

# New Chum Community Reference Group

## Meeting Minutes

**Title:** New Chum Community Reference Group

**Date:** Monday 10 February 2014

**Time:** 6.00 – 8.00 pm

**Facilitator:** Dr. Georgina Davis

**Venue:** Ipswich City Council Administration Building, 50 South Street, Ipswich

## In Attendance

### Attendance

Georgina Davis – Independent Facilitator	Duchense Broad – Riverview Community	Neil Randall – Principal, Riverview State School
Jo Pocock – Development Planning Manager, ICC	Jim Dodrill – President, IRATE	Paul Tutin – Member, IRATE
Scott Blanchard – Regional Manager, DEHP	Dr Kari Jarvinen, A/Director Public Health, WMHHS (West Moreton Hospital and Health Service)	Bruce Morton, Manager Environmental Health, WMHHS
Ben Sawley – General Manager, TPI	John Nicholls, Environmental Manager, TPI	Olga Ghiri, Stakeholder and Community Liaison Officer, TPI
Bob Crotty – Operational Manager for New Chum, TPI		
<b>Apologies</b>		
Cr. Victor Attwood – Division 3	Cr. Bruce Casas – Division 4	Darryl Small – Riverview Community
Diarmuid O’Riordan – Principal, St Peter Claver College		

## Notes & Actions

Item	Minutes	Action/Decision
1. Welcome	Bob Crotty, Operations Manager introduced himself. He is the new Operations Manager for the Transpacific New Chum facility.	

	<p>Dr Kariv Jarvinen and Bruce Moreton, WMHHS introduced themselves to the Group. Bruce will be the permanent WMHHS representative for the Group.</p> <p>As part of the introduction, KJ and BM provided an overview of a public health study undertaken by WMHHS to determine if there was any evidence of increased cancer incidence in the immediate area of the new chum landfill in comparison to surrounding and other areas. The study involved the processing of 'cancer data' between 1996-2010. KJ noted the following caveats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cancer is a broad term</li> <li>2. Few cancers are known to be caused from environmental factors</li> <li>3. Most cancers have a lag period</li> <li>4. 2010 was the most recent data used</li> <li>5. The incidence of new cancers for a population is subject to various factors, for example, demographic characteristics (age etc.)</li> <li>6. There are clear guidelines for investigation of 'cancer clusters'</li> <li>7. There is increasing access to data relating to the incidence of cancer (incidence data).</li> </ol> <p>The WMHHS study concluded that there was no increased incidence of cancer in East Ipswich. However, note was made that the Ipswich LGA has a slightly higher cancer incidence than the rest of Queensland.</p> <p>PT and JD both noted that the period of analysis and the commencement of many facilities (including the New Chum Landfill) would not yet provide an indication of some cancers due their lag times.</p> <p>DB also noted that the study only considered cancers and not respiratory issues which were of community concern also.</p> <p>KJ and BM noted that the collection of such data (relating to asthma) would be more difficult to collect and analyse given the access to data from a range of primary health care professionals which are involved (doctors, health care centres and hospitals); and the range of contributing factors.</p> <p>Chair noted that the Group can follow-up on these matters with BM and assist in the future identification and communication of health concerns from the community to WMHHS.</p>	
2. Review of Minutes	<p>Chair went through the action items from the minutes from Monday 9 December 2013 and confirmed all were done except for the 'floc handling procedures being added to the web page'.</p> <p>JN confirmed that Transpacific were not currently accepting floc and a commercial decision regarding any future acceptance had</p>	Chair to confirm by email acceptance of minutes for 16

	<p>not been made. Transpacific to advise the Group of all future decisions regarding the acceptance of floc on site.</p> <p>Comments and feedback for the minutes from 9 December received from most of the Group.</p> <p>Due to time constraints, Chair to solicit amendments and acceptance of minutes from 16 October from the Group by email.</p>	<p>October and 9 December 2013.</p>
<p><b>3. General Discussion Arising From Health Concerns</b></p>	<p>JD noted that there had been a relaxation of 'asbestos acceptance criteria' to the site from "must be covered immediately" to "as soon as practicable". SB confirmed that this was a standard condition.</p> <p>JD and PT asked if there was a point of contact within WMHHS should another fire on site occur so that a regime of health monitoring can be undertaken immediately. BM advised that the primary point of contact for any immediate or acute health concerns is the hospital or to seek health advice from their usual doctor or 13; and with regards to monitoring emissions/air quality, QFS are the lead agency.</p> <p>JD noted that during the November fire, QFS did not appear to be on-site until the following morning, even though he was aware of the fire at 8pm on the previous evening. SB expressed concern that if the fire was identified by JD at 8pm, why JD did not call QFS or inform DEHP until 4pm the following day.</p> <p>NR stated that there may be confusion with regards to the location of a fire when speaking with QFS.</p> <p>PT articulated concern that the air monitoring undertaken by QFS is limited and may not identify particular emissions which may impact community health. WMHHS were informed that TPI had commissioned its own air monitoring through GHD and that the results were on the New Chum website.</p> <p>BC confirmed that he was currently liaising with QFS and is implementing an 'Emergency Management Team' on-site.</p> <p>BC also confirmed that he was the community's primary point of contact and will co-ordinate the dissemination of information from any emergency.</p> <p>BS commented that the cause of the November fire is unknown but that there is now full-time security on-site.</p> <p>NR remarked that the implementation of security (including security guards and also surveillance measures) should be communicated to the broader community along with the legality of trespass and intent to prosecute.</p>	<p>BC to provide an overview of the new Team and also feedback from discussions with QFS at the next meeting.</p> <p>BC to clarify emission testing protocols undertaken by QFS during a fire.</p>
<p><b>4. Soil Analysis and Contaminant Loading</b></p>	<p>JN discussed the protocols to determine the contaminant levels for accepted waste streams on site, to ensure that any contaminant levels are within the 'waste acceptance criteria' as specified on Transpacific's Environmental Authority.</p> <p>The characteristics of accepted wastes are noted on either the 'soil disposal permits' or 'waste tracking documentation'.</p>	<p>JN to provide a summary of the TCLP testing regime and upload to the website.</p>

