



# Darwin Harbour Advisory Committee

## MINUTES FOR MEETING 9

9 May 2005

9.00am – 12.00pm

Meeting Room 1, Darwin City Council Building, Harry Chan Ave, Darwin

### 1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

#### Present:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Ms Annie Andrews	Business and industry
Mr Chris Makepeace	Amateur Fishermen's Association of the NT
Mr John Bailey	Independent chairperson
Mr Alastair Black	Darwin Port Corporation
Mr Brendan Dowd	Local government interests
Ms Adele Pedder	Environment Centre of the NT
Ms Liza Schenkel	Landcare
Ms Kira Schlusser	Project Coordinator, Darwin Harbour Regional Plan of Management
Professor Bob Wasson	Charles Darwin University
Mr Chris Young	Shipping and transport industry

#### Apologies:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Ms Donna Odegaard	Larrakia Nation Aboriginal Corporation
Ms Christine Truarn	Horticultural/agricultural interests

Mr Bailey welcomed the members of the Darwin Harbour Advisory Committee (DHAC). He introduced Mr Chris Makepeace, who had been recently appointed by Minister Burns to represent the Amateur Fishermen's Association, and replaced Mr John Harrison.

Mr Bailey announced the following projects had been funded by the NT Government for 2005-06:

1. The communication strategy
2. Post doctoral research fellow position for developing the conceptual model
3. Indigenous involvement in monitoring, planning and management in the Darwin Harbour area.
4. Identifying significant environments in the Darwin Harbour area.

He said that total funding requested for the above projects totalled \$350K, but \$300K had been allocated. The project coordinator would find out whether Treasury had allocated a specific amount to each project or whether a lump sum had been provided, which could be allocated according to priorities.

The chairman tabled two copies of the ConocoPhillips *Mangrove Monitoring Programme 2003-2004 Annual Report*. Copies would remain with the DHAC and could be borrowed by members as required.

**ACTION**

The project coordinator will find out the status of funding for individual projects.

**PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

**2. ACCEPTANCE OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

Moved: Ms Liza Schenkel

Seconded: Mr Brendan Dowd

**3. ACTION SHEET AND STATUS REPORT**

Members noted the action sheet, the status report of projects and the work program to date.

Ms Pedder confirmed that she was continuing to prepare questions on the proposed Glyde Point development.

The Project Coordinator reported that a briefing on the Helium plant proposal had been organised for late May and a date would be confirmed as soon as possible.

**ACTION**

1. Ms Pedder will forward questions regarding the proposed Glyde Point development when completed.
2. Ms Schlusser would continue to follow up a specific date for a briefing on the proposed helium plant.

**4. CORRESPONDENCE**

Correspondence noted.

**5. FINANCIAL REPORT**

Members noted the financial statement.

**6. ECOSYSTEM MONITORING GROUP (EMG)**

Mr Bailey informed members that the tender process for reviewing the report on past and current monitoring in the region, prepared by Mr Jeff Morgan, was underway. The successful tenderer was expected to be announced within a few weeks. Professor Wasson wanted information about the nature of the review and requested a copy of the tender document.

**ACTION**

The Project Coordinator will provide Professor Wasson a copy of the tender documentation for the EMG review report as soon as possible.

**7. ECOSYSTEM RESEARCH GROUP (ERG)**

Professor Wasson expressed concern about any possible cut in funding for the development of the conceptual model project, which he said would impact on the ability to attract a post doctoral research fellow to Darwin. He said one of the important outcomes generated by the ERG workshop and resulting report, prepared by the consultants Drs Barry Newell and Katrina Proust, was the need to focus on one or two specific aspects of the model. However, unless someone could be attracted to the position with suitable funding then the work could not proceed.

**8. INDIGENOUS WORKING GROUP (IWG)**

Mr Bailey reported that the IWG had met for the first time on 12 April and he had chaired the meeting. Working group members had agreed to consult and announce who would be chairperson of the IWG at the next meeting. Mr Bailey said he understood Ms Donna Odegaard had been nominated as interim chairperson and the matter of an on-going chairperson would be discussed at the next meeting.

He said the IWG meeting had focussed on the need to develop protocols and guidelines for consulting with the indigenous community in the Darwin Harbour region and the need to genuinely engage indigenous people in training and employment.

The next meeting would be held on 24 May 2005, when Professor Wasson and Dr Townsend, who chair the ERG and EMG respectively, would present their group's work to the IWG.

**9. ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN PRESENTATION**

Mr Dowd briefed the committee on Darwin City Council's Environmental Management Plan (EMP). He said the management plan was based on sub catchments in the Darwin Shire and was available on Darwin City Council's website. An Environmental Management System had also been developed within Council.

Mr Dowd said an EMP advisory committee had been formed to provide advice on developing the EMP and would continue to play a role in validating, evaluating and interpreting scientific information.

## 10. GLYDE POINT PROPOSAL PRESENTATION

Members wanted information about why the Glyde Point proposal was being undertaken at this point in time. They expressed concern that the way the proposal was being developed lacked transparency and it appeared proactive input and feedback from the community had not been sought.

Members also agreed, however, that the committee should advise the Minister on how the proposal should be developed, if it were to go ahead. In particular, the committee would recommend that the Government *not* follow the process undertaken for the waterfront development, in which a generic EIS had been undertaken and then had to be followed by amendments to the project due to public disagreement with aspects of the proposal.

Members also expressed concern about the EIS process in relation to the proposed Glyde Point development and that it needed to be better thought out.

Members agreed the Glyde Point proposal would be used as a case study to define issues for comment, determine how to move ahead and where the community and DHAC fit into the process.

