



Management Committee Meeting 20 Minutes

Date: Wednesday 1 November 2016 **Time:** 9:00am to 3:00pm

Location: Leo Zussino Building, CQ University Gladstone Campus

Attendees

| Name | Position | Organisation |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Community | | |
| Mr Paul Birch (Chair) | CEO | Fitzroy Basin Association |
| Mr Peter Brady | Management Committee Representative | Gladstone Region Environmental Advisory Network |
| Government | | |
| Mr Greg Greene | Manager, Reef Coordination and Partnerships | Department of Environment and Heritage Protection |
| Ms Michelle Nelson | Proxy for Ms Angela Stokes | Department of Environment |
| Councillor Rick Hansen | Proxy for Councillor Desley O'Grady | Gladstone Regional Council |
| Industry | | |
| Mr Patrick Hastings | CEO | Gladstone Industry Leadership Group |
| Mr John Sherriff | General Manager, Safety Environment & Risk | Gladstone Ports Corporation |
| Mr Andrew Tapsall | | QGC |
| Research | | |
| Prof. Owen Nevin | Associate Vice-Chancellor | Central Queensland University |
| ISP Members | | |
| Dr John Rolfe | Chair | GHHP Independent Science Panel |
| Dr Nadine Marshall | Member | GHHP Independent Science Panel |
| Dr Melissa Dobbie | Member | GHHP Independent Science Panel |
| Other Attendees | | |
| | | |
| Ms Crystal McGregor | Media and Communication Team | Amarna Consulting |
| Mrs Lyndal Hansen | Media and Communication Team | Amarna Consulting |
| Ms Maddy Willey | Secretariat | GHHP |
| Dr Uthpala Pinto | Science Team | GHHP |
| Dr Mark Schultz | Science Team | GHHP |

Agenda Item 2 – Joint ISP/MC

ISP Chair, Dr John Rolfe, provided the 2016 Gladstone Harbour Report Card Draft results.

2.1 Social Indicators

ISP Chair noted that there was very little change in social health indicators for the 2016 report card; the component will include 22 measures and 8 indicators. The CATI telephone interview was used again to compile the data for the social health indicator groups. The ISP Chair presented results for each indicator, including previous data from 2014, 2015 and why scores may have changed. It was noted that ISP would like to refrain from stating when scored showed minor increases/decreases.

Social health results for harbour access showed that survey respondents were mostly satisfied with the level of access to the harbour, most recent trip and quality of ramps and facilities.

The ISP's confidence rating in the social health results remains high. The ISP Chair outlined issues and the methodologies that contributed to this confidence rating.

MC Comments/Questions

- There is no definitive number for when the ISP believe a change should be reported – instead the ISP would like to report on significant changes/trends over time and when significant changes in scores occur.
- The bias in the CATI survey was addressed as older people are over-represented – the ISP Chair explained that this was because the survey can only be conducted through landline calls and cannot be done via mobile phones.
- The results from the CATI survey and feedback from GHHP community consultation – the Communications team stated that these mostly correlate.
- Capturing the feelings of under 18 – it's hard to capture the feelings because of the ethics of the survey; in future years web-based surveys will be looked at so as to create a database of young people in town to take a sample of for surveying purposes.

The Management Committee agreed to adopt the social health results for the 2016 report card.

2.2 Economic Indicators

The ISP reported no change to the methodology and measures; 11 measures and 8 indicators were used to test the economic health for the 2016 report card. Data for economic performance were collected through various secondary sources. Again, the ISP Chair presented results for each indicator, including previous data from 2014, 2015 and why scores may have changed. The ISP Chair noted some issues on how tourism data was collected. The ISP Chair pointed out a substantial decrease in value in fishing in Gladstone; there are some issues that reduce the ISP's confidence in the commercial fishing data, but they have followed the methodology that is consistent with previous years. The ISP believes that scores for economic stimulus measures reflect reality.

