – will also inform recommended beach nourishment at certain locations over time
 - MA said the seawall does not affect coastal processes either side of it
- VRT asked if we can monitor erosion of the dunes along the fence-line like the comparative photos of Norfolk beach erosion from 2015-2020 recently circulated
 - MA acknowledged we could. They didn't currently have an accuracy with surveys but he hadn't seen any survey results
- VRT said there has been no substantial nourishment at Norfolk Beach since 2013. We should use the latest survey results to inform recommendations
- VRT said that we should have access to the most recent survey data
 - MA said Council can use the survey info to determine whether an area requires beach nourishment
- LM asked if there is any benefit in delaying the SEMP until further surveys as suggested.
 - JC said no. SEMP is a framework for Council to work from and can be informed by survey data going forward
- KC asked what is the purpose of removing fallen/falling trees at Norfolk Beach
- GRT said that the 2015 report indicated that control points are vital to maintaining beaches – this is not considered in the draft SEMP

- MA said the 2015 report was developed through the eyes of Oswald and that coloured recommendations now we are looking into the future with a more holistic point of view
 - JC said we want to monitor to gain a better idea of the processes
- VRT said most of the erosion at control points happens further up the beach reinforcing the need to bolster dune vegetation here, as recommended in the 2015 erosion report.
- LM asked JC and MC to explain why groynes would not be effective
 - MA said groynes are not suitable at Coochiemudlo Island – explained groynes work where there is strong longshore drift
- KC – Dune enhancement
- MP said that fallen trees are covered by the Fisheries Act
 - LM said the accepted development requirements have some provisions for Council to work with the State to remove fallen vegetation only if it poses a risk to the public.
- KC – comment regarding migratory shorebirds
- GRT agreed that it was important to look after fish habitat but was more concerned at the impact of seawater intrusion into the wetlands which would destroy a Ramsar listed site Erosion has already in the past two years destroyed over 130 trees along Norfolk Beach
- LM – mentioned existing Marine Parks Permit allows some works.
- MG said there is long-term erosion and that loss of large trees indicates erosion progressing into the inactive coastal zone. MG said there is continuous long-term erosion along most of Norfolk Beach and no offshore sand supply – Sand loss may be small compared to an ocean beach but it is significant here. MG said Control Point 1 is a naturally occurring offshore breakwater – A tombolo (sand deposit linking the offshore rocks to the shore behind it) forms there under all normal conditions with sand moving around the seaward side of this Control Point at low tide. MG said extreme events with a storm surge may remove the tombolo but it subsequently reforms. Control Point 2 is the opposite – Sand from the north is controlled by rocks that project out like a groyne. MG said sand moves across Control Point 2 between the rocks and land at high tide – There appears to be no sand movement around the seaward end of these rocks. It is easy to block the flow – MG said he is not talking about building big structures into the ocean. It should be easy to do with a few geotextile bags (or some other acceptable material e.g. logs). MG said he is somewhat disappointed with what has been recommended and said GRT is quite right – we do have an erosion problem that needs addressing
 - MA said that in terms of recommendations to Council, BMT has not been able to quantitatively identify long term erosion. However, if previous surveys can be looked back on with anecdotal reports and photos, there's a method to move forward
 - MP said we need to create an operational plan that looks at all impact, and develop an environmental plan
 - MA said that there is no defensible evidence of erosion but perhaps VRT's photos will be useful as there is a permanent mark with the fence posts
 - GRT said he believed there was enough evidence to quantify what was happening and quantify what can be done. At present we don't have a SEMP we have a Council Maintenance Program CMP and the past five years has been wasted

Meeting #10 Record – Coochiemudlo Island SEMP CRG

- KC Thanks to JC and MA. The draft SEMP has given us a lot to consider
- LM thanked JC and MA and said we have some recommendations which will provide a framework to address erosion on the island, Council will be able to respond to the coastal erosion in ways that it currently cannot
 - MA said control point two is more relevant to control point five because of the transport of sand - We haven't put a lot of emphasis on Control Point 5
- JB said regarding approvals and duties, the Native Title Act is missing from the draft SEMP
- LM reiterated draft SEMP timeline moving forward:
 - CRG has until 23/06/20 to provide feedback on draft SEMP
 - Internal review of draft SEMP
 - Council workshop, review and adoption
- CR said he is glad that erosion on Coochiemudlo Island has been acknowledged and that the Emerald fringe is Heritage listed, the wetlands are being compromised and the State Government needs to look at the value of trees
- LM thanked everyone for attending, and BMT for the presentation

Actions from today's meeting	Responsible
CRG to provide any feedback on the draft SEMP	CRG members
Collect feedback and provide to BMT for review	LM

Meeting closed: 12.00pm

Next meeting: TBA