



# **Tweed River Entrance Sand Bypassing Project**

Feasibility Studies to Enhance System Operation

Community Consultation

Prepared by: Tweed River Entrance Sand Bypassing Project

© NSW Department of Trade and Investment

January 2013

# Contents

<b>Background</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Community Consultation</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Objectives</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Consultation Process</b>	<b>5</b>
Consultation methodology	5
Consultation timing	5
<b>Submissions</b>	<b>6</b>
Number of submissions received	6
Information about interests of respondents	6
<b>Community Responses and Comments</b>	<b>7</b>
Response Analysis	7
Community Response to Option 1 – New outlet at North Kirra	7
Community Response to Option 2 – Extended dredge placement areas	8
Community Response to Option 3 – One off placement at Kingscliff	9
Community Response to Option 4 – Backpassing	10
Community Response – other comments	11
<b>Results of Community Consultation</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Actions Arising from Community Consultation</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Agenda for Community Information meeting</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Community Feedback Form</b>	<b>17</b>

# Background

The dynamic ebb-shoal bar at the entrance of the Tweed River adjacent to the NSW/QLD border has historically been a navigational hazard for the local commercial and recreational boating community. The entrance training walls were extended in the early 1960s to improve the navigability of the Tweed River entrance. However over time, the predominant northward longshore sediment transport was trapped on the southern side of the entrance which prevented sand from moving into the southern Gold Coast beaches. Additionally, cyclonic weather conditions in the 1960s and 70s caused severe erosion of the southern Gold Coast beaches. These beaches were unable to recover from the storm events without the natural sand supply from the south which resulted in progressive recession at Coolangatta and Kirra. Furthermore, since the beach was devoid of sand there was minimal protection from storm waves which threatened to damage Marine Parade and buildings close to the shoreline.

In March 1994, the Tweed River Entrance Sand Bypassing Project (TRESBP) was established as a joint venture between the NSW and Queensland state governments. Its objectives were to maintain sand supply to the southern Gold Coast beaches and establish and maintain a navigable entrance to the Tweed River. The TRESBP achieves these objectives by capturing the majority of the northward moving coastal sand at a sand bypassing jetty located on Letitia Spit before it reaches the river entrance. The sand is then pumped through a pipeline, under the Tweed River to the primary outlet beneath Point Danger, to the north of Duranbah Beach. Because of the location of the primary outlet, Duranbah Beach requires periodic nourishment. Pumping to Duranbah Beach occurs on average twice per year prior to stormy seasons. On a few occasions, sand has been pumped to secondary outlets located at Snapper Rocks West and Kirra Point. Sand that is discharged from the outlets naturally moves onto and along the southern Gold Coast beaches by the action of ocean tides, currents and waves. A schematic of the pipe network can be seen below.



Not all of the sand moving northwards is able to be captured by the jetty pumping facility, particularly during storm events. Sand that is transported by storms into the entrance of the Tweed River forms an entrance bar over time, which impedes safe navigation by vessels. Depending on the amount of shoaling within the river entrance, a floating dredge is used occasionally to help maintain the entrance navigation conditions as part of the sand bypassing operations. The sand removed from the entrance channel is deposited by the dredge in the project's designated nearshore sand placement areas north of the river entrance, generally offshore of Point Danger.

The sand bypassing system commenced operations in March 2001, pumping over six million cubic metres of sand to the southern Gold Coast beaches. In the initial years of system operation, large volumes of sand were also extracted and delivered by the project to clear the Tweed River entrance bar and restore the severely eroded southern Gold Coast beaches. Prolonged calm weather over the early to mid 2000's resulted in slower than predicted sand movement along the southern Gold Coast beaches. These factors contributed to the formation of wide beaches in Coolangatta Bay and at Kirra and accumulation of sand around Kirra Reef.

While recent studies have shown that the excess sand volumes are naturally dispersing from Coolangatta Bay, community concerns led to a campaign for changes to the operation of the system. In response to these concerns, the TRESBP implemented a number of strategies for reducing sand supply into the bay to aid the dispersal of the sand build up, such as placement of dredged sand in less mobile offshore disposal areas.