MC Comments/Questions

- Source of information – Queensland Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
 - GPC data from DAF database is different – the database is not systematic, so the ISP has taken the data they have been given.
- Determining the weightings of the indicators – three years ago with original scoping exercises, CSIRO repeated this community group and a group of experts and policy makers. The weighting exercise is due to be updated next year.
- Have cruise ships data been factored in to tourism data – tourism is largely based on visitor number and bed nights; issues have been identified in these measures and will be addressed.
- Shipping activity is not necessarily effective of the economic value – GPC do a breakdown on commodities and value of shipping; it is flagged in confidence rating that breaking the shipping activity up may be an option.
- What would happen if the unemployment figures to employment figures as unemployment figures remain stable while employment figures rise and fall more dramatically; when people become unemployed the leave Gladstone.
- Is a comment relative around why recreation fishing scores have decreased, but the value of recreational fishing has decreased – satisfaction has declined; there needs to be some justification around why the value has increased but the score has decreased.
- Why are we including a measure based on satisfaction in an economic indicator – economics should be based on figures; this is the way the indicator has been measured for 2 years but is something that needs to be included in a review.

- Why is the confidence rating high when there are a lot of issues – the shipping component makes up more than 80% of the weighting so the issues are within the two indicators that do not carry a heavy weighting.
- An issue surrounding missing values from 2005 should not be included as we do not want to make comment on anything before 2012 – baselines are based on a ten year average. Remove the year from which the values are missing from and instead just state that they are missing.
- Does there need to be a narrative around the steadiness of the economic grade from 2015 to 2016 – narrative will be easier this year than last year but it needs to be stated that the report card is a reflection of the harbour and not a reflection Gladstone.

The ISP's confidence rating in the economic health results is high. The ISP Chair outlined issues and the methodologies that contributed to this confidence rating.

The Management Committee agreed to adopt the cultural health results for the 2016 report card.

2.3 Cultural Indicators

The cultural component has changed dramatically with the inclusion of the Indigenous Cultural Heritage indicator. Sense of place methodology remains unchanged from previous year. The ISP Chair presented results for each indicator, including previous data from 2015 and why scores may have changed. Indigenous Cultural Heritage is very new and is hard to verify against what other people have done as it has not really been done before. Is assessed in two ways – identifying heritage sites and assessing them, management strategies across 5 zones within the harbour and assessed them at a zone level in terms of protection, land use and cultural maintenance. The biggest challenge within the Indigenous Cultural Heritage indicator is the engagement with the Indigenous community. Involvement between Peter Brockhurst and Terra Rosa – became hard for Terra Rosa to maintain original enthusiasm. The ISP Chair noted that he had spoken to Peter Brockhurst and he was happy with the report, but for future year's the ISP will aim to have much more engagement with the Indigenous Elders. There are very mixed results across the four sites that were reported on under the Indigenous Cultural Heritage indicator. The good thing about the measures is that with extra protection, the scores can be improved. Maintaining the cultural record scores badly but can potentially be improved in the future with the involvement of the Indigenous community. The ISP Chair stated that there are no weightings behind this indicator. The ISP Chair believes that consultation with Peter Brockhurst will need to occur again before the report card is released, but consultation with Indigenous Elders also needs to occur.

MC Comments/Questions

- Protection for Gladstone Central is so poor but the spiritual and social values are so high; more knowledge and direct links to the site, whereas in the other sites there isn't a great historical linkage. The report would need to be consulted to understand why the scores are the way they are.
- There's no weighting between the sites and management strategy, but within in each zone they have taken the best site and rated the other sites against the best zone.
- Bayesian believe network is not used for Indigenous Cultural Heritage and does not include weightings – the mean is not used because there are low counts as opposed to social components that collect high counts from a whole community. Methodology is included in technical report.
- Terra Rosa plan to consult with Indigenous Elders to decide on weightings

The ISP's confidence rating in the cultural health results is moderate. The ISP Chair outlined issues and the methodologies that contributed to this confidence rating.

The Management Committee agreed to adopt the cultural health results for the 2016 report card.

2.4 Coral Indicators

The ISP Chair explained that there has been very little change in the approach to coral projects; methods are identical to 2015. The ISP Chair presented results for each indicator, including previous data from 2015. Scores have decreased since 2015. It was reported that the low scores are due to low coral cover and high cover of macroalgae at all sites. The poor conditions of coral are similar to the GBR report for the Fitzroy Region. The low scores in 2016 can be mostly attributed to increased macroalgal cover.

