



**Port Hedland Industries Council**  
Community Industry Meeting

**Minutes**

Wednesday 25 August 2021  
3.00 pm

**VENUE**

The WEB Business Hub, Port Hedland

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Kirsty Danby (Chair)	PHIC
Tracey Garbin (Dep Chair)	Community
Gloria Jacob	Community
Jenna Dodge	PDC - Proxy
Deirdra Tindale	PHIC / Pilbara Ports Authority
Roger Higgins	PH Progress Assoc
Clinton Smith	Community
Joel Schreiber	Community
Jaylan Smith	PHIC / Fortescue
Chantel Cullen	PHIC
Jeanette Hasleby	PHIC / Roy Hill
Sam Arif	Care For Hedland
Patrik Mellberg	PHIC / BHP
Michelle Kivits	Ashburton Aboriginal Corp
Donna Curnow	North Regional TAFE
Nicholas Green	Kariyarra Aboriginal Corp
Daniel Barker	PHIC / Mineral Resources

<b>Apologies</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Kevin Michel, MP	Member for Pilbara
Trish Barron	Pilbara Development Commission
Mayor Peter Carter	ToPH
Claire Boyce	PHCCI
Morag Lowe	Community
Georgia Wells	Community

<b>Invitees</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Peter Franklin, Senior Scientific Officer	Department of Water Health
Philip Christy, GM Marine	Pilbara Ports Authority
Caiden Gray, Chairperson	Port Hedland Seafarers Centre
Karlene Bylund, Managing Director	Hedland Maritime Initiative