The NSW and Queensland Governments also agreed to investigate the feasibility of four potential operational options for enhancing the longer term capability of the system to better achieve project objectives in the highly variable natural environment. The options investigated were:

1. A new sand delivery outlet at North Kirra with an extension of the existing sand delivery pipeline in the order of one kilometre,
2. Additional dredge placement areas potentially located along Bilinga and Tugun beaches about three kilometres to the north of the project placement areas, and also in deeper waters further offshore of the existing Point Danger to Coolangatta nearshore sand placement areas;
3. Delivery of sand dredged from the Tweed River entrance to Kingscliff for beach nourishment of the eroded south Kingscliff Beach; and
4. Sand backpassing by either dredge placement and/or pumping of sand southwards along Letitia Spit beach.

Consultants were engaged to undertake the investigation and produced three reports:

- Assessment of the North Kirra outlet, alternative dredge placement locations and sand delivery to Kingscliff – *Feasibility Study of Sand Placement Options for System Augmentation* (GHD, February 2011);
- Assessment of the sand backpassing option – *Sand Backpassing Feasibility Assessment* (BMT WBM, September 2010); and
- Options Summary Report to provide an overview of the assessment of all four options – *Options Feasibility Summary Report* (GHD, September 2011).

All three reports have been made publicly available online via the TRESBP website located at the following link:  
<http://www.tweedsandbypass.nsw.gov.au/>

Prior to the TRESBP making final recommendations to the NSW and Queensland Ministers regarding the potential operational enhancements to the existing system, it was agreed that the reports would be the subject of community consultation.

Independently from the TRESBP community consultation process, the Queensland Department of Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts (DSITIA) concurrently sought public opinion on the Queensland

Government Kirra Beach Restoration Project. A separate public consultation process on the Kirra Beach Restoration Project has been undertaken by DSITIA and will be reported separately from the TRESBP consultation process.

# Community Consultation

## Objectives

The objectives of the TRESBP feasibility options community consultation were to:

- Make the community aware of the outcomes of the technical investigations into the various options.
- Enable the community to provide feedback and comment on the options.
- Assist in the development of recommendations to the NSW and Queensland Ministers in regard to future actions.

## Consultation Process

### Consultation methodology

The consultation process was launched with a media release by the then Queensland Minister for the Environment on 12 October 2011, providing an overview of the four operational enhancement options and inviting community input.

The three feasibility study reports were made available on the NSW TRESBP website and a link provided from the Queensland DSITIA website.

An independently-facilitated public information meeting was held on 2 November 2011 to provide the community with detailed information on the options, answer questions about the options and to detail the formal feedback process. Approximately 60 community members attended the information session, with several additional meetings held with specific community groups following the information meeting. A copy of the agenda for the meeting is provided at Appendix 1.

Feedback forms were provided to the community at the public information meeting. Feedback forms were also made available online via the TRESBP's public website. A dedicated webpage was launched providing: an overview of the feasibility studies; links to relevant information; links to the three reports; and address details for returning the feedback form to the project team. Completed forms could be submitted at the information meeting, in hard copy by mail or electronically by email. A copy of the feedback form is provided at Appendix 2.

### Consultation timing

Public comment was invited between 2 and 30 November 2011. Submissions beyond this timeframe were also accepted to allow for comment following further community discussions at the TRESBP Community Advisory Committee meeting on 5 December 2011.

## Submissions

### Number of submissions received

A total of 32 submissions were lodged with the TRESBP within the community consultation process. This includes a number of responses that were combined with responses to the Kirra Beach Restoration Project and 3 responses that were provided after the formal date for lodgement.

Of these submissions:

- 27 were from individuals.
- 4 were from community and environment groups.
- One was from local government (Tweed Shire Council).

It is known that some of the individual respondents were also members of groups that made submissions, but the number of such responses cannot be quantified.