MC Comments/Questions

- Will core sampling occur in the future – AIMS have found suitable coral for core sampling and the next stage will be to do the sampling, with results to be available for next year.

2.5 Seagrass Indicators

The ISP Chair explained that there has been very little change in the approach to seagrass projects; methods are identical to 2015. The ISP Chair presented results for each indicator, including previous data from 2015. Results vary across the six harbour zones in which seagrass was monitored. Scores are mostly lower than last year – seagrass continues to be D but has dropped 8 points which can be largely contributed to low scores in the Inner Harbour and low biomass. There is still hope for improvements in the future.

MC Comments/Questions

- Do we benchmark just with the Fitzroy Region – benchmark could occur all the way up the coast and there wouldn't be much change in the score.
- Doing orthographic work to measure dugong feeding trails; there's always been a concern with biomass and including a lot of other factors.

2.6 Fish and Crab Indicators

The third subcomponent in the environmental indicator. There was a project run for fish recruitment that included cast netting across several sites in 12 of the 13 zones. Fish recruitment will be the first indicator group to be included with fish health and mudcrabs still being developed. The cast netting included many different species but bream was the most common species that was caught. The pattern of how the fish vary across the zones and years was analysed. Historical data is not great but data from last year is very robust so in future year's data around fish recruitment will become better. The scores generated come out of a statistical model that uses historical and zone data to predict the scores for 2016. It is the only way to generate scores as there is not enough data to create a baseline without a 10 year average. The models work well when the data is pooled. The numbers are consistent with the score for the whole of harbour. Fish recruitment scores a D for 2016; three of the zones score a C. The ISP's focus is on explaining that this is a first year project that will get better with time.

MC Comments/Questions:

- Long term average is over 5 years but is not as detailed as the last year; half of the data is historic and half is from last year
- How do we interpret the data and how will the public interpret the data – the assumption with the indicator and why it comes out like this will be huge
- Cast netting depends on like – if you can consistently sample over several years then the data will be better; as we collect more historical data the ISP's confidence in the results will increase. Historic data is not developed
- Source of historical data – Bill Sawynok

- Will Outer Harbour always be excluded – no suitable habitats
- Indicator should be called 'Fish' if it is only going to include fish and not crabs
 - 'Fish and Crabs' may be a useful way to deflect as it will be easier to explain that the indicator is still in its infancy stages;
 - Fish and Crabs were in last year with grey spots to indicate that they are not included in this year's report card

2.7 Water and Sediment Indicators

The ISP Chair explained that there has been very little change in the approach to water quality projects. The ISP Chair presented results for each indicator. Water quality data is recorded quarterly, while sediment data is recorded annually. Presentation of comparison of scores does not include 2015 results, but instead the increase/decrease from the 2015 score. The ISP recommends that the arrows be removed from the tables and to downplay the change in scores. Chlorophyll-a has been included for the first time, while ammonia, NOx and Orthophosphates are still not included because the limit of reporting is greater than guideline values. Water quality received a B grade.

The ISP Chair explained that there has been very little change in the approach to sediment quality projects. The ISP Chair presented results for each indicator. Sediment continues to score very high. Sediment nutrients have not been included as there is no relevant guideline available. Sediment mercury is not included because limit of reporting is greater than guideline values.

MC Comments/Questions

- The MC would like to see historical changes in the scores – the ISP is concerned that where there very little changes in scores there is a perception that things are getting better or worse when a notable change hasn't actually occurred.
- Arrows should not be used unless there is a change in grade – ISP would be comfortable with arrows indicating a change in grade but not when changes do not affect the score.
- Could include 2016 score, 2015 score and if the grade has changed then an arrow could be used.
- Arrows not used for other component scores when reporting 2016 and 2015 results – the ISP do not see the value in having arrows when changes are so minor.
- Arrows confuse the message when the grade has remained the same.
- Turbidity in Western Basin has a large job, does this correspond with seagrass – the current levels of turbidity in the harbour have not affect the light availability to seagrass as it grows in shallow waters.
- Dot point to be included that these scores are a lot better than the Fitzroy Region – results were compared previously; ISP need to ensure that we are measuring the same thing
- Executive summary needs to include a water and sediment results table

Overall Environmental Score

Cultural and environmental health scores are not comparable from 2015 to 2016 and have been hatched in the ISP's results graph.

