

New Chum Community Reference Group

Meeting Minutes

Title: New Chum Community Reference Group

Date: Wednesday 16 October 2013

Time: 6.00 – 8.30 pm

Facilitator: Dr. Georgina Davis

Venue: Riverview State School, Old Ipswich Road, Riverview

In Attendance

Attendance

Georgina Davis – Independent Facilitator	Darryl Small – Riverview Community	Neil Randall – Principal, Riverview State School
Cr. Victor Attwood – Division 3	Jim Dodrill – President, IRATE	Duchense Broad – Riverview Community
Scott Blanchard – Regional Manager, DEHP	Jo Pocock – Development Planning Manager, ICC	Leanne Burleigh – Head of Curriculum, Riverview State School
Ben Sawley – General Manager, TPI	Mike Read – Regional Manager Queensland, TPI	Janet Tutin – Member, IRATE

Apologies

Paul Tutin – Member, IRATE	Diarmuid O’Riordan – Principal, St Peter Claver College
----------------------------	---

Notes & Actions

Item	Minutes	Action/Decision
1. Welcome and Introductions (new members)	<p><i>‘New’ Group members provided a brief introduction of themselves and their objectives:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectively review the New Chum landfill operation given the close proximity to the school and provide feedback to the local community. Ensure that the landfill did not impact adversely on the 	

	<p>local community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the local landform and possible impacts associated with it, before it is finalised so that changes can be made. • Limit the impact of the facility on local house prices, assure the community and any future residents of the safety of the site • Confirm the site is in compliance and safeguard the community. <p>GD confirmed that Queensland Health (West Moreton Area) had been contacted and a representative should be attending the next meeting.</p> <p>GD confirmed that the designated web site and email address for the Group were now operational and the Group was to determine what information went to the web site from the 'information request'.</p> <p>GD also confirmed that the full Golders Report was available to interested members of the Group. A summary will also be provided for those who do not want to review the whole document.</p>	<p>GD to obtain written clarification and delegate name</p> <p>GD to arrange opportunities (before the next meeting) to review the full Golders report and produce summary.</p>
<p>2. Review of Minutes and Terms of Reference (ToR)</p>	<p>Janet Tutin commented that Paul Tutin had noted a missing objective from the previous minutes -</p> <p>'To oppose future changes to the site which impact the community, for example, the application to extend the landfill to accept putrescible wastes'</p> <p>GD briefly highlighted the amendments made to the ToR from discussions at the last meeting. Group to provide any further amendments or comments by 31 October so that they may be loaded to the web site.</p>	<p>GD to amend minutes to add the missing objective and arrange upload to the web site</p> <p>GD to finalise ToR and arrange for it to be placed on the web site from 1 November</p>
<p>3. Information Request</p>	<p>Transpacific commenced with copies of an historic map and current overlayed map showing the location of the cells.</p> <p>Group noted that they would have like to see more maps of the site clearly showing placement of wastes over time.</p> <p>Location of cells (particularly with regard to Sub Cell 2) caused some concern to the Group as it had not previously been depicted. JP clarified that she was unaware of the sub division which appeared to 'fall across' Cells 2 and 3. JP referred to Councils existing approval for Cells 1-5 (192/98) and Operational Works application for Sub Cell 2 4318/13. (Condition 35 final rehab document, 1996).</p> <p>This Cell is subject to asbestos disposal in accordance with the environmental authority administered by DEHP.</p>	<p>Transpacific to provide further maps to the Group and/or for the web site.</p> <p>Location of Sub Cell 2 to be clarified at an intermediate meeting (possibly Golders Report Review)</p> <p>BS to provide an</p>