As indicated above, due to the concurrent Kirra Beach Restoration Project – Stage 3 community consultation process, a number of responses that provided comment on the TRESBP feasibility options were submitted directly to the Queensland Government instead of the TRESBP project team. These responses were forwarded to the TRESBP project team for inclusion as part of the TRESBP enhancement options community consultation process.

Similarly, some of the Kirra Beach Restoration project feedback was submitted to TRESBP and was subsequently forwarded to the Queensland Government as part of this process.

### Information about interests of respondents

In order to provide some information on the community's interests and interaction with the TRESBP, respondents were asked the following questions:

1. *Do you use the local beaches (visit, walk, swim, ride)? How many times a year?*
2. *Do you ride a surfboard?*
3. *Do you undertake boating activities through the Tweed River entrance? How many times a year?*
4. *Do you live within 20 kilometres of Tweed Heads?*
5. *Do you have other interests you would like to mention about the beaches and Tweed sand bypassing?*

Noting that some of the submissions were made by groups, it is difficult to provide a definitive statistical analysis of the responses. However, the following observations can be made:

- Majority of responses were made by persons in the local area (that is, within 20 km of Tweed Heads).
- The vast majority of the respondents indicated that they used the local beaches frequently (300 or more days per year).
- Approximately 75% of respondents advised that they rode a surfboard.

- Approximately 25% of respondents advised that they undertook boating activities through the Tweed entrance, but this was generally on the basis of a few occasions per year.

## Community Responses and Comments

### Response Analysis

The opportunity to provide feedback was framed in a qualitative manner and invited the community to provide comment and analysis on the options. In some cases there were no comments made on particular options and in others it was not clear whether an option was favoured or not. In any case the limited number of responses would not permit any valid statistical analysis of overall community views.

Nonetheless, an indicative summary of the level of support has been tabulated for each option in the following sections. However, these tabulations should be viewed with caution in the light of previous comments regarding analysis of responses.

Just as importantly, the responses have been reviewed in terms of the views expressed and key comments have also been collated in the following sections. Comments have been paraphrased for brevity. Where similar comments have been made by more than one respondent they have not been repeated. It should be noted that many respondents did not provide comment on each option.

### Community Response to Option 1 – New outlet at North Kirra

Generally the feedback was evenly divided between those favouring and those having a neutral or no opinion on this option although a number of respondents were unsupportive of this option. This is reflective of the individual interests of the respondents particularly the surfing patrons of Kirra.

An indicative summary of the responses to Option 1 (New outlet at North Kirra) is provided in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Responses to Option 1 (North Kirra outlet)**

	Number of responses	Percentage
Support for Option 1	12	38%
Do not support Option 1	7	22%
Neutral or no comment on Option 1	13	40%

Key comments made on Option 1 – North Kirra Outlet included:

- Would benefit beaches north of Kirra – more resilience and better swimming/surfing along Bilinga to Tugun.
- High capital costs but good investment for the future.

- Long term solution to provide flexibility in system.
- Possible beach re-alignment to the south-east and compounding of sand build-up issues.
- Possible transfer of issues to northward beaches such as Kirra and Currumbin.
- Does not provide sufficient certainty against further sand build-up.
- Possibly the most expensive but also the most permanent fix for Kirra.
- Would provide narrower beaches to the south and therefore improved amenity.
- Already too much sand at North Kirra.
- Unlikely to assist beaches where erosion has been most severe.
- Would help produce better results for surfers.
- Fair outcome for all users and for natural appearance and integrity of Coolangatta.
- Long term outcome once Kirra Point Groyne extended.
- Not needed because nature is ideal sand distribution mechanism.
- Too costly.
- Not consistent with objectives of the project.
- None of the options will fix the Kirra world famous wave problem.
- Although not required with present sand volumes, an outlet at North Kirra would be wise for future protection and management.
- Do not spend \$7 million on a pumping outlet 2.4 km north of Kirra Point... spend that money south to replenish sand in the Kingscliff area.

