

New Chum Community Reference Group – Sub Committee Meeting

Sub-Committee Meeting Notes

Title: New Chum Community Reference Group – Sub-Committee Meeting

Date: Tuesday 10 June 2014

Time: 6.00 – 8.00 pm

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

In Attendance

Attendance

Greg Broad (Riverview Community)		
Jo Pocock – Development Planning Manager, ICC	Geoff Yarham, IRATE	Paul Tutin – Member, IRATE
Scott Blanchard – Regional Manager, DEHP	Bob Crotty – Operational Manager for New Chum, TPI (Transitioning)	Michael Pitman, Engineering Manager, TPI
Eric