



## Management Committee Meeting 13 Minutes

**Date:** Monday 20 April 2015 **Time:** 11:30am to 3:30pm

**Location:** Leo Zussino Building, CQ University Gladstone Campus

### Attendees

Name	Position	Organisation
<b>Community</b>		
Mr Paul Birch (Chair)	CEO	Fitzroy Basin Association
Mr Peter Brady	Management Committee Representative	Gladstone Region Environmental Advisory Network
Mr Peter Brockhurst		Gidarjil Development Corporation
<b>Government</b>		
Ms Claire Andersen	Director – Strategic Policy Services	Department of Environment and Heritage Protection
Ms Angela Stokes	Proxy for Ms Peta Lane	Department of Environment
<b>Industry</b>		
Mr Kurt Heidecker	CEO	Gladstone Industry Leadership Group
Mrs Megan Ellis	Proxy for Mr John Sherriff	Gladstone Ports Corporation
Mr Garry Scanlan	Gladstone Regional Manager	GLNG
<b>Research</b>		
Mr John Gunn	CEO	Australian Institute of Marine Science
<b>Other Attendees</b>		
Dr Ian Poiner	Chair	GHHP Independent Science Panel
Dr John Kirkwood	GHHP Science Convenor	Fitzroy Basin Association
Ms Lyndal Hansen	Media and Communication Team	Amarna Consulting
Ms Maddy Willey	Media and Communication Team	Amarna Consulting

### Agenda Item 1 – Introduction

Apologies:

Name	Position	Organisation
Councillor Col Chapman	Councillor	Gladstone Regional Council
Mr John Sherriff	General Manager, Safety Environment & Risk	Gladstone Ports Corporation
Mr Noel Bowley	Management Committee Proxy	Gladstone Region Environmental Advisory Network
Ms Crystal McGregor	Media and Communication Team	Amarna Consulting
Ms Rachael Stegemann	Secretariat	Fitzroy Basin Association

### Agenda Item 2 – Private Committee Discussion

**All staff and contractors were invited to stay**

16<sup>th</sup> April GREAN Meeting Feedback

- Concerns regarding questions asked of staff member at the recent GREAN meeting about “why aren’t we doing something about what happened in 2011?”

- Discussion was around one or two GREAN members expressing their views and indicating that many people in the community felt the same way (not trusting the GHHP Report Card)
- Three Management Committee Members were in attendance at the GREAN meeting and believed they were legitimate questions/challenging of Report Card. Although there was some discussion on whether the GREAN members represented opinions of most of the community. The Management Committee Members did agree that the timing and placement of the conversation could have been better delivered.
- Peter Brady had concerns for consumption of fish and wanted GHHP to address this. Concerns were that GHHP reporting does nothing to report on previous issues, GHHP Staff explained that it was a reporting period for 2014. Peter expressed his disappointment that we haven't move in the direction of testing fish flesh. Ian explained that only observations and speculations on the what attributed to poor fish health in 2011 could not be put down to any one thing
- Issue of 2011 reporting should not be rehashed with each new face that appears at GREAN meetings
- Peter raised the issue that he felt that Committee Members were being bullied in relation to the wording in the Technical Reports. Paul referred to the GHHP Charter of 2013 as a terms of reference and went on to say -no one in the Management Committee is bullied to vote in a particular way – everyone is free to vote in a way that reflects their opinions –a decision is set in stone once it has been voted and decided on by the majority. It is important that decisions made by the Management Committee are supported by the Committee Members.

### **Agenda Item 3 – Reports**

#### **3.1 Previous Minutes and Actions**

##### MC item 12.2

- John rang Paul Maxwell from SEQ Waterways – stated they don't use dissolved oxygen because it doesn't usually change, however they do use it in estuaries as it does display differences

#### **3.2 Science Program Report**

Dr Ian Poiner tabled the Science Program Report, and advised.