## Community Response to Option 2 – Extended dredge placement areas

The feedback on Option 2 – Extended dredge placement areas (2a Bilinga/Tugun; 2b deep water) was somewhat more complex because of the two sub-options involved.

Option 2a (Bilinga/Tugun) received more positive feedback than Option 2b (deep water placement). The key community concern regarding Option 2b is the potential for deep water dredge placements to impact on surf amenity and beach amenity.

An indicative summary of the responses to Option 2 (Extended dredge placement areas) is provided in Table 2 and 3 below.

**Table 2: Responses to Option 2a (Bilinga / Tugun dredge placement)**

	Number of responses	Percentage
Support for Option 2a	11	34%
Do not support Option 2a	4	13%
Neutral or no comment on Option 2a	17	53%

**Table 3: Responses to Option 2b (deep water dredge placement)**

	Number of responses	Percentage
Support for Option 2b	8	25%
Do not support Option 2b	9	28%
Neutral or no comment on Option 2b	15	47%

Key comments made on this option included:

- Dredge and barge movement of large sand quantities not favoured – little benefit to beaches north of Kirra.
- Support Bilinga to Tugun but only needed infrequently and not to replace other areas.
- Deep water placement will almost certainly affect surf quality at Snapper.
- Bilinga to Tugun placement would give immediate result to these beaches but need to avoid sand build up nuisance in the future.
- For deep water placement, potential for sand build up in calm weather and onshore nuisance impacts.
- Perhaps using both options alternately may be best solution.
- Don't forget need to keep Durambah supplied if these options adopted.
- Not clear how these options will fix Kirra.
- Report comments on potential reduction of sand supply to Rainbow and need for nourishment, but do not believe that Rainbow is being eroded.
- Placement in deeper water is certainly better than nearshore at Rainbow.
- Support Bilinga to Tugun placement because erosion has historically been more severe.
- Do not support further changes off Snapper – let natural sand movement repair it.
- Deposit well clear of Kirra Reef to build up Bilinga Tugun reserves and form new surf breaks.
- Even deep water deposition will eventually drift into the bay.
- Sand placed further north has less value to Gold Coast beaches.
- Deep sand may not help form storm bars.
- Bilinga to Tugun would alleviate surplus sand build up in Bay.
- Deep water option preferable to current dredge areas but sand could still impact on beaches.

### **Community Response to Option 3 – One off placement at Kingscliff**

Almost half of the respondents expressed opinions in favour of this option and around one sixth were opposed. Many who supported this option believed it was a logical way of addressing two issues at once (slowing down overall sand supply and addressing Kingscliff erosion).

An indicative summary of the responses to Option 3 (one-off placement at Kingscliff) is provided in Table 4 below.

**Table 4: Responses to Option 3 (one-off placement at Kingscliff)**

	Number of responses	Percentage
Support for Option 3	14	44%
Do not support Option 3	5	16%
Neutral or no comment on Option 3	13	40%

Key comments made on this option included:

- Appears to be a waste of money – pumping sand in circles.
- Better to pump sand from the Tweed River.
- Would be beneficial to the management of the total coastline if done on a “one off” basis.
- Will do little to solve sand build up from Kirra to Snapper.
- Better to construct rock wall at Kingscliff.
- Further investigation needed – should not be discounted.
- Could benefit both Kingscliff and Rainbow Bay.
- Support for option on the basis that erosion at Kingscliff has been an outcome of sand pumping operations.
- Good solution to Kingscliff problems.
- More practical and cheaper to dredge shoals upstream in Tweed River.
- Danger that one off nourishment masks long term trends and climate change issues.
- Definitely adopt to save Kingscliff Beach.
- Good investment for erosion mitigation and public relations.
- Consider pumping from Cudgen Creek onto Kingscliff Beach.
- Truck the sand down the coast to where surf clubs are falling into the sea
- Do not spend \$7 million on a pumping outlet 2.4 km north of Kirra Point... spend that money south to replenish sand in the Kingscliff area
- Recirculate back to Fingal/Kingscliff with selective dumping at Snapper when needed

