

Coochie SEMP Community Reference Group

Meeting 8 Record

1 August 2019 – 9.30-11.30am

Redland City Council – Cassim Room

Version control

	Circulation date	Amendment date
Version 1	30/08/2019	
Version 2		

Attendees:

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 Sultman		
Keith Stebbins	✓		Gay Deacon		
Tammy Holcroft			Luke Bekker		
Chris Leonard		✓	Deputy Mayor Lance Hewlett	✓	
Kate Brooks					
Vivienne Roberts-Thomson	✓		Rod Powell	✓	
Nikki Cornwall	✓		Jenn Meyer	✓	
Malcolm Andrew (BMT)	✓		Alistair Michell	✓	
Jessie Cullen (BMT)	✓				

Housekeeping and meeting record endorsement

- Cr acknowledged Traditional Owners
- Cr asked if everyone can introduce themselves
- AM introduced Jenn Meyer as the new Comms Adviser for the CHAS and SEMP
- AM explains we're recording this meeting to assist with the formulation of the meeting record as we do not want verbatim minutes
- AM said he'd like to remind everyone of the purpose of the CRG meeting so that we can get the most out of these meetings and keep the SEMP moving along - he is also happy to send out the Terms and Conditions to members. AM explains the primary purpose of the reference group is to work with Redland City Council officers to contribute their expertise and knowledge to shoreline erosion planning for Coochiemudlo Island and provide valuable local input to enable the delivery of a SEMP and a draft implementation plan that meets the current and long term needs of the community – if everyone could keep this in mind as we move through the meeting we should be able to achieve a lot more
- Confirmation and adoption of meeting 7 record – MG said in the actions from previous meeting it should read Michael Holland, not MG

Actions arising from previous meeting record:

- Notify Energex and Telstra of exposed cables on behalf of CRG
 - RP has followed up with his colleagues at Energex and Telstra and they have acknowledged the issue
 - Cr has had significant back and forth communication with Telstra however they don't seem to have their act together – one technician went to the island and couldn't find the sign – Energex have said they are fixing their signs, not 100% sure where they're at though
- Follow up on the Norfolk Beach seawall – DA for emergency works
 - AM explains the DA is ongoing through the State. State have raised concerns with Council around compliance with the state development assessment provisions. Particularly, there's a module that references the criteria around the erosion control structures are primarily used in response to imminent threat to building or infrastructure. State has asked Council for more information in that regard and Council initially responded through BMT. AM is dealing with the State directly in regards to other issues raised around the heritage listing at the Emerald Fringe, and the fact that even though the State Code references infrastructure and buildings, it should also recognise other items of community importance
 - State is currently deliberating on our representation. AM said he will share feedback/outcomes as they comes through
 - DSDMIP are assisting Council with working that through, and are also working with DES to keep that relationship strong as they have carriage of that code
 - AM has relayed the information he received from Vivienne regarding existing issues to the State
 - DA will not be advertised and no community input will be made
- Report vegetation and slip hazard for boaties on ramp to Council
 - NC said she found that there is no vegetation around the ramp area due to the operation of the barge. NC said there was a large accumulation of twigs, algae and seagrass after the storm came through on 22 February 2019
 - NC said erosion measures have occurred twice in which they removed sand and the vegetation from the area
 - With the new angle of the ramp, it will not become as slippery
 - NC asked for clarification with the channel dredging works that are planned at the Victoria Point site – will they not dredge on the Coochiemudlo side?
 - RP said no they are not planning to this time
 - NC said something they noticed in the last couple of years is that there is an accumulation, where the barge turns around close to the bollards, of sand. At low tide you can see the barge sitting on the sand which then creates muddy water. NC said Coochie requires some dredging otherwise the situation will get worse
 - RP said it is definitely not being done this time around. RP said GRT raised the issue with him as well, and that he has already emailed someone to look at the sedimentation information. RP said long-term problem number one is that Council does not take responsibility for the dredging, instead DTMR does. The dredging that's being done right now is by DTMR and they are only interested in Victoria Point at this stage. RP has already sent an email to