MC Comments/Questions

- If we keep changing the perimeters in which we measure, will a comparison be possible – we need more data to be able to compare anyway. Trends may be available to report on next year.
 - Through the AIMS team, we can ask to run score cards with and without added measures.
- Measurements between each indicator vary greatly but don't hold different weightings. Water and sediment measurements won't change (26), while habitat will only ever have

8. Coral and seagrass won't improve for up to 5 years, but water and sediment could improve in 12 months.

- The ISP recommends to not weigh within the subcomponents. When you start weighting you have to decide which attributes are more important to environmental health. The DIMS team ran the data with weightings and without weightings according to what sub-components have the most data – scores change by 0.08 but does not change the score. The ISP feels that as soon as you start weighting the data according to what data you have makes it look like you are trying to alter results. If there is no change in grade than the weightings have no significance.
- If you weigh water quality high and it scores well while everything else continues to suffer, an output would still give a good environmental result.
- If there are changes, it looks bad to change now when scores for fish health and habitats are low – the ISP would like to stick with what we have currently and put it to a review.

The ISP's confidence rating in the environmental health results is moderate. The ISP Chair outlined issues and the methodologies that contributed to this confidence rating.

The Management Committee agreed to adopt the environmental health results for the 2016 report card.

Key Observations

MC Comments/Questions

- Cultural health - Indigenous Cultural Heritage inclusion
- Social health and economic performance
- Habitats
- Fish and crabs inclusion for 2016, but still needs to be developed in future years
- Water and sediment quality

Stewardship

The ISP would like the methodology to be reviewed. The problem that needs to be identified is the consequences of the breaches that are reported. It needs to be specified whether the breach is major or minor. There's lots of missing data because not everyone has responded or participated. 8 of the 11 industry groups took part in the survey, while only 3 completed it. Needs to be included in review.

2016 Report Card

The MC agreed to adopt the change in the report card for 'trends' to be 'changes'.

Agenda Item 4 - Reports

3.1 Previous Minutes and Actions

Noted.

3.2 – Science Program Report

The ISP Chair tabled the Science Program Report, and advised that projects are on track and running well.

Mud crab project is still with the ISP as the scope of works is in its late development stages with data collection to begin next year so as to be included in the 2017 report card.

Mangrove reports commissioned by ERMP – two reports done and have been waiting a while for the second one on the status of mangroves in the area (trends, baselines). The challenge is that

it is hard to measure mangroves and also that the program is no longer continuing. If mangroves were to be taken on, GHHP would have to do it themselves and start from scratch. The ISP will discuss a strategy at the first meeting next year and get something to the Management Committee, which would mean that mangroves would not be available for the 2017 report card.

The Science Team will include appendix A and an explanation in the technical report, including the ISP's recommendation that was accepted by the Management Committee.

MC Comments/Questions

- Gladstone Harbour Model – will it be able to be adjusted for the changes made to measure/indicator additions
 - Model is designed to sit next to the report card but isn't very closely based on the report card
 - Science would like to present the current model to the Management Committee so it can decide whether further investment is desirable to develop the model further
- Model should be ready after ISP review in two weeks and Science will work towards having it ready for the meeting on the 29th of November

3.3 Community Report

Peter Brady explained that the structure of GREAN has changed to include 6 groups and 3 appointed individuals. Further discussion will occur when Councillor O'Grady is present so that she can further explain the new structure of GREAN.

3.4 Finance Report

The GHHP Chair tabled the Finance Report, and advised.

The ISP would like contracts to go out earlier so that the projects commence earlier and the ISP are able to work through the reports earlier. The Chair advised that cash flow is not an issue and these are items already budgeted for, so as soon as the Science can contract, the projects can commence.

3.5 – Media and Communications Update

The Media and Communications team tabled their update, and advised.