## Community Response to Option 4 – Backpassing

An indicative summary of the responses to Option 4 (Backpassing) is provided in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: Responses to Option 4 (Backpassing)**

	Number of responses	Percentage
Support for Option 4	12	38%
Do not support Option 4	8	24%
Neutral or no comment for Option 4	12	38%

Key comments made on this option included:

- Appears to pump sand in circles - expensive.
- Will improve flexibility – support both nearshore and onshore placement.
- Need further modelling to understand effects.
- Supported as long as environmentally and aesthetically sound with community input.
- Logical solution over longer terms – improves flexibility and ability to look after Letitia.
- Self defeating option – pumping in circles.
- Supported in providing flexibility to system.
- Need to deal with visual and access impacts.
- Would benefit both Letitia and Rainbow.
- Not supported – better to turn off the jet pumps so as to balance sand stocks.
- Use modification of this option to pump sand to eroded area of Kingscliff.
- Stopping the pumps is better than pumping in circles.
- Often put forward by surfing community – good early way to fix oversupply to East Snapper outlet and could improve beach amenity at Fingal.
- Good option – with in-depth community input and monitoring.
- Best option, but need to make sure that contractor is not “double-dipping” and getting paid twice. Careful thought required to placing on Letitia to ensure no ill effects.
- Preferred option provides more flexibility to TRESBP Project and can accommodate sand nourishment to Letitia when needed.
- Recirculate back to Fingal/Kingscliff with selective dumping at Snapper when needed.
- Better to have less sand extraction from Letitia.
- Need to protect current ecological and amenity values on Letitia.
- New EIS required to assess impacts.

## Community Response – other comments

The community was invited to make further relevant comments or provide additional suggestions.

Key items raised by the community included:

- Further scientific study of the hydrodynamics of the whole system should be undertaken.
- Need to monitor beach regularly to see the impact.
- Why pump at all?
- Concerns re adverse effects on nearby coastal reefs.
- Concerns re impacts of sand pumping on beach systems further south.
- Need to consider impacts of sea level rise.
- Suggestion to “drip feed” sand into Duranbah rather than dump large amounts of sand.
- Make decisions in the light of what is decided about Kirra Point Groyne.
- Need to acknowledge the economic and amenity values of a well managed TRESBP.

- Should deliver sand on a daily basis (that is 1/365 of annual average each day).
- Extend Kirra Groyne – would enhance Coolangatta SLSC Bay area.
- More meetings with community stakeholders to evaluate pumping requirements.
- Surf at Snapper/Greenmount is better with sand saturation, whereas surf at Kirra is better with depleted sand levels – what is the best way to manage this?
- Consider option of sand delivery by dredge to various locations along Fingal, Letitia and Dreamtime beaches.
- Not viable to have the same great surf breaks at both Kirra Point and Superbank as one was a result of a sand deficit and the other from a restored sand supply.
- All options have merit to be used at different times.
- To mimic nature is the mission.
- Need to consider sand nourishment options to the south of the jetty at various locations along Letitia, Fingal and Dreamtime beaches.

# Results of Community Consultation

The submissions provided during the TRESBP Enhancement Options community consultation process have provided valuable input on a range of coastal management issues that are of concern to individuals and groups within the community.

The feedback from the consultation process will assist in the formation of TRESBP's final recommendations for enhancement options to the respective Queensland and NSW Ministers. There is also a need to address and provide information to the community on particular concerns raised, regardless of the option(s) chosen to better manage the delivery of the highly variable natural sand supply rates to the southern Gold Coast beaches.

As indicated earlier, the nature of the responses and the number of responses received are such that it is not appropriate to draw a statistically valid view of the overall community position. There has been no consistent response in terms of a particular preferred option. Nearly all of the responses acknowledged that at least one of the options warranted further investigation. All options other than Option 2b (Deep water dredge placement) attracted a higher level of support than opposition. For Option 2b, the level of support and opposition was nearly equal.

