

Meeting minutes

Title:	Koo Wee Rup Longwarry Flood Protection District Advisory Committee - No 15
Meeting date:	Thursday, 23 March 2023
Meeting time:	12.50 for 1.00pm – 3.00pm
Location:	Zoom
Attendees:	Bruce Turner, Ian Anderson, Matthew Coleman, Frank Rovers, Susan Anderson, Con Raffa, Ben Wood (Cardinia), Paul Rees (MW), Tom le Cerf (MW), Sophie Kinerman (MW), Stuart Cochrane (MW) Apologies: Adam Ryan (MW), Paul Bucys and Kuan Yeoh (Casey), Robert Mure, Teena Mathew (Baw Baw SC)
Chairperson:	Bruce Turner
Note takers:	Paul, Tom and Bruce

1. Welcome, apologies and Committee Renewal process			Presenter
1.00	1.1	Welcome & apologies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bruce acknowledged the change of plan from a face-to-face meeting and district tour, saying that in light of the yet to be finalised renewal of the membership, there was more benefit in the next one being the face-to-face meeting after the new members have been recruited. 	Bruce Turner (Chair)
	1.2	Committee Renewal process update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 people submitted applications forms, another 2 still interested, but have not yet submitted. Tom has asked them to finalise by the end of the week. Jo and John have stepped down from the committee, so 2 current vacancies. Ian asked where the gaps are. Tom indicated Longwarry township was one. Potential to go from 8 to 9 committee members if really good candidates. If we have many good candidates, then we may need to look at the attendance record of existing members with a view to freeing up more places. 	Tom Le Cerf
2. Actions from previous meetings			Presenter/ status
1.10		ACTION 4.2 follow up: (re MW guidelines for new culverts) Update on progress with consultant review CLOSED	Tom at Item 5
		ACTION 7.7 Adam to report on options considered re alternatives to gates at Cora Lynn CLOSED	Adam at Item 4
		ACTION 13.2: Charter to be refreshed; draft circulated for feedback (incl. ACTION 11.1: Re roles & responsibilities one-pager)– CLOSED	Sophie at Item 3
		ACTION 14.1 Stuart and Adam to ensure that all desilt works are showing on the online map of works underway – CLOSED	Item 4

3. Customer Charter and Rates Review			Presenter
--------------------------------------	--	--	-----------

1.15	3.1	<p>Communications and Engagement Plan update – including progress with Precept Charge change, and Roles/ Responsibilities one-pager</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Originally planned to go out in March to consult on a possible increase in precept rate The most recent customers survey which went out to KWR and those results, indicated that many of the community were feeling high to extreme levels of financial stress. Also a more targeted survey, which indicated the KWR community is not clear on the specific services that MW provides. The ongoing communications and engagement has been moved back into the Pricing Submission team, who can provide a more targeted and long term communication approach to this. Acknowledge that this may be disappointing, but ultimately we think that it will work better in the longer term. Customer Charter will be put into another team which will manage the renewal of this. Matt asked if the current price (rate/ charge) included CPI. Paul explained the price is fixed at the start of the pricing period; some CPI was included, but fixed at 2% per year. Matt referred to the fact that the district boundary does not follow the catchment boundary and asked if it was possible to redraw the catchment boundary as part of the review to align with where water flows? Tom indicated it may be possible to look at what are the logical inclusions and exclusions to the district, in consultation with affected landowners Sophie said she and Tom could talk to the team to look at this. Frank commented that it would be worth asking about the process too, to check that consultation had the potential to change things; otherwise there is little point in consulting. Con commented that it was surely common sense that landowners will want to contribute if the service is of benefit to them. This prompted further discussion of how things worked in the distant past in terms of getting works done. Tom commented that criteria around the level of service need to be built into the pricing submission. <p>NEW ACTION 15.1 Sophie and Tom to ensure handover of this process and suggested topic scope, as explored by the Committee, to the Pricing Submission team.</p>	Sophie Kinerman
------	-----	--	-----------------

4. Works update			Presenter
-----------------	--	--	-----------

1.25	4.1	<p>Maintenance works update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tooradin Inlet Drain – desilting works Deep Creek Catch Drain – vegetation works 	Stu
------	-----	---	-----

- Koo Wee Rup bypass roundabout – works to reduce continual flooding
 - Program completed for the year. Only doing crisis works and building the program for next year.
 - In relation to Action 14.1, it was noted that the ‘What’s Happening Near Me’ map on MW’s website now shows desilting works, although the colour coding makes it difficult to distinguish these from other works. Paul commented that one issue being worked through was how long the works are listed on the map. (Action closed)
- 4.2 Capital works (incl. Cora Lynn gates issue – **ACTION 7.7**) Paul
- Discussing Cora Lynn gates with legal team re: road responsibilities. Nothing to report as yet. Item to be **closed** and transferred to prioritisation list as unable to be resolved as a part of BAU.
- 4.3 Future works planning Stu
(see above)