- DTMR about dredging at Coochie and will look over it but can't make it any promises
 - RP stated the ferry operator hasn't actually raised the issue with Council which is why Council hadn't noticed it
- Forward Wayne Matthews report on safety issues
 - AM explains there has been ongoing dialogue with Wayne in relation to operational/safety matters
 - Safe to say we have a mechanism in place for those matters raised by customers for Wayne to attend to
- Ensure work request is raised for exposed geo-sandbags on Norfolk Beach
 - AM said if there are concerns around the condition of the geo-sandbags and they should be discussed through the operational channels
- Ensure open house summary document is on the website
 - JM confirms the document was uploaded to the website in early July
- Issue of sewage reticulation infrastructure on Coochie SEMP implementation
 - KC said he has circulated the inundation map and believes that the electrical power units that sit above the sewage wells may not get inundated. However, there are some at the barge ramp and at Norfolk Beach that are well within the inundation line. Also posed the question of how future sea level rise will be considered in SEMP, noting officers had previously undertaken to consider issues around access to the ferry and impacts on sewerage infrastructure.
 - AM said that what KC is referring to is the CHAS (Coastal Hazard Adaptation Strategy) which has to do with future erosion, sea level rise issues and storm tides.
 - The CHAS will look at what the inundation impacts will be in 2070 and 2100, and a significant part of the CHAS will also consider which Council assets are at risk. Currently in the process of identifying the areas of risk and also the assets within those areas – referred to as phase 3 and 4 of the CHAS.
 - Moving into phase 5 soon - the risk assessment phase, followed by the management option phases
 - SEMP feeds into the CHAS by being a shorter term strategy that deals with what we're facing now and anything we do today needs to be analysed as options that could help mitigate future issues
 - KC said he is looking at it from "where is the best investment of the rate payer's dollar" today to accommodate the future scenario
- Carry over SEMP budget to FY 19/20
 - AM confirms Council has managed to secure the budget for the completion of the SEMP in this financial year. In terms of a budget strategy for the Coochie SEMP implementation plan, without knowing what the management options are, we've got to secure a detailed budget. Through the budget formulation, Council has secured a sum of funds to hopefully be used this financial year upon completion of the SEMP – it may not be enough to see out all the recommendations but it should mean we'll be able to keep enough traction moving forward. How we use the funds will depend on the SEMP
 - AM said about \$80k has been secured but depends on what we have to finalise the SEMP

- Cr said they have a meeting after this meeting to see how they can enact that funding to get something done quickly and facilitate the use of those funds
- Investigate Bays and Creek strategy status and potential for consideration in SEMP
 - AM said the strategy is in development at the moment so there isn't enough to feed into the SEMP right now
 - Council will maintain that dialogue with Pippa Donaldson
 - Cr said in his upcoming newsletter he has announced that Brad Salton's group are undertaking a flood study across the front of the foreshore because of the creek issues around Red Rock. Council will be going out to consult and see how they can manage those issues
 - Subsequent works will be subject to budget allocations
- Follow up on policies on place naming, including Indigenous Place Names
 - Policies were sent out last month
 - MG asked that we make sure there is a consistent set of names used, beginning with the SEMP report
 - JC is happy to adopt any names as long as they're approved accordingly
 - Ensure we can come to an agreement on how we decide which names will be used
 - AM to take action develop a map based on previous map and share with the group to come to an agreement on names
 - AM will develop a map with names and proceed with approval process and share with CRG
- Ross Johnston submission to be forwarded to BMT for inclusion
 - Completed
- Provide a topographical map of Coochie to CRG once NE bathy surveys are complete
 - NC said she thought that the request was for a map indicating the different sea levels in the area
 - AM will share the State's topographical map
 - MG requires a map that illustrates the heritage items on the island and would like to see a topographical map of the island
 - RP said Council doesn't create topographical maps. The State has a department that manage these
- Organise 2100 SLR Plan of Coochie – KC to collect from Council
 - Plan has been shared

Main issues of discussion

Shoreline Erosion Study findings presented by Jessie Cullen

- Study indicates first part of the SEMP has been completed and this report will be fed into the SEMP. It identifies what the management options are, to some extent the area's values and what will be permissible in terms of legislations and planning
- Images do not 100% overlay each other – to do so is difficult thus accuracy is +/- 5 metres
- Assessment is intended to be indicative where we've seen major change in the area in response to a storm event or a gradual process