<b>Item</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting opened by Kirsty Danby 3.02pm</li> <li>- Acknowledgement of Country and recognition of the Kariyarra people as the Traditional Custodians of the land on which the CIF meets.</li> </ul>
<b>1.1 Introductions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CIF members provided an introduction of themselves and who they are representing (if applicable).</li> <li>- Resignation of an inaugural member Jim Henneberry representing Community. PHIC CEO &amp; members thanks Jim for his valuable contribution to the CIF.</li> <li>- Introduction of new members representing Kariyarra Aboriginal Corporation, Nicholas Green, CEO.</li> </ul>
<b>1.2 Confirmation of Minutes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alteration to the previous minutes 12 May 2021 requested by Roger Higgins – a query to DWER was not expressed the way it was intended. PHIC CEO and Roger to amend out of session. Agreed by members.</li> <li>- PHIC CEO notes that the minutes are sanitised and reviewed by presenters.</li> <li>- Remainder of PHIC CIF Minutes confirmed by Roger Higgins noting the minutes are very detailed and well done.</li> </ul>
<b>1.3 Governance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NA</li> </ul>
<b>2.0 PHIC Update</b>	<p><b>Ms Kirsty Danby provided an update the Port Hedland Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Network Hanover to DWER:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DWER has informed PHIC it is currently working to achieve transfer of the Port Hedland Ambient Air Quality Network this year.</li> <li>- PHIC will continue to maintain the Network and has a month-to-month contract in place with Ecotech to cover monitoring until DWER takes over responsibility of the Network.</li> <li>- PHIC remains committed to the ongoing maintenance of key Network sites to ensure the collection of robust and reliable air quality data for the Port Hedland region in the lead up to the transfer of the Network to DWER.</li> <li>- PHIC is committed to handing over the Network to DWER in good working order.</li> <li>- DWER have requested that an additional site is added to the Air Quality Network - taking the network monitors from 8 to 9. Known as the hospital site, this site has been included on the live monitoring network, it is technically not part of the PHIC Network, it is owned by BHP.</li> <li>- PHIC and BHP have agreed to DWER's request for the Hospital monitoring site to be transferred in addition to the eight monitors that make up the PHIC monitoring Network.</li> <li>- 2021 will be the last time PHIC presents the Annual Report to JTSI, in accordance with the Taskforce requirements. The following financial year will be reported by DWER. We are in the process of developing our Annual Report. The process is for Ecotech to provide all datasets to our independent consultants and air quality specialist, Katestone, who analyse the data and provide a copy of their results.</li> <li>- In the past financial year 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021 there was one exceedance of the air monitoring guidelines of 70 micrograms per cubic metre for Port Hedland on 3 October 2020. The exceedance was attributed to local industry source as well as a regional event.</li> <li>- Port users have invested heavily over the past decade in reducing dust emissions and this will continue.</li> <li>- Members remain committed to implementing leading dust mitigation practices in Port Hedland and will continue to work with the regulator on the development of best practice dust management guidelines for port operators.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion following the presentation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A member queried if there has been any discussion on whether the report format will be the same from DWER as it has been from PHIC. Will the data be the same as we have always had?</li> <li>- PHIC CEO replied she cannot guarantee that, it will be up to DWER. PHIC will try to influence that all level of data to PHIC members and the public remain the same.</li> </ul>
<b>3.0 Port Hedland Health Risk Assessment – what does risk mean?</b>	<p><b>Presentation from Peter Franklin, Senior Scientific Officer, WA Department of Health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussion following the presentation:</li> <li>- A member queried given the fact that the HRA from 2016, made recommendations that the national standard for PM10 is 50 micrograms, because the population is small we can increase that by 40% to 70 micrograms?</li> <li>- Peter replied that it (the HRA) didn't say we were going to increase it. It says that the difference between 70mg and 50mg was not noticeable as far as the health outcomes. There is no material difference in the burden of disease at the population level between 70mg and 50mg.</li> <li>- A member queried if there are no known threshold below which health affects are not observed, why has there not been any attempt to conduct a detailed survey of the population here since the HRA came out to see what affect on respiratory disease has changed in that time?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Peter replied because it is a small population we probably won't find anything. The numbers are too small and it would be hard to find a signal among the background noise (ie background levels of disease) because the risk from air pollution is low and the health effects have many different causes. For example, if 1 person attends hospital for respiratory issues a week, when one extra person attends the next week, it is already double, which is a big change and may be due to many reasons. Because you have such a small numerator, the increased number of the people with disease makes a big change compared with what happens if you have a million people. Because there are so many other reasons for hospitalisation, when we try to do these studies in small populations, there is so much variation that we find it hard to see a statistical change associated with dust. This then can work against the idea of dust having any affect and, therefore, there will be an argument that nothing needs to be done about dust levels. The HRA model showed how many health events we would expect to have in a small population and then the decision is whether that is acceptable.</li> <li>The HRA took the baseline health events in Port Hedland and modelled what would happen with the differences in dust levels at 50 and 70.</li> <li>The HRA was based on population risk. It is difficult to compare population risk with individual risk. The population risk is very low but for the people who are affected by dust (individual risk) the risk is 100%. Some people will be affected by any dust level (even below 50). The fewer people there are, there will be fewer susceptible people that can be affected.</li> <li>We still want to keep the risk as low as possible and the downside of standards is that people work to a standard. The standard does not separate 'safe' from 'dangerous'. What we would like to see is people working to as low as reasonably practical. Particularly in big cities, the lower we get air population the bigger the benefit for the burden of disease.</li> <li>- A member queried whether the occupational health risk only relates to 8 hours a day, is the risk exasperated by the fact we don't work 8 hours a day we actually work up to 12 hour days.</li> <li>- Peter replied that I believe they do make adjustments for it (confirmed by Karina Martin BHP Superintendent Safety in attendance)</li> <li>- A member queried if Peter sees a future where industry are made to comply (with NEPM) to minimise the dust level through infrastructure be it in the stockpiling or conveyor belts that are covered.</li> <li>- Peter replied, I think that is part of the plan. I my first tour of BHP and I get the impression there are efforts being made to reduce that and Patrik and Karina can talk to that more than I can. Health would strongly encourage decreasing it at source as much as possible.</li> </ul>
<b>4.0 Supporting seafarers in our local community</b>	<b>Presentation from Philip Christy, General Manager, Pilbara Ports Authority:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Discussion following the presentation:</b></li> <li>- NIL</li> </ul>
<b>5.0 Port Hedland Seafarer's Centre</b>	<b>Presentation from Caiden Gray, Chairperson, Port Hedland Seafarers Centre:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Discussion following the presentation:</b></li> <li>- A member queried that the number of seafarers through the centre was 34,000, how does that compare to how many visit the harbour and may not actually get off the boat?</li> <li>- Roger Johnston, Pilbara Ports Authority CEO (in attendance) replied around the number is around 100,000 a year.</li> <li>- Caiden added that during COVID times around 3-4 vessels a day are ordering through the Seafarers catalogue.</li> <li>- Kirsty Danby suggested PHIC arrange a Seafarers Harbour Tour for the PHIC CIF, members were in agreeance.</li> </ul>
<b>6.0 Port Hedland Voluntary Buy-Back Scheme (PHVBS) &amp; Maritime Precinct</b>	<b>Presentation from Karlene Bylund, Managing Director, Hedland Maritime Initiative:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Discussion following the presentation:</b></li> <li>- A member queried if there was any Kariyarra buy in to the Maritime Precinct proposal.</li> <li>- Karlene replied that there is and I have briefed the Kariyarra Aboriginal Corporation board directly on the Maritime Precinct Masterplan. But we certainly have it on our agenda to continue to brief the Kariyarra Aboriginal Corporation Board. From my understanding the Kariyarra people are looking for a cultural area and precinct or an area of focus but also want to see meaningful recognition of culture throughout the Maritime Precinct.</li> </ul>

