



## GHHP Partnership Meeting Minutes 10

**Date:** Wednesday 30 November 2016

**Time:** 10:30am to 12:30pm

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

Attendees		
Name	Position	Organisation
Mr Paul Birch (Chair)	CEO	Fitzroy Basin Association
Mr Christian Crosby	Proxy for Mr Rod Duke	Santos GLNG
Mr Brenton Hawtin	General Manager - Operations	GLNG
Ms Angela Stokes		Australian Government Department of Environment
Mr Patrick Hastings	CEO	Gladstone Industry Leadership Group Ltd.
Mr John Sherriff	General Manager Safety Environment & Risk	Gladstone Ports Corporation
Councillor Desley O'Grady	GRC Environment Portfolio	Gladstone Regional Council
Mr Peter Ritchie	Orica Yarwun Site Manager	Orica Australia
Ms Patrice Brown		CQG Consulting
Ms Marilyn Steel		QGC
Professor Owen Nevin	Associate Vice-Chancellor Gladstone Region	Central Queensland University
Ms Anja Urban	Proxy for Mr Ross Greenhalgh	Queensland Alumina Ltd
Mr Trent Attard	Proxy for Mr Phil Randall	Wiggins Island Coal Export Terminal
Mr Ian Coad		Boyne Smelters Limited
Mr Jim Grayson		Gladstone Area Water Board
Mr Michael Dunstan		Queensland Alumina Ltd
Mr John Abbott		NRG Gladstone Operating Services
Mr Andrew Tapsall		QGC
Mr Peter Brady	Member	Gladstone Regional Environmental Advisory Network (GREAN)
Ms Kirsten Kenyon	Proxy for Ms Claire Andersen	Queensland Government Department of Environment and Heritage Protection
Mr Peter O'Sullivan	CEO	Gladstone Ports Corporation
Dr John Rolfe	Chair	GHHP Independent Science Panel
Dr Mark Schultz	Science Team	GHHP
Dr Uthpala Pinto	Science Team	GHHP
Mrs Lyndal Hansen	Director, Armana	GHHP Communication Team
Ms Crystal McGregor	Director, Armana	GHHP Communication Team
Ms Maddy Willey	Secretariat	GHHP

<b>Apologies</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Mr John Linden	Queensland Energy Resources
Mayor Matthew Burnett	Gladstone Regional Council
The Hon Steven Miles MP	Minister of Environment Heritage Protection Queensland Government
Mr Jim Singer	Rio Tinto

### **Agenda Item 1 - Introduction**

The Chair welcomed Partners and provided a brief outline of the agenda. Acknowledgement of Country was read.

### **Agenda Item 2 – Reports**

#### **2.1 Previous Minutes and Actions**

The following amendments were recommended for the previous minutes:

- Councillor Desley O’Grady - update
- Action: deliver scope of works for the International Waterway Symposium – action was performed and is now complete
- Joe Rea – Boyne Smelter Ltd.
- Update Owen Nevin details

#### **2.3 Media and Communications Report**

The Media and Communications team presented a slideshow presentation on the communications activities undertaken.

### **Agenda Item 3 – Items requiring decision**

#### **3.1 Adoption of 2016 Report Card**

ISP Chair, John Rolfe, presented the 2016 report card to Partners.

The ISP Chair advised that while the environmental grade had remained the same, the score has decreased. The decrease was attributed to the exclusion of connectivity as it was deemed a driver, not a measure of health, and the inclusion of the fish recruitment indicator.

Dr. Rolfe acknowledged the inclusion of the new cultural health indicator group, Indigenous Cultural Heritage. The ISP Chair explained the way in which the new indicator group was measured. The lower cultural health grade was attributed to the inclusion of the new indicator group and its low score.

Dr. Rolfe noted that the way in which social and economic health were measured had not changed since last year and advised of indicator group scores. The rise in social health grade was attributed to a small change in indicator scores.

The Chair, Paul Birch, advised on all other elements of the report card.

*Partners Comments/Questions*

- A question was raised about the grade for economic performance as the indicator grades varied largely but was still graded an A overall
  - There is a higher weighting on shipping activity as it is the most representative indicator of the health of economic performance
- Habitats scores relies on seagrass and coral only – is this a true indicator of the health when seagrass and corals aren't within all zones?
  - Executive summary and technical report detail changes within indicator scores
- Trends over time are of interest to the Partners but how do we measure these when measures change each year. Needs more wording around the communication of why trends are unable to be represented.
  - Trends in grades are presented – we need to be clear in our explanation to the community that we are constantly adding indicators and we can't compare things that are not the same
  - We don't have any conversation about any data before 2012 – this is only the second full report card, as we progress we will be able to show trends from year to year
  - 2017 will be a year of change as the whole process goes under review so the Partnership can evolve and grow
  - Feedback from other stake holders outside of the membership group
    - Comments back from report card groups all over QLD has been exceptional. The general public are generally accepting of the report card.
  - Trends can only be demonstrated when the same things are being compared
- Connectivity is a model to predict how nutrients or particles move through the harbour under different conditions. It is something that is important as baseline information to understand how different parts of the harbour are linked together
- Difference between ecological and contaminant connectivity
  - Containments are not widely spread across the harbour, hence the high score – low loads of contaminants and no events to make them disperse around the harbour
  - Ecological connectivity relates to coral spawn or seagrass seeds moving around the harbour – no major event this year
- How are the cultural indicator groups weighted?
  - Focus groups were run with the community to establish weightings in cultural and social and some economic indicators. The weighting is not quite even – sense of place is weighted 53% and Indigenous Cultural Heritage is weighted 47%. The weighting is to go under review in 2017
- Inclusion of fish recruitment with such little data – could it just be included as commentary?
  - We have enough data to get an accurate statistical model but it is recognised that we only have 5 years of data with major events in the past years so there is caution about saying the model is perfect. The data is good but still needs to be develop in years to come – not as robust as water and sediment quality data.
  - Since 2012 the most commonly asked question has been in regards to fish – inclusion demonstrates we are making a start on it and not neglecting it or covering anything up.
- Areas where zones are better, any specific reason?
  - Mid and outer harbour are – coral is only present in 2 zones and seagrass in 6 zones and they scored low and has pulled the whole score down.