	<p>Approved methodologies state that representative sampling criteria must be applied and analysis must be undertaken at a NATA accredited laboratory.</p> <p>One of the most important tests specified is TCLP – which determines the leachability of a contaminant.</p>	
<b>5. TPI's - Community Engagement Program</b>	<p>Olga Ghiri provided an introduction to her role within Transpacific as a Stakeholder and Community Liaison Officer. Although based in Victoria, she will be primary community liaison for the facility.</p> <p>OG provided a presentation of community engagement programs and initiatives implemented at other Transpacific sites around Australia including, waste management education programs for school groups, information sheets, a community newsletter (which will be made available to the broader community and posted on TPI's community website <a href="http://www.transpacific.com.au/newchum">www.transpacific.com.au/newchum</a>), a Community Information Centre at the New Chum landfill, a 24/7 help-line 1800 213 753 which allows the community to speak directly to Transpacific regarding any queries they may have. OG also discussed the opportunity for host an Open Day on 31 May 2014 which was strongly supported by the Group.</p> <p>The presentation also provided an overview of the current status of the Green Zone project at New Chum and the recent audit conducted by Greening Australia which identified areas of valuable habitat.</p> <p>BS reiterated to the Group that Transpacific are committing to bring the land back to the natural value for the benefit of the community both from a long term ecological perspective and also as a project for use by the community to learn and contribute to ecological improvement of this buffer land. As such, Transpacific is making an ongoing commitment to support these endeavours but this will need the formulation and agreement of a Plan by the Group. This Plan will need to identify a program of works for both the short and long term to meet the desired outcomes.</p> <p>JD reiterated the importance of having a formal commitment from Transpacific otherwise there will be no longevity of the project or ownership from the community.</p> <p>OG confirmed that she has made an enquiry with the Ipswich Rotary Club to arrange a BBQ at the open day as a charity fund raising event.</p>	<p>The presentation to be uploaded to the website.</p> <p>OG to plan a site community open day for 31 May – details to be discussed at the April meeting.</p> <p>BS to provide the possible structure for a Community Fund at the next meeting.</p> <p>OG to follow-up with Ipswich Rotary Club.</p>
<b>6. Other Business</b>	<p>PT questioned if Transpacific had yet determined the current height of the landfill? BS confirmed that the aerial survey had been undertaken in January but that the resulting report had not yet been provided to Transpacific.</p> <p>JD and PT noted that the insurance form provided to the Group from the December meeting appeared to be more appropriate for Transpacific to complete as opposed to individual Group members.</p>	<p>BS to advise the Group of the height of the landfill (at the time of the survey) at the next meeting.</p>

	<p>PT noted that the advice provided back from Rob Morphet at Golders regarding the Collingwood Park collapse (column failures) did not address the concerns raised by the Grubb report.</p> <p>BS noted that GHD has been commissioned to provide dust monitoring on-site commencing from 1 March 2014. There are six sampling points on-site which provide representative cover of the site. There is already a weather station on-site. GHD will provide a quarterly report which Transpacific will make available to the community.</p> <p>PT noted that he had queries with regards to the responses provided by Transpacific to the 'community questions' on 16 October. For example, Transpacific had stated that they were self-insurers which IRATE questioned. The Chair noted that there was insufficient time left at the current meeting but that it was important to clarify all responses and concerns.</p> <p>Chair noted that forthcoming deadline (end of March) for the information request and application relating to the MCU for a putrescible landfill. JD and PT expressed interest in having a Community Group meeting prior to Transpacific submitting that application. Chair noted that a Special Meeting would be of interest to the Group.</p>	<p>PT to send specific questions to BS on Transpacific's insurances for the next meeting.</p> <p>PT to provide the Chair with the details of the Transpacific responses which require clarification.</p>
<b>7. Next Meeting Options</b>	<p>A 'Special Meeting' has been identified specifically to discuss the putrescible MCU application by TPI, prior to its lodgement.</p> <p>A further meeting date will also be negotiated with the Group to discuss ongoing matters including the structure of the proposed Community Fund and Open Day.</p>	<p>JP kindly volunteered Ipswich City Council for the next meeting.</p> <p>GD to circulate provisional dates for both meetings.</p>
<b>8. Closing of meeting</b>	8.10pm	
<b>9. Next Meeting</b>	<p>Date of Special Meeting – Monday 17 March</p> <p>Venue – TBA</p> <p>Time: 6 – 8.00 pm</p> <p>Next Meeting – Monday 14 April, venue TBA</p>	<p>GD to circulate Agenda and Minutes</p>