##### Management Committee Comments/Questions on Science Program Report:

- Sediment – will the absolute amounts be included in technical report or considered as part of the report card? Ian responded that it will be presented as trends and detail explanation in technical report.
- Comms – how do we articulate that 2015 won't be a full report card? Ian said most of it will be reported, however, fish health will not be reported on
- Will crabs be reported on?
  - Standardisation is a little difficult but some information will be presented
- Why is cultural heritage reporting still uncertain according to the table Ian presented?
  - Ian responded - it's new, we've never done it before and are trying to develop a scope of works.
- Update of information on website – how much of that is being done by Science and Comms team?
  - Working together to work through the update – Science to provide material and Comms to look after the redesign
- Science Program Report Card and Technical Documents Timeline
  - Report Card/Technical Docs need to go back to ISP before sent back to MC in December – Ian to adjust timeline to include event

- Can Report Card be delayed by a fortnight so that its release correlates with release of Technical Reports? GHHP credibility risk when there's a large gap between release dates – achievability issue to get them out on the same date as information needs to be reviewed
- If we put back launch of Report Card 8 or 9 days can the technical reports come forward 8 or 9 days?
  - Science team to go through and discuss if that is realistic for the Science Team to be able to release a “spot on” document by then
- Data has been requested from PCIMP and come up with an annual date for us to request the data
- Provided ISP can provide technical reports earlier than scheduled everyone is happy with new proposed format for Report Card release? All Management Committee Members were in agreement
- Pre-release information for Partners?
  - Partners to come up with a solution and bring back to Management Committee
    - Suggestion of technical contact group within industry to report on progress of indicators but not scores to be presented in Report Card
    - SEQ do pre-briefing 1 week before release where Paul and Ian would go to CEOs and highlight key aspects of Report Card without giving away an actual copy

### 3.4 Finance Report February 2015

Finance Report was tabled.

Management Committee Comments/Questions on Finance Report:  
None.

### 3.5 Communications Update

Communications Report was tabled.

Management Committee Comments/Questions on Communications Report:

- Is there a need to reconvene focus groups?
  - Attendance at GREAN, rotary, etc. meetings to gain more community feedback – general community people don't have anything to compare it to what it should look like so really struggle when we ask formatting questions, however the general comments are that the Pilot Report Card made sense and was professional looking.
- Comms team looking how to develop Facebook page – Claire Anderson happy to post GHHP on their Facebook page.

## **Agenda Item 4 – Items requiring decision**

### 4.1 2015-2016 Draft Budget

Draft Budget was tabled.

Management Committee Comments/Questions on 2015-2016 Draft Budget:

- Split between Citizen Science and Stewardship program?
- Is it the same amount for sitting fees for the ISP as last year?
  - Same as last year
- Statistics phase 2 projects – for additional indicators – Ian said an additional, automated monitoring systems had to be compatible with DIMS

- If you're not getting the information that you want at the moment why would we be going back to people who aren't delivering
  - Getting high quality statistical support is difficult and costly to find another team to deliver statistical support – DIMS looking at ways to change their methods of supply – don't have a large amount of quality suppliers to choose from
  - In relation to ISPO08a are there any other people besides Sandra Johnstone?
    - Sandra is contact point but there are other statisticians involved
- Can we expand the group of people we are engaging to improve consistency in methodology so it can be used in other regions?
  - We try to be consistent everywhere in GBR and elsewhere – ongoing discussions to adopt methods to improve consistency throughout GBR
  - Maximise use of money in Gladstone so that we can adapt these methods elsewhere
- With fish monitoring are we only doing recruits?
  - Trying to develop a recruitment index – InfoFish data is not suitable for that.
  - Use recruits because they're impacted the same as adults?
    - Good indicator of what has happened to that population.
- Can we compare barramundi somewhere else?
  - InfoFish reflects that barramundi habitat is low, cannot compare it to somewhere with a place of high barramundi occupancy
- Once they develop a new method for treatment, will that change their ongoing sampling?
  - Discussion to be had with InfoFish – response should be positive as we are not asking for a great shift in method.
- Do recruits have more vulnerability than adult fish? – Ian and John Gunn to follow up with Fish Health Experts
- Spending a lot of money on scientific systems and not as much on intense data gathering, can you reassure us that enough is being completed to get the monitoring done?
  - \$700,000 already allocated last year, these are new monies requested for this year - Statistics are very complicated, balance is reasonable as they are incremental costs – Paul to provide at next meeting a table detailing costs over all 3 years
- Does the coral monitoring take on what coral has been where and how coral will improve in the future?
  - This is about the living coral habitat and whether it is changing, may use past monitoring to come up with a baseline
- Happy with the mangrove monitoring data from GPC?
  - Data cannot be changed but can be modified to suit our methods
- How much are we spending on fish health monitoring?
  - \$750,000 with additional money budgeted for this year
- Fish Health Workshops to be reported on and presented back to Management Committee
- We haven't spent anything substantial on fish health monitoring and have a large sum set aside for it?
  - Only expenditure has been on workshop to agree on approach and then figure out how to move forward with that approach. Original quote to broad scale fish health monitoring would be \$1.1million – a lot of money set aside because of the work needed to gather data
- Why is it important for additional sediment data to be collected?
  - Deemed to be higher risk issues in terms of the health of the harbour which aren't being monitored by PCIMP. We have discussed with PCIMP if the additional items that need to be measure (PAHs) can be monitored – response has been positive
- No change in contributions except for reduction in State and Federal contributions – reduction due to lack of availability/restraints