- Shoreline has been assessed by analysing whether vegetation in the area has moved along the shoreline – Sand cannot be assessed because we do not know if the images are low tide or high tide
- Morwong Beach – JC said it does appear to either have not changed much or there is a slight increase in the vegetation. There is sand that washes out due to either a storm tide or a creek – aerial image shows bloom of sand which would eventually get moved around
- North-East Beach – JC said it is eroding and has eroded about 20 metres since 1955. Does not appear to be a consistent process, rather it tends to stop and start. Area is very rocky and has a thin layer of sand over it which can be indicative – and if it continues to erode at the same rate - that it could have a significant property impact in about 50 years. Definitely an area that's suffering from ongoing erosion
 - GRT said he thinks in the last 5 years there's been 5 metres of erosion – believes it's significantly eroding faster in recent years
 - NC asked whether there have been any other weather events that have impacted Coochie other than the 2013 cyclone that could have impacted the shoreline
 - VRT said she has a historical list of past events (extreme weather events) from MG
- MG said that instead of seeing 'lines' on the map that indicate the level of erosion over the years, he would rather see the respective year's aerial photographs that illustrate the shoreline erosion
 - JC said the 1955 and 1997 photographs provided by DES aren't detailed enough to feed into the report and she will not be able to get 5 metres of accuracy, she will be lucky if she gets +/- 10 metres of accuracy
- PR said he lives on Morwong Beach and agrees with GRT that the progression of erosion over the past decade has been dramatic
 - JC asked if that's due to a loss of vegetation or loss of sand as this study is only assessing the shoreline's vegetation levels
 - VRT said there are images of when the eucalyptus trees fell in 1996 due to the eroding shoreline
 - NC asked if you can distinguish whether the trees along the shoreline will fall over during the next storm
 - MG said he can understand the deception along Morwong Beach because it hasn't really lost vegetation because that vegetation naturally grows. Photographs taken two decades ago would show the foliage line at a certain point but now the foliage line is much greater; gum trees have grown so the canopies will deceive the situation
 - JC said she has tried to account for that but as she said nothing in it is to a metre
 - JC said if anyone has recorded events they think took out those trees she can then try and find anymore images around those and try and add them in
 - MG said he cannot think of a particular event that started the destruction of those trees around the eastern side of the point. It

- was water inundation that caused the 80-100 year old trees to show signs of stress and would slowly die and topple over
- PR said he believes the shoreline has been impacted by human settlement activity in the past and it could be repaired by replanting trees – it's a long-term strategy but is invariably successful
 - JC reminds everyone everything relating to past and current trees and other vegetation is listed in the report – nothing in the presentation is new
 - Norfolk Beach – JC said in terms of long-term erosion, there appears to be minor recession +/- 5 metres of accuracy but there are spots that appear to be changing around the creek, and it's also fluctuating a little bit
 - Main Beach – JC said it does not seem to change much between control point one and two (Flinders Beach). Between the control point and the ferry terminal, there does appear to be a bit of a build-up mostly from south-east waves which is driving the sand west
 - GRT? asked if JC has looked at the sand slump that might've been in that corner from the dredging of the ferry terminal
 - JC said no because she does not have data to assess that is quantifiable
 - GRT? said he thinks that sand might be from a more recent event like the dredging that's occurred in the area
 - NC asked if the image is pre-new jetty
 - JC said the image is from Nov. 2018 from NearMap
 - JC said it is possible the images are transparent and could be why it is showing two jetties rather than one. JC will update it if that's the case
 - NC asked whether in the report she will be able to see the single image from Nov. 2018
 - JC confirms she has taken these images from the draft report
 - NC said as much as she trusts JC's tracing of the shorelines, she thinks everyone would benefit from seeing the individual images side by side for comparison
 - JC will add an appendix for each image
 - Golf course – JC said there is some erosion. Vegetation in the dented area has significantly increased. JC said there long-term ongoing erosion in where the spots are – it doesn't appear to be huge or everywhere, and these processes seem to be very slow. The erosion appears to be more event driven – it will change but gradually the sand moves back up. JC said you can see in the north-eastern corner there is definitely ongoing erosion
 - Red Rock / Cliffs – JC said there was a geo-technical investigation that BMT were provided with. JC said being out there, the waves that come across these shoulders only come across during high tide and are every small. Any undercutting of the rock is going to be a very slow process so it is not something they are considering in the SEMP
 - Model waves – JC said there is no recorded wave data around Coochiemudlo Island or in Moreton Bay so the modelling is to give some indication of what the processes might be. The model doesn't suggest there are many swell waves coming in – so it's all locally generated. The biggest waves do occur off Morwong and Norfolk Beach and most of the time they are less than 0.3 metres big, and Main Beach is experiencing even smaller waves – some waves did reach 0.8 metres or 1 metre but that is a fraction of a percent of a time and that will be during a big event