	<p>BS displayed various monitoring data with regards to the facility including waters and dust sampling.</p> <p>Where exceedences occur, the external consultants GHD et al., submit a breach report to Transpacific and EHP.</p> <p>BS clarified to the Group that no leachate is pumped into Void 10 – only water goes into Void 10.</p> <p>Group question – what happens during a storm event, is there mixing of storm water and leachate?</p> <p>BS confirmed that it is designed so that mixing does not occur.</p> <p>EHP provided further comment that they routinely visit sites (including the New Chum facility) during and immediately after significant rain events to ensure that the site is in compliance. EHP also noted that there were additional drivers at present from a 'Wet Weather Inspection Audit' review being undertaken, which focuses on landfills and quarries.</p> <p>Group asked about 'Temporary Emission Licences' (TEL) and their role in permitting Transpacific to pump potentially contaminated water off-site.</p> <p>EHP confirmed that TELs are typically only utilised by the resource industry and that there are strict conditions and emission limits associated with such a licence.</p> <p>Group expressed concern regarding potential contamination levels in surface and ground waters. EHP noted that some of the 'contamination' is naturally occurring and that there are acid sulphate soils in the region.</p> <p>Final landform for the site was presented by Transpacific. This included four photos (artist impressions) of the proposed final landform from various locations.</p> <p>The Group expressed concern regarding the proposed final height and gradient. It was broadly felt to be inconsistent with community expectations (of recreational amenities) and unsympathetic with the surrounding landforms.</p> <p>NR asked Transpacific if there was flexibility in the final landform design.</p> <p>BS clearly stated that the final landform was provisional and was not finalised; and that the Group would have further opportunity to provide input on their preferences.</p> <p>Transpacific presented information on wastes received (by percentage weight) onto site. This included confirmation that no medical wastes were received at the facility.</p>	<p>overview of the methodologies, sampling points, and any third party sampling and analysis to the Group</p> <p>BS also to add licence limits to the graphs so any accidents may be visually identified</p> <p>Graphs showing monitoring to be uploaded to the web site</p> <p>Transpacific to provide a map showing the location of ground monitoring bore holes to the Group next meeting</p> <p>Chair to request further information from Transpacific regarding soil contamination levels for next meeting (possibly aggregated by</p>
--	---	---

	<p>JD also commented that they expected to see a breakdown of contaminants in the 'soil categories', with particular concern relating to mercury contaminated soils.</p> <p>Chair noted that previous minutes had only requested the proportions of wastes received at the facility and that item had been misconstrued by the Chair.</p> <p>JD also asked how asbestos in loads is identified on-site – as it enters the facility.</p> <p>JT produced a photograph taken 16 October 2012 of the facility showing dust over the tipping face and asked to review the dust monitoring data for that particular date.</p> <p>The data showed that dust/airborne particulates did not exceed allowable levels for that day (16 Oct) the data showed a spike for the period.</p> <p>MR indicated that it was unlikely that the dust would have been carried off-site due to the contours of the site and prevailing wind – and that Transpacific undertake good dust management on-site.</p> <p>JT/JD expressed concern that the location of dust monitoring is subjective and may not be truly representative of dust leaving the site.</p> <p>BS noted that Transpacific would be happy to investigate the opportunity for the placement of dust monitoring stations even though there was no legal obligation for Transpacific to do so.</p> <p>DS noted that dust is an issue, particularly in highly trafficked areas and those areas used as a 'rat-run'</p>	<p>Soil Disposal Permits). Format to be negotiated with Transpacific and Group.</p> <p>Transpacific to provide an overview of the on-site method utilised to identify contaminants in waste loads received and the procedure once contaminations has been identified.</p> <p>BS to investigate the cost associated with the installation of dust monitoring stations and report to the Group next meeting</p>
4. Items Carried Over	<p>Due to time constraints and some veracious discussion, some of the information request was carried over to the next meeting, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of the Liner System • Responses to questions provided by the Group regarding the broader operation and management of the facility and the role of the Group 	
5. Concrete Crushing Application	<p>Jo Pocock, Development Planning Manager for Ipswich City Council requested opportunity to bring to the Groups attention the current negotiated decision request made by Transpacific for the addition of a concrete crushing operation at the New Chum site.</p> <p>Delegate for this decision cannot be JP but a colleague. Details of the request may be viewed at:</p> <p>http://pdonline.ipswich.qld.gov.au/pdonline/modules/PropertyMaster/default.aspx?page=wrapper&key=236439</p>	

6. Other Items	<p>JD enquired about the landfill gas management options, in particular, wanted to determine the layout of the pipework and how the pipework would be maintained across a site with a fault.</p> <p>Also, the design of the final flare, if it would be visually intrusive and how products of incomplete combustion would be managed.</p>	<p>Chair to request information from Transpacific.</p> <p>Dissemination to be determined.</p>
7. Next Meeting Options	<p><i>Purpose of the next meeting is to provide the Group with a summary of the Golders Report and to address outstanding items carried over from the this meeting.</i></p>	<p>NR kindly volunteered Riverview State School for the next meeting</p>
8. Closing of meeting	8.40pm	
9. Next Meeting	<p>Proposed date – Monday 9 December 2013</p> <p>Venue – Riverview State School, Old Ipswich Road, Riverview.</p> <p>Time: 6 – 8.30 pm</p>	<p>GD to circulate Agenda and Minutes</p>