
Urban Nutrients and Pollution Reduction in Moreton Bay Workshop 7 July 2016 Facilitated/Interactive Discussion Notes

SESSION 2 – NUTRIENT ABATEMENT DISCUSSION TONY PRESSLAND

Baseflow regeneration

Workshop aims:

- 1) Problems
- 2) Solutions
- 3) Prioritise

Problems:

- 1) Range of targets
 - Community
 - Institution
 - Creek work
 - Development – Roadside
 - Environmental objectives – Catchment groups have no specific (numerical) targets – do we go back to DEHP objectives?
- 2) Lack of baseline information and monitoring data
 - Rollout of Government
 - Healthy Waterways stations do not pick up small catchments
 - Loss of corporate knowledge from government
 - Can't measure/can't manage
 - Episodic nature of rainfall events versus day-to-day management.
- 3) ID hot spots for pollution
 - Bubble Licence
 - Biggest bang for buck
 - What is the issue? → Nutrients → Pollution → Toxicity
- 4) Spatial issue
 - Moreton Bay
 - Brisbane River
 - Creeks → Fresh water → Salt Water
 - Measurement of health of creek – ecosystem health rather than quantitative; include integrated approach with aquatic animal life, plants, etc
 - Meaningful measurement
- 5) Community working locally
 - Institutions need also to work in the community
 - Funding for Council lands but smaller industries less engaged.
- 6) Maps needed showing lands owned by private landholders that are not actually being used/managed from pollution viewpoint.
- 7) Plastics – have solutions but not implemented by the Queensland Government.

- 8) Sediments
 - Conservation/development/regulator action insufficient
 - Riparian zone – landowner responsible
 - Ineffective guidelines for development – plans not sufficient – needs stronger commitment by regulator?
 - Clear problem of water ecological testing (see point 4 above)

- 9) Clear problem of water ecological testing (see Problem 4 above) to catchment level.

- 10) Governance!!! – participation okay
 - Lower Brisbane River
 - City Plan inadequate
 - Trade Coast

- 11) Roads and Drainage – Council
 - Spraying process; weeds; management
 - Lack of training (contractors?)/compliance (process by BCC?)
 - Communication between green part of BCC and roads/drainage inadequate

- 12) Pricing of Offsets
 - Does not include maintenance of areas by Council
 - Last resort has now become first resort by Developers

- 13) Population
 - Nitrogen and phosphorus levels have improved but will be wiped out by population growth
 - Pricing – carbon and nitrogen etc
 - Solution – infrastructure charges for pricing.

Solutions:

- 1) Offsets
 - Must include ongoing maintenance in contract – not just the first year or so after development
 - Include costing of acquisition of land and subsequent management
 - Green bonds for industry sustainability credits
 - Capex/maintenance money must be hypothecated (legally earmarked).

- 2) Catchment based modeling
 - For where pollution is coming from – models need to be validated!!! – Pollution hot spots identified.
 - Scope what data is there and identify any gaps – monitoring.

- 3) Role model for creek restoration
 - What works?
 - What does not work?
 - Publicise case studies
 - Need to cover small catchments – Healthy Waterways/SEQ Catchments (Problem 4 above)
 - On-site solutions needed
 - Improve communication within Council.

- 4) Revitalise Catchment Plans for all Brisbane streams
 - Water Sensitive Design
 - Riparian
 - Water Assessment – monitor what? – nutrients, heavy metals, hydrocarbons, pesticides (German water quality monitoring parameters)

- 5) State Planning Policy and SEQ Regional Plan

- Healthy Waterways Guidelines
- Submission from Community (BCN) on these plans

- 6) Enforce existing regulations – BCC
- Developers pay 100% of development offsets – over ? x years

SESSION 3 – THE COMMUNITY AND RESEARCH DISCUSSION

- 1) Information Sources:

Catchment Management Plans (late 1990s)

- Good data but old information
- Good baseline

Waterways Management Plan (2000s)

- Healthy Waterways Monitoring
- Great data through time
- Data collection not enough to cover all sub/catchments
- Changes with Healthy Waterways/SEQ Catchments merger?

Aim to develop a Nutrient Monitoring Program in each Catchment

- Hydrocarbons
- Heavy metals
- Total suspended solids
- Biological
- Gross pollutants

Accessing data collected from all Government Agencies/Organisations

- Sharing information e.g. BCC
- Information stored all in one place, consistent data

- 2) Aim for Community groups to undertake own monitoring – requires funding \$

- Need to focus on parameters that will make a difference
- Advice from Water-By-Design etc
- Not just monitor – do stuff as well as monitor
- Must monitor at local scale (creek) to show outcomes/improvements
- Share data – make data available and accessible
- Incorporate into Plans/Planning
- Data being brought together now by SEQ Catchments
- Often do Projects but don't have the baseline data and rate of changes (improvements)

- 3) Setting targets for investment

- QUU working for science-based targets, then, how best cost/effective to address?
- QUU has the mechanisms to do it and examples e.g. Beaudesert
- How apply to other Catchments/areas?
- Every Catchment Group will have priority - or can identify
- Nominate sites, ground truth
- A 'bank' of Projects
- Estimation tool to indicate benefit for a Project – ha or tonnes e.g. from MangroveWatch
- Make the methodology available for Catchment/Community Groups
- Put information out on personal footprint and seek ideas/actions from the community to address
- Pilot in a creek somewhere
- Engage with Industry/Corporations in Catchment
 - o Social responsibility
 - o Become involved.