Agenda Item 5 – Items requiring decision

5.1 2016 Gladstone Harbour Report Card (draft)

MC Comments/Questions

- Change arrows on zone map
 - Key observation: buttons are not comparable to last year as connectivity is out and fish and crabs are in
 - Link to be included on zone map to website for last year's results
- Introduction needs to include the purpose of the report card and that is ambitious and developing – more succinct

The Communications Team and Science Team will work on the Report Card for 2 weeks and circulate it to the Management Committee between 14 – 16 November, with comments to be provided by the 18th of November.

5.2 Hosting Arrangements

The Management Committee has decided to revise their scope of works and send it to the two parties that have shown interest in hosting GHHP to ensure the Management Committee are comfortable with the equity of the process.

5.3 Community Representative on MC

The Chair tabled the Community Representative paper that suggests community appoint a representative to be a proxy for Peter Brockhurst to ensure that three community representatives are present. It is recommended that GREAN nominate a second community representative while an Indigenous representative is found. The terms of reference state that one of the community representatives should be from an Indigenous group, however a proxy can be from a community representative.

The paper will be moved to the next Management Committee meeting and the Chair will report back.

5.4 GHHP Roadshow

The Chair tabled the GHHP Roadshow agenda paper, and the Communications Team advised.

It has come to the attention of the Science and Communications team that parties outside of Gladstone would be interested in the report card results, and also provides an opportunity to change the perception of Gladstone Harbour.

MC Comments/Questions

- Discussion with other Partnerships about the Roadshow as there could be some confusion around how the Gladstone Harbour report card fits into the grand scheme of things.
 - We want the attention to be on Gladstone Harbour, but there is intention to contact those Partnerships
 - Needs to be very focused on Gladstone Harbour and not report cards in general.
- An alternative to the symposium because we couldn't bring them in so we are going to them. Is also another way to deliver messages to future leaders (schools).
- Mini roadshow for the Gladstone Region
- Is there any benefit in leaving the Gladstone Region to circulate the report card – there's a huge perception outside the region that Gladstone Harbour is unhealthy

The Management Committee agreed for the Roadshow to take place in the Gladstone Region only. The Communications Team will revise the proposal with the inclusion of Management Committee comments.

5.5 Development of R scripts to calculate, aggregate and integrate cultural heritage indicators with GHHP Data and Information Management System

The Chair advised that Science reports will be circulated to the Management Committee requiring comment.

Agenda Item 7 – General/recurring business

Next meeting: 29th November 2016

Meeting closed: 2:30pm

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 |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------|-------|
| MC Meeting 16 | | | | | |
| MC 16.5 | Renegotiation of PCIMP contract | | | | |
| MC 16.6 | Negotiate data sharing agreement with GPC | | | | |
| MC Meeting 17 | | | | | |
| MC 17.2 | Col Chapman, Patrick Hastings and John Sherriff to work together to outline requirements for hosting | Col Chapman, Patrick Hastings and John Sherriff | | Ongoing | |
| MC 17.3 | Paul Birch, John Sherriff and Andrew Tapsall to provide guidance as to the nature and form of the proposed GHHP science review – teleconference within next 14 days. | Paul Birch, John Sherriff and Andrew Tapsall | Teleconference 15/2/16 | Ongoing | |
| MC Meeting 18 | | | | | |
| MC 18.2 | Partnership meeting to be included in Science timeline. ISP Chair to update and circulate. | ISP Chair | | | |
| MC 18.6 | Paul Birch, Patrick Hastings and State and Federal Government Representatives to form a working group to progress further enter discussions with the Fitzroy Partnership and to determine level of involvement and future recommendation to MC. | GHHP Chair, Patrick Hastings, Federal and State Government representatives | | | |
| MC Meeting 19 | | | | | |
| MC 19.2 | ISP0021 report to be amended that discussions will take place with PCIMP not GPC | Science Team | | | |
| MC Meeting 20 | | | | | |
| MC 20.1 | Communications Team to revise GHHP Roadshow proposal to stay within the Gladstone region and bring back to MC. | Communications Team | | | |
| MC 20.2 | Science Team to circulate 'R' Script papers to MC for comment | Science Team and MC | | | |