Not surprisingly, many of the responses were directed to the particular area of interest of the person or group lodging the submission. It was apparent that some submissions focussed on the outcomes that were desired by that group/individual without necessarily considering the overall strengths and weaknesses of the options, including factors such as cost, other impacts, scheme objectives or commercial/legal implications.

It is evident from the community consultation process that there remains some misunderstanding within the community regarding the TRESBP enhancement options and the general function of the TRESBP. Matters that require further clarification or provision of information to the community include the following:

- Emphasis that the Kirra Point Groyne issue is not part of the TRESBP enhancement options and is instead under consideration by the Queensland Government and Gold Coast City Council.
- Explain that during the initial stages of TRESBP, some 3 million cubic metres of sand was required to be delivered which had accumulated within the entrance area between the end of the initial dredging and the commissioning of the pumping works. This obligation was completed in 2006. The operational strategy adopted since that time was to deliver sand volumes consistent with the highly variable natural sand supply rate.
- Clarify that, pending formal recommendations to the respective Queensland and NSW Ministers to proceed with implementation of any option, a thorough impact assessment will be undertaken to identify and mitigate any adverse impacts that may arise as a result of the option.
- Clarify that Options 1 and 2 provide increased flexibility to deal with the unpredictable and highly variable volumes of sand being delivered – but do not assist in controlling the volumes that are transported. On the other hand, Option 4 is designed to improve the ability of the system to respond to varying conditions so that the overall sand quantities delivered better match natural sand transport rates.
- Explain the benefits of backpassing to assist in nourishing Letitia Spit beach post storm events, providing sand for southerly littoral transport during northerly swells (currently once sand is pumped north of the river entrance, TRESBP have no mechanism to pump it south of the entrance to mimic the natural processes that would occur on a northerly swell).
- Provide further explanation of the physical issues and potential impacts on TRESBP associated with Option 3.
- Clarify that Option 3 is considered a 'one-off' nourishment campaign, not an ongoing operation.
- Explain the consequences of not operating the TRESBP and continue to provide information on the fundamental operating mechanism of the system.

- Clarify the impacts of the operation of TRESBP on Letitia Spit and natural littoral drift.
- Provide additional data on the natural behaviour of beaches further to the south of Fingal, to clarify that they are not impacted by TRESBP operation.
- Provide information on the TRESBP website and at the upcoming community information meetings regarding the beach and seafloor profile conditions at Coolangatta and Kirra prior to the construction of the Tweed River Entrance training walls; post construction of the Tweed River Entrance training walls, pre and post construction of TRESBP; and the current profile conditions. This will assist in clarifying the natural and variable coverage of the nearshore reefs, bank formations, and beach widths.

# Actions Arising from Community Consultation

As a result of the recent TRESBP operational enhancement options community consultation process, the following actions are recommended:

- Consider and incorporate the feedback from the TRESBP community consultation process into the overall recommendations made by TRESBP to the respective NSW and Queensland Ministers.
- Develop a strategy for providing further clarification and provision of information to the community on the enhancement options, local coastal processes and other TRESBP-related matters (see “Results of Community Consultation” above).
- Forward any Kirra Beach-related feedback to the Queensland Government for consideration as part of the Kirra Beach Restoration Project consultation process.
- Consider the additional recommendations made by the community regarding the management of TRESBP (see “Community Response – Other Comments”).
- Further develop strategy for improved TRESBP communications in order to reach a larger proportion of the Gold Coast and Tweed communities.

# Appendix 1

## Agenda for Community Information meeting

### Community Information Session TRESBP : Enhancement Options

Wednesday 2 November 2011

#### TWEED RIVER ENTRANCE SAND BYPASSING PROJECT (TRESBP)



#### PROGRAM

Venue: Auditorium, Tweed Heads Civic and Cultural Centre  
Meeting start: 6.30 pm NSW time/5.30 pm Qld time