- There's no weightings within the environmental scores so habitats tend to pull the scores down – weightings were discussed with MC and ISP but was decide to not weigh indicators as it had not been done previously but would go under review in 2017
- Community may perceive this wrong – but can be communicated

The Partnership agreed to adopt the 2016 report card.

The Chair advised the report card will be released to the public in the first two weeks of February 2017.

### 3.2 Adoption of Technical Report/Executive Summary

The ISP Chair presented the 2016 Executive Summary and advised.

#### *Partners Comments/Questions*

- What are the guidelines for habitats and fish?
  - There are no guidelines – the guideline values are a mix of comparisons between scores and historic values (seagrass) or GBR values (corals)
  - Are expectations of habitat health taken into account – is it compared against its optimum position
    - It's scored against the comparison metric
  - Are the low scores alarming?
    - The positive message is that water and sediment won't get much better than what it is, habitats are low but will take time to recover. Low figures of habitats are alarming but they are the facts. Promises can't be made that recovery is definite. Recruitment is high and gives hope of improvement.
  - Inclusion of more habitats for zones that don't record seagrass or coral
    - Possible inclusion of more habitats will form part of the review
- PAHs removed in report card as they recorded very low level – this is recorded in the technical report
- A Partner reported PCIMP stated at their AGM that a technical review would take place between GHHP and PCIMP before the report card release
  - Meeting took place between GHHP science team and PCIMP
  - PCIMP want to know what has become of their data – meeting to take place
- ISP has discussed asking sub-contracted organisations to detail how they will do trend analysis
- Is there explanation from PCIMP about low nutrient scores
  - It's not really within the PCIMP charter to do so – there isn't a model to explain nutrients and how they pass through the harbour
  - Nutrients usually come from agriculture but other things can attribute to low scores
  - Nutrient scores may have been effected by rainfall
- Coral scores are collected by AIMS and are compared against inshore reef scores
- How many sites per zone is the fish recruitment data collected
  - Generally there are 3 to 4 sites per zone, but in some zones there are only 1 or 2 sites. The casts are done under the same time and conditions, usually after a full moon when recruitment is high
- Crabs for 2017
  - ISP are working towards getting this in but the data is hard to collect as it is reliant upon crabbers filling out log sheets
  - Tender has gone out but is yet to be finalised

- In the interests of transparency, it would be good to have some information around weightings of economic performance? Noted

The Partnership agreed to adopt the 2016 executive summary and technical report.

The Chair noted that the technical report will be released in the first two weeks of February 2017.

### 3.3 Adoption of 2015/16 Financial Statements

The Chair tabled the 2015/15 financial statements and advised.

- Previous ISP Chair was contracted prior to GHHP – Contract with new Chair to decrease salary by 50%
- Reduction of wage value due to vacancy of the science convenor position

The Partnership agreed to adopt the 2016 Financial Statements

### 3.4 Adoption of 2015/16 Annual Report

The Chair tabled the 2015/16 Annual Report and advised.

#### *Partner Comments/Questions*

- Change ISP comprised of 9 members should be changed to 11 on highlights page

The Partnership agreed to adopt the 2016 Annual report

### **Agenda Item 4 – General/recurring business**

One Partner raised the point of a review of the whole Partnership to ensure that after 3-4 years of operations, we are meeting our outcomes, or if we need to reassess our outcomes. Issues regarding context, ensuring that what we are doing is of value and is aligning with the other report cards.

#### *Partners Comments/Questions*

- There are a lot of similarities between report cards – in terms of a model, the other report cards are built on what Gladstone has set up
- A project of this size and complexity requires a review
- What is the next step in terms of management response to the results we get over time
  - A fair portion of that comes from being able to identify trends
- Needs to be identified if we have met other outcomes that we did not originally set out to achieve
- ISP are working towards reviewing which can contribute to the external review

Meeting closed: 12:25pm

Action Number	Action	Who is responsible?	When it is due?	Status	Notes
<b>Partnership Meeting 10</b>					
<b>P 10.1</b>	John Rolfe and Owen Nevin to organise PCIMP and GHHP Science Team Meeting	John Rolfe, Owen Nevin	Before release of RC		
<b>P 10.2</b>	Peter Brady to raise subject of reviewing a process to explain nutrient scores at next MC	Peter Brady	Before next MC meeting		

Action Number	Action	Who is responsible?	When it is due?	Status	Notes
P 10.3	Management Committee to agree on formal process to regarding governance review	MC	12 months		