The project coordinator would prepare a background paper. This paper should include background notes, concerns about process, in the light of how to deal with future projects, particularly with respect to how the different branches within Government should engage with DHAC, the Minister and the CEO's.

### **ACTIONS**

1. The project coordinator will prepare a discussion paper on the proposal that will be used as the basis for discussion at subsequent meetings
2. The project coordinator will find out when the EIS is planned to go ahead
3. Members will workshop the issue over the next few meetings

## 11. STORM WATER STRATEGY UPDATE

Mr Michael Lawton addressed the committee on the status of the storm water strategy. He said various target groups had been consulted and their comments incorporated into the draft document. Mr Lawton said he was hoping the committee could review the draft plan so that it could be presented to Minister Scrymgour as soon as possible.

Following the Minister's approval the next stage would be at least a five-week public display phase, after which the draft plan would be made ready for submission to Cabinet, hopefully for the end of June.

Committee members expressed concern about the general lack of feedback and information to the committee while the draft plan was being developed.

They also expressed concern that there was still no information available and were expected to provide a quick response of five working days for a document they have yet to receive.

Nevertheless, to expedite matters committee members agreed that the project coordinator would email the draft strategy to DHAC members as soon as it was received and Mr Dowd would provide comments on the draft strategy to the project coordinator for circulation to members within a few days of receiving the document. Members would then provide any further comments to the project coordinator who would incorporate them and email the product to members for a final check prior to submitting it to Mr Lawton at OEH.

Mr Lawton also said he would provide financial expenditure figures, as been requested by the committee, shortly.

#### **ACTIONS**

1. Once Mr Lawton provides a copy of the draft storm water strategy the project coordinator will email it to members of the committee.
2. Mr Dowd will review the strategy and provide comments to the project coordinator within a few days, who will email those comments to all members.
3. Members will provide any further comments to the project coordinator within a day or two and she will incorporate them into Mr Dowd's response.
4. The project coordinator will then email that version of comments to members prior to submitting the comments document to Mr Lawton with the whole process taking five working days.

## **12. HUDSON CREEK BOAT RAMP PROPOSAL**

The project coordinator explained that an update on the proposed boat ramp at Hudson Creek would be available once the consultant had finished their report. She said that she had been informed Mr Neville Jones, Executive Director, Land Development in DIPE would contact the committee with an update when the information was available. Mr Makepeace, AFANT, raised some issues regarding the proposed boat ramp, which would be followed up for the next meeting.

Further information on the proposed Hudson Creek boat ramp would be available once the consultant had completed their report and Mr Neville Jones, Executive Director, Land Development would contact the committee with further information.

#### **ACTIONS**

1. The project coordinator will follow up the latest development concept plan for the region.
2. The project coordinator will find out what existing land use plans are current for the area and a summary paper or a briefing on how these plans fit into the Darwin Harbour region.

### **13. COMMUNICATION WITH GOVERNMENT AGENCIES**

Members considered the background paper prepared by the project coordinator and agreed that the chairman should meet with the CEO's of each of the relevant organisations responsible for implementing the plan of management.

#### **ACTION**

Mr Bailey and Ms Schlusser would arrange to meet the CEO's of the relevant organisations responsible for implementing actions in the plan of management and report back to the committee.

### **14. SELF EVALUATION DIALOGUE**

Members agreed to hold a workshop to review where the committee had been, what was needed to be changed, to determine a strategy for where it wanted to go and how to get there. Mrs Samantha Fox would be invited to report on the results of her PhD on coastal management. Someone suitable from the Moreton Bay partnership would be invited to speak about their experiences in Moreton Bay, which was considered to be one of the more successful committees involved with coastal management. A facilitator would be engaged to run the workshop and the subsequent planning session.

Members agreed to aim for a date in early August 2005.

#### **ACTION**

The project coordinator will organise a workshop for early August.

### **15. ANNUAL STATUS REPORT**

Members agreed with the overall structure of the status report provided by the project coordinator. Members commented that they wanted to see a reflection on what has been achieved, future directions and a need to reprioritise the actions in the five-year plan of management, most of which have starting dates in the first two years of the plan's implementation.

### **BUSINESS ARISING**

#### **16. ATTENDANCE AT PRESENTATIONS AND MEETINGS**

Members agreed that visitors could accompany members to meetings and briefings provided it was limited to one or two people and that the project coordinator was notified for planning purposes.

#### **17. MONITORING IN DARWIN HARBOUR**

Professor Wasson said that the EMG process of reviewing past and current monitoring and working through a qualitative risk assessment exercise had been useful in terms of feeding into the ERG project.

However, he wanted to ensure that the monitoring work being undertaken by AIMS, which has one more year to run, is continued and was concerned it would not be.

Members agreed that the project coordinator should organise a meeting between Professor Wasson, Dr Townsend, Mr Bailey and Mr Darryl Day from Power Water to find a possible solution to the otherwise likely cessation of phytoplankton and other monitoring in some parts of Darwin Harbour.

**ACTION**

The project coordinator will organise a meeting as outlined above.

**18. SITTING FEES**

Members agreed that since Ms Odegaard was not being paid to represent Larrakia Nation that she would be paid sitting fees at the standard rate for meetings she attends.

**19. PROPOSED BARRAMUNDI AQUACULTURE FACILITY**

Mr Bailey summarised the meeting some of the members had had with Mr Robert Kennedy and Mr Dean Lukin regarding a barramundi aquaculture facility using floating cages, which they hoped to operate in Darwin Harbour.

**ACTION**

The project coordinator will request an electronic copy of the proposal from Mr Glen Schipp, DBIRD, and email it to members of the committee.

**20. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held Monday 6 June 2005.