5. Focus area updates		Presenter
-----------------------	--	-----------

2.00	5.1	<p>Provide updates on Four focus areas and any works planned or undertaken. Focus on key progress.</p> <p>Focus Area 1 Enhancing and managing the function of drains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Including update on flood modelling study and risk-based maintenance project (ACTION 13.6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom reported re the flood modelling study that the last update had been to scope up this year and deliver next year. However, many of the flood modellers have left and joined consultancies. Item to be closed and updates to be provided when available. And added to prioritisation list <p>Focus area 2 Managing impacts of development on flow volumes, amenity etc; incl updates on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guidelines for new culverts (ACTION 4.2). Item to be closed and transferred to prioritisation list as unable to be resolved as a part of BAU. - Progress with Healesville to KWR Road upgrade modelling and landowner engagement (ACTION 13.4) - CLOSED - Lower Gum Scrub Creek flood retarding basin (Aero Club) update (ACTION 13.5) <p><i>Culverts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom reported that the work had been affected by the recent restructure. He is building a case to update the guidelines to provide better visibility up front and define standards for what MW will and won’t accept. • Where it currently stands, the assessment is based on a hydraulic assessment and is based on impact to determine whether culverts are possible. There is a strong preference for culverts but each needs to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. 	Tom
------	-----	--	-----

Pakenham Wetlands – Deep Creek Retarding Basin

- Cardinia Council is responsible for the design of the wetland. Ben Wood said he was not in touch with the project but commented that there was a lot of change in the catchment which is not necessarily of benefit to those downstream. He undertook to provide an update. It was noted that James Hodgens from MW Development Services could be a source of more information. Bruce suggested that this topic/ site could be an interesting one to include in the next district tour, possibly with James attending. Paul agreed.

NEW ACTION 15.2 Ben Wood to source information from Cardinia SC on where things stand with the Deep Ck Retarding Basin and what to expect next.

Lower Gum Scrub Creek (Action 13.5)

- Paul reported on collaborative work with Council – Melbourne Water have been undertaking works on Wenn Road to clear and repair culverts and flood gates.
- We have been inspecting levees to identify any low points and rectify.
- We have also been looking at lower gum scrub creek and how to access the area.
- The Melbourne Water team Paul, Tom, Stu and Adam are responsible for the operations and maintenance of the waterways and drainage system. They are usually consulted on development that is to occur, but the team is not managing or responsible for this.
- Con asked on behalf of John Hobson whether there are issues with a landholder restricting access for works?
- Paul responded that MW is working with the landholder to try and balance competing demands, (a) protecting the vegetation (which has a covenant) and (b) allowing the flow of water. We are ensuring the culverts under Cardinia Road are clear and have created a high flow bypass to the north of the vegetation.

Healesville to KWR Road upgrade

- Bruce recommended removing this from the list of outstanding actions, since there had been nothing further to report for some time, but said this didn't rule out an update in the future.

Focus Area 3 Disaster management – climate change, climate extremes, contamination, fires across swamp, water pollution event

- Sue suggested adding Foot and Mouth Disease to the list of possible disasters since, if there were an outbreak, there would be a need for restriction/ management of movements around the district.

Focus area 4 Communication roles and responsibilities – user friendly advice – who's responsible (see Item 3.1 - Charter)

- New team will be responsible.

6. Community feedback/ general business		Presenter
2.15	<p>6.1 Responses to community feedback from last meeting (ACTION 14.2) – To be addressed via email prior to meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hornbuckle Road – Stu to investigate • Deep Creek Catch Drain Flood Gate – Tom commented that it might be possible to seek funding for an initial investigation, but there was no budget to improve assets in KWR and the priority would be low. Tom to close off correspondence with interested landowners • Drains into Longwarry Drain – Stuart needs to look at the other drains flowing in now that the Longwarry Drain has been desilted. • Drains downstream of Manks Road – Issue with access for crews being worked through • Willows – Adam has been out with the landowners to discuss this. Consultants to look at slippages of the bank. Debris was removed at Cora Lynn Ford. Sue suggested it would be good to review the practice of wholesale removal; is it possible to stage works? Challenges balancing competing demands; better flows vs bank stability. • Yallock Creek concerns downstream of Bayles – control is the road • Corflute guards – Stu and Paul discussed challenges balancing how quickly biodegradable with the need to protect new plantings. <p>6.2 New community feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frank noted the very high flows this last spring. He said he was interested in the size of flows compared to the design capacity. For example, was there a difference in Bunyip River capacity from 13 mile to Cora Lynn compared to design capacity due to the significant trees in this section? Question on notice for next meeting • Frank sought feedback on works at Evans Road – clearing of drain. Challenges around access. Paul commented that MW has powers to force access, but then is liable for any damage etc and is not conducive to enabling access in the future. So MW endeavours where possible to foster a collaborative approach to preserve ongoing relationships. • Frank commented that at Evans Road it is public land that private owners have encroached on. Paul said MW is removing grazing leases as they come up for renewal, but didn't know the specifics for Evans Road • Frank asked if Bastion Drain was to be cleared. There's an unused road which is pretty inaccessible. Stu said he would have a look and organise a desilt if needed. • Frank then asked about Cora Lynn spillway and the process for removing the remaining sand stockpile. Stuart via the call centre 	ALL

is the manager of the list of properties interested in the sand. Currently restricted to 3 loads per property. Paul and Tom are considering the options for disposal of the excess. Frank suggested an option would be to allow more than 3 loads. Stu commented that the key consideration would be to ensure the sand was not used to fill the floodplain or redirect flows.

7. Meeting conclusion			Presenter
2.45	7.1	Next meeting – Thursday 20 or 27 July 2023 (tbc once new members have been appointed)	Bruce Turner
	7.2	Towards a plan for the site visit/ district tour to take place in conjunction with next meeting	Tom Le Cerf
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Paul said Tom (who had left by this point) had done some planning. It was noted the <i>Pakenham Wetlands – Deep Creek Retarding Basin</i> could be a site of interest.	
