

Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.
180 Haven Road,
Pullenvale QLD 4069
Email: malcolmr@conscious.com.au
Phone: 04 1964 2379 and 07 3374 3374

Tuesday, June 5th, 2012

Mr. John Porter.
The Administrator
Port Macquarie-Hastings Council
PO Box 84
Port Macquarie NSW 2444

**Page 1 of 6 sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation
and by email attachment**

Dear Mr. Porter:

**Re: Notice of Demand and
Comment on Port Macquarie-Hastings Council's Call for Public Comment
on 'Draft Lake Cathie Coastline Management Study - Stage 2 Report'**

Thank you for your letter dated April 13, 2012 received by email from your assistant Linda Kocis.

I feel deeply disappointed and concerned that you failed to respond specifically to any of my twelve questions. As a result of your chosen action that is now a matter for me to pursue as advised in my previous letter.

Secondly, as your letter suggested, I have read your council's '*Draft Lake Cathie Coastline Management Study—Stage 2*'. It fails to answer any of the twelve questions in my original letter dated Friday, March 30th, 2012.

Relative to my specific questions (Q.1-Q.12) your council's study makes the following types of comments:

Q.1. Brief vague and inconclusive mention in draft study report. In places the report cites the UN IPCC's unscientific projections on sea level seemingly as validation for use of '*upper level*' projections on which the study appears to be based.

Q.2. See Q.1. above. From reading the Draft Report it seems that your council's threatened actions appear to be based on unscientific and unfounded projections by the

previous NSW state government apparently for the next century. Those ‘*projections*’ are now labelled as ‘*benchmarks*’ for the next century. They contradict empirical science.

Q.3. Failed to answer. No answer in Draft Study.

Q.4. Failed to answer. No answer in Draft Study.

Q.5. Failed to answer. No answer in Draft Study.

Q.6. Failed to answer. Report makes varied claims about actual rates of sea level rise.

Q.7. Failed to answer. No answer in Draft Study.

Q.8. Failed to answer. No answer in Draft Study.

Q.9. Failed to answer. No answer in Draft Study.

Q.10. Failed to answer. No answer in Draft Study.

Q.11. Failed to answer. No answer in Draft Study.

Q.12. Failed to answer. No answer in Draft Study.

Based on your reply, I wonder as to whether you are ignorant of your council study’s contents? Or am I to conclude that you are avoiding specifically answering my fundamental questions?

In case my reading of your council’s draft report is mistaken, please specifically identify where in your council’s study each question is answered.

If I do not receive your signed written specific and supported contradiction to each of my conclusions Q.1.-Q.12. listed above within ten days from today’s date I will conclude that my conclusions above are valid and accurate.

Given your seemingly false assertion that the Draft Study Report would answer my questions, please advise the reason for your unfounded assertion. Given your statement should Lake Cathie residents trust your council’s statements to them on the alternatives for Lake Cathie?

Thirdly, please refer to your council’s study and note the following:

1. Section 2.3.3 Enhanced Greenhouse Effect:

There is no empirical scientific evidence nor any scientific logical reasoning supporting your council study’s discussion of a claimed ‘*possible*’ Enhanced Greenhouse Effect. Empirical science reveals no possible impact of such a supposed effect.

Enclosed are summary notes on the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, UN IPCC. Please accept them as part of this submission to your council’s call for public comment by June 8th, 2012.

2. Section 3.3.3 Future Beach Recession—Sea Level Rise:

Are you aware that use of the Bruun Rule has apparently been scientifically discredited or at the very least, scientifically challenged?

Please refer to ‘*Sea-level rise and shoreline retreat: time to abandon the Bruun Rule*’ by Cooper A.O. and Pilkey O.H., *Global and Planetary Change* 43 (2004) 157–171

The authors state, quote: “*the Bruun Rule ignores various important geological and oceanographic principles and cannot predict shoreline retreat due to sea level rises accurately*”. They conclude that the Bruun Rule, quote: “*should be abandoned*”.

3. Section 4.2.2 Fifty Year Planning Period:

Based on my reading, it seems that the draft report’s conclusions incorporate use of the Bruun Rule and future sea level projections that contradict empirical evidence on sea levels. **If my conclusion is not correct please advise specifically.**

4. Section 4.2.3 100 Year Planning Period:

Based on my reading, it seems that the draft report’s conclusions incorporate use of the Bruun Rule and future sea level projections that contradict empirical evidence on sea levels. **If my conclusion is not correct please advise specifically.**

5. Section 4.3 Coastline Hazard Assessment and Risk Assessment:

Quoting : “*The prognosis for a future sea level rise, as a result of global warming, could increase the rate of long term recession. The NSW Government has recently (February 2009) published benchmarks for sea level rise to be considered for planning purposes throughout NSW. This benchmark is based on a broad suite of scientific data, including the upper range of projections from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report (IPCC 2007), and research by CSIRO. These benchmarks require sea level rises of 0.4 m to 2050 and 0.9 m to 2100 to be considered for coastal planning purposes throughout NSW.*”

[http://www.hastings.nsw.gov.au/resources/documents/Draft Lake Cathie Management Study Pages 47-63_july09.pdf](http://www.hastings.nsw.gov.au/resources/documents/Draft_Lake_Cathie_Management_Study_Pages_47-63_july09.pdf)

Are you aware that both the UN IPCC’s and CSIRO’s projections are based on unvalidated computer models contradicting empirical scientific evidence and on political manipulations? Are you aware that both the UN IPCC and CSIRO have no empirical scientific evidence and no logical scientific rational for unfounded claims that human carbon dioxide (CO₂) caused global warming?

This is confirmed by analysis of CSIRO documents on global warming and in responses by CSIRO Chief Executive Dr Megan Clark and CSIRO Group Executive—Environment to my requests for scientific evidence.

The previous NSW government coastal planning ‘*benchmarks*’ contradict empirical science and are scientifically unfounded. **Are you aware of this fact?**

6. Actual Sea Level Rise in Recent Decades:

Please refer to the accompanying investigation and audit of actual sea level by Gold Coast businessman, investor and science philanthropist, Gregg Thompson. It contains references to many scientific studies and empirical measurements. It's available at: <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/EvidenceForNoSeaLevelChange.pdf>

Note that Maritime Safety Queensland reports Australian sea level rising 0.3 millimetres annually during the last 15 years. At this current rate in the next century sea level will rise by 3.0 centimetres, around one inch.

Please refer to Alberto Borettis' analysis of Australian sea level using tidal gauge measurements entitled "*Is there any support in the long term tide gauge data to the claims that parts of Sydney will be swamped by rising sea levels?*" It's available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378383912000154>
Alberto Boretti's analysis extends back over a century. Depending on location, recent decades reveal that sea level is rising at a rate of less than 50 millimetres per century.

The 'Wollongong City Council Coastal Zone Study', June 30, 2010 states in its first paragraph, quote: "*It was found that there is presently no evidence of long term shoreline recession or loss of beach volume*".

The report says that for almost all locations in the Wollongong Council's coastline, minimum beach volume was in 1974. That was soon after storms. That covers 40 years.

Quote: "*However, since then almost all the profiles have shown a steady accretion of beach width and beach volume. To this end no long-term shoreline recession could be identified and was therefore adopted to be zero (for present Mean Sea Level) for the determination of erosion hazard lines*".

Wyong Coastal Hazard Study, October 2011 was prepared by SMEC. On page 11, it says, quote: "*Generally it was found that most of the beaches in the study area are not undergoing significant long term beach recession and that since storms of May 1974, most of the beaches have been recovering in sand volume as a result of recent storm activity.*"

That's 40 years. That's what The Weekend Australian front-page picture article on March 31 revealed: according to residents in their 80's, all that was occurring was natural erosion and rebuilding of beaches. Nothing unusual.

7. UN IPCC is an unscientific political organisation with a political agenda:

Please refer to the accompanying notes on the UN IPCC.

8. UN Agenda 21 'Sustainability':

Finally, **Mr Porter are you aware that the United Nations UN Agenda 21 campaign supposedly promoting sustainability has been exposed in various nations for unfounded use of false climate and environmental claims as a way of destroying private property rights?** This has reportedly been done by supposed local '*authorities*' unlawfully resuming and/or restricting private land rights such as renovations. From the wording of your council's Draft Study council could be seen to want to act without accurate empirical scientific evidence.

Are you aware of UN Agenda 21 for Sustainability?

In response to **Port Macquarie-Hastings Council's Call for Public Comment on 'Draft Lake Cathie Coastline Management Study - Stage 2 Report'** I submit **that council not consider any of its proposed alternatives until council develops alternatives based on actual rates of sea level rise in the last two decades and that an alternative to the Bruun Rule be sought when estimating whether or not any action need be taken.**

It seems that the Secombes, as quoted in The Weekend Australian article on Saturday, March 24, 2012 were correct, quote: "*Long-term locals such as the Secombes point out that while erosion can be a problem, it has been a natural ebb and flow over the decades. "A few years ago there was an eight- or ten-foot cliff on the other side of the road, then three months on, it was back to a full beach," Mr Secombe said.*"

Rather than considering forced removal of the Secombes and other residents perhaps council could consider paying them consulting fees for their conclusions consistent with empirical scientific evidence and reports by other councils.

I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.

BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)

Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

Enclosures:

Document entitled: '*Have We Been Told The Truth About Sea Level?*' of seven pages
Critique of UN IPCC, 12 pages

cc: Electronically to:

Mr. Stephen Hunt, Resident, Illaroo Road, Lake
Mr. and Mrs. Russell and Anne Secombe, Residents, Illaroo Road, Lake Cathie
Mr. Jacques Laxale, Consumers And Taxpayers Association
Mr. Pat Aiken, Secretary, Coastal Residents Incorporated
Mr. Tim Bishop, Hastings Community Radio 2-Way FM
Ms. Brie Snare, Journalist, Port Macquarie News and Port Macquarie Express
Mr. Leon Pittard, Fair Dinkum Radio, Wauchope
Mr. Angus Gordon, Coastal Engineer