<b>Future Agenda Items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Port Hedland Airport</li> <li>● Port Hedland Greening Project update</li> <li>● Pilbara Ports Authority to provide update on the Spoilbank Marina</li> <li>● Non industry members to present on their organisations</li> </ul>
<b>5.0 Action Items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● PHIC CEO and Roger Higgins to amend minutes 12 May 2021 and circulate</li> <li>● PHIC to arrange a Seafarers Harbour Tour for the CIF members</li> <li>● PHIC to circulate BHP's questions on notice from May meeting in writing</li> </ul>
<b>6.0 Other Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● BHP questions on notice from May meeting are attached to minutes as appendix</li> <li>● Next Meeting: 10 November 2021</li> </ul>

## Appendix

Question on Notice from 12 May 2021 PHIC CIF Meeting  
BHP Response, Chris Serginson, Manager Environment

- 1. A member queried if there will be water constraints to run the greening project. Concern that town water levels will not be sufficient.**

Water levels are sufficient for the CBD based West End Greening Project and LEAF Trail site through groundwater recharge in cyclone season as well as additional work being currently undertaken to secure a third water source.

- 2. A member queried once the green belt is established, who will pay for the water and maintenance?**

BHP will pay for the water and maintenance of the LEAF Trial site.

There will be a gradual decline in watering over three years to optimise plant health and longevity (indicatively this will be 60% of year 1 use in year 2 and 20% of year 1 use in year 3)

In terms of maintenance, due to use of mulch, there should be very little required but will be covered by BHP as the project and land owner.

In regards to the future stages of the LEAF project, there is significant additional work required including land use approvals, vegetation barrier design, and determination of maintenance and water requirements. We will update as this progresses.

- 3. A member queried the timelines for Scope 2/3 for emissions and whether they would be renewed.**

Chris responded that new target set includes scope 1 & 2. Scope 3 emissions are aimed at steel producers which makes them harder to affect, however memorandums and joint initiatives have started.

- In relation to climate change, our website outlines:
  - Our approach <https://www.bhp.com/sustainability/climate-change/>; and
  - Our position <https://www.bhp.com/sustainability/climate-change/our-position-on-climate-change/>.

- We have set targets for operational emissions (scope 1 & 2) as follows:

*We have set a medium-term target to reduce operational GHG emissions (Scope 1 and Scope 2 from our operated assets) by at least 30 per cent from FY2020 levels by FY2030. Our FY2030 target was informed by our Pathways to Net Zero (P2NZ) emissions project that was established to understand opportunities to achieve and maintain net-zero operational emissions by 2050.*

<https://www.bhp.com/sustainability/climate-change/operational-ghg-emissions-reductions/>):

- We have set targets for value chain emissions (scope 3) as follows:

*We have set Scope 3 GHG emissions goals for 2030 to:*

- *support industry to develop technologies and pathways capable of 30 per cent emissions intensity reduction in integrated steelmaking, with widespread adoption expected post 2030*
- *support 40 per cent emissions intensity reduction of BHP-chartered shipping of our products.*

<https://www.bhp.com/sustainability/climate-change/value-chain-emissions-reductions/>

- We recognise that the climate change policy environment is rapidly evolving. We make updates to our approach as appropriate and typically provide these updates as part of our annual reporting processes.

**4. A member queried if BHP report progress in their sustainability report.**

Chris responded that there was recent information than what was released in their sustainability reports and he would provide it to members should they wish to see it.

Our approach to Sustainability, including a link to reports, is here -

<https://www.bhp.com/sustainability/sustainability-approach/>