- Current modelling – JC said in the deeper waters most of the time we are not getting current mobilised transport – will get it occasionally during incoming or out-coming tide. Interestingly enough, at Main Beach the currents occur on a ebb tide so when there is any transport sand happening from the west to the east
- JC said they have done longshore transport modelling to get an indication of sand transport patterns – all these formulas are for open coast beaches. There is dominant northerly transport along Norfolk Beach which would be expected from those south-easterly winds
- JC said they looked at event-based erosion using the 100year design water levels from Cardno's study in 2009 which did not cover Coochiemudlo so they've taken a level off Victoria Point which should be fairly close, and you're getting potentials of up to 20 metres of erosion at various locations
- JC said the report doesn't take into account rocks or any other coastal protection structures – it's assuming it's all sand so if you've got heavily vegetated areas it's likely to be held back somewhat
- Values – JC said there are many; environmental values – Moreton Bay Marine Park, Ramsar Wetland heritage listing; heritage and social values
- JC said when looking at management options we will have to be aware of legislative restrictions; please look at summary listed in draft report
- JC said the point of this study was to give us some information on what the processes were to feed into management options – next step will be to receive comments on this report
- MP asked if shifting sand around is a management option we can consider
 - RP said we will need approval from DES to bypass sand
- VRT asked if the five control points that hold the island together are still important and what would be the cost saving of control point two of actually developing it as it was recommended in the earlier report and bolstering it to try and stop the sand loss
 - JC said Jeremy who handles the legislation said to get approval for off-shore structures would be very difficult because they are a rock outcrop
 - VRT said she thought it was defined as using sand built-up and geo-sandbags and control point two has had no work done to it and thus is deteriorating
 - RP said the problem with the bags is that the Department doesn't see them as a soft option, they seem as a seawall. We need to submit a proposal first and convince them that mitigating erosion in this area is the most crucial option rather than 'retreating'. This is the purpose of the SEMP. Council is happy to support the community's position on what you would like to do but Council does not have the control over this. Last report indicated we should relocate sand, not install geo-sandbags
 - VRT said we have important natural infrastructure that we need make sure it doesn't deteriorate
 - AM said we are dealing with a localised issue –but we have a state wide code which can't always apply to a local issue. Also mentioned the case of Amity Point where a 'flow slide barrier' has been recognised by the state as an erosion control structure even though it's not in any state codes. The SEMP provides an opportunity to come up with an agreed framework that looks at the specific values of the area whilst considering state interests.

Once agreed to, this can then be relied upon for future applications, rather than the State Code itself. SEMP needs to justify this is what we've up come with and these are the values we need to manage.

- RP said we need to go the Department with an innovative solution to control the erosion but we can't guarantee what the Department will say
- NC said she is concerned that during the next storm event the sand will continue to smother vegetation and soil
- MG summarised importance of SEMP and that it needs to look beyond what the State rules say
- MP and MG noted the fact that there is no external source of sand for the eastern side of the island
 - MA agreed with comments

Actions from today's meeting	Responsible
Provide a copy of Victoria Point sediment analysis to SEMP consultant	RP/AM
Contact Steve Wallace regarding dredging at Coochie	RP/Vije
Share State's topographical map with CRG	AM
Provide status update on Norfolk Beach seawall application	AM
Confirm beach names for SEMP	AM

Meeting closed: 11.30am

Next meeting: 27 February 2020