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Tea and coffee<br>Welcome and meeting overview (10 mins)   | Sally MacKinnon<br>Independent facilitator<br>from the Ethos Foundation |
| 2. TRESBP overview & operations (25 mins)   | Cath Acworth (Qld)<br>Craig Abbs (NSW)<br>Project Directors             |
| 3. Options for TRESBP Operations<br>Enhancement — Feasibility (40 mins)   | Paul O'Keefe, GHD<br>Project Director                                   |
| 4. Qld Government Kirra Beach Restoration<br>Project – feedback form (5 mins)   | Robert Schwartz, DERM   |
| 5. 'Information tables' (70 mins)<br>Following Options presentations there is<br>an opportunity to discuss and give<br>feedback on the Options. | Sally MacKinnon and<br>TRESBP operations specialists                    |

Auditorium closes approx. 9 pm NSW time/8 pm Qld time.

**Your feedback is important. Please collect and complete a feedback sheet.**

**Thank you for attending.**

For additional feedback sheets or to find out more about TRESBP Enhancement Options,  
see: [www.tweedsandbypass.nsw.gov.au](http://www.tweedsandbypass.nsw.gov.au)



# Appendix 2

## Community Feedback Form



**Tweed River Entrance Sand Bypassing Project (TRESBP)  
invites your feedback**



**TRESBP is considering four options to enhance sand bypassing operations. Your views on these options are welcome.**

### **What are the TRESBP Enhancement options?**

- Option 1: North Kirra Sand Outlet**—extend the existing sand pumping and delivery to a new outlet at North Kirra.
- Option 2: Additional dredge placement areas**—the first, potentially located along Bilinga and Tugun beaches, about three kilometres to the north of the project placement areas (Option 2a). The second, in deeper waters further offshore of the existing Point Danger to Coolangatta nearshore sand placement areas (Option 2b).
- Option 3: Kingscliff sand delivery**—consider the Tweed River entrance as a one-off source of sand for proposed beach nourishment works of the eroded south Kingscliff Beach proposed by the Tweed Shire Council
- Option 4: Sand backpassing**—develop a dredging and/or pumping regime to allow sand to be delivered south of the Tweed River entrance to northern Letitia Beach

**For more information visit [www.tweedsandbypass.nsw.gov.au](http://www.tweedsandbypass.nsw.gov.au)**

**Please give feedback by 30 November 2011.  
See reverse of this page for 'How to return your feedback'.**

## How to return your feedback

You may use one of the following methods to return your feedback:

- Lodge your completed form with TRESBP organisers at the community meeting, held at Tweed Heads on 2 November 2011.
- Send your completed form or write a letter to **TRESBP Options Feedback, PO Box 624, Ballina NSW 2478.**
- Scan your completed form and email to [TRESBPInfo@lands.nsw.gov.au](mailto:TRESBPInfo@lands.nsw.gov.au).

Feedback submissions close on 30 November 2011. For more information visit the TRESBP website at [www.tweedsandbypass.nsw.gov.au](http://www.tweedsandbypass.nsw.gov.au)

### Tell us a little about yourself:

Do you use the local beaches (visit, walk, swim, ride)? Yes No How many times a year? \_\_\_\_\_

Do you ride a surfboard? Yes No

Do you undertake boating activities through the Tweed River entrance? Yes No times a year? \_\_\_\_\_

Do you live within 20 kilometres of Tweed Heads? Yes No

Do you have other interests you would like to mention about the beaches and Tweed sand bypassing?

Additional Contact details (entirely optional): \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Address/Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

**Please comment on each option(s) that are of particular interest to you.  
You may add additional page(s) if required.**

**What comments would you like to make on Option 1 (North Kirra outlet)?**

**What comments would you like to make on Option 2A (Extended Dredge Placement Areas to Bilinga/Tugun) and Option 2B (Extension of Existing Dredge Placement Areas into Deeper Water)?**

**What comments would you like to make on Option 3 (One off Sand Delivery to Kingscliff)?**

**What comments would you like to make on Option 4 (Sand back-passing to Letitia Beach)?**

**Do you have any further comments?**

**Thank you for your time and input.  
Please return by 30 November 2011.  
(Refer to page 2 for 'How to return your feedback')**