- Qld Government Membership Contribution –cannot confirm amount until after Qld government budget released
- **Draft Budget for GHHP 2015/16 approved by all MC members.**

#### 4.2 Process for approving final Reports for Science Projects

Process for approving final Reports for Science Projects was discussed.

##### Management Committee Comments/Questions

- If we reject the report does it go back to the ISP? Yes. Another step/arrow to be added to include report coming back to MC after handed back to ISP to approve for release.
- Grammatical errors need to be addressed in reports
- Seagrass and Cultural Social Economic reports are approved to release on website, Paul to receive comments from John Sherriff Connectivity Report (ISP007) before approval.

#### 4.3 Report Card Format

The 2015 Report Card format was outlined and discussed.

The following changes were suggested by a Partner:

- We should be dealing specifically with things such as turtle management and “did you know?” section
- Contribution of pipeline to reducing discharges into harbour
- Include rainfall statistics – directly contributes to water quality
- Worth having an introduction? Purpose of Report Card
- Claire to send through Mackay mock up for Stewardship
- Equal weighting of components if writing is split into 4 sections? Does the space provided allow for enough explanation of components – refer to technical reports and website
- Confidence bars are there but not used in current mock up

### **Agenda Item 5 – Items for Noting**

#### 5.1 Citizen Science Project Update

Noted.

#### 5.2 Stewardship Project Update

Noted.

### **Agenda Item 6 - General / Recurring Business**

Next Meeting: Partnership meeting 18 May 2015.  
MC meeting 20 July 2015

Meeting closed at 3:10pm.

## Meeting Actions Register: GHHP and MC

(Once actions have been endorsed as complete in the meeting outcomes, they will be deleted from the list)

Action Number	Action	Who is responsible?	When it is due?	Status	Notes
<b>MC Meeting 7</b>					
<b>MC7.5</b>	Discuss with Science Team about the integration of the Stewardship work with the Report Card.	Science Team and GHHP Secretariat	ASAP	<b>Ongoing</b>	
<b>MC Meeting 9</b>					
<b>MC9.3</b>	Circulate GHHP Columns and GHHP media releases to the MC following the Chair's approval.	GHHP Secretariat (RS)	ASAP	<b>Ongoing</b>	
<b>MC9.6</b>	Circulate updated Communications Plan to the Management Committee.	GHHP Comms Contractor	ASAP	<b>Ongoing</b>	Communications Plan is being addressed regularly through updates on activities, such as the GHHP Community Engagement Strategy, and Report Card Feedback Process.
<b>MC Meeting 12</b>					
<b>MC 12.3</b>	Investigation of policies and procedures to monitor and set up a GHHP Facebook Group	GHHP Comms Contractor		<b>Underway</b>	Comms team to discuss with Claire Andersen policies used for Reef Facts Facebook page.
<b>MC Meeting 13</b>					
<b>MC 13.1</b>	Do recruits have more vulnerability than adult fish?	Chair, ISP			Contact John Gunn (Mackay)
<b>MC 13.2</b>	Table detailing line item costs since inception	Chair, GHHP			
<b>MC 13.3</b>	Release ISP 007 Connectivity report	Chair, GHHP			comments from John Sherriff Connectivity Report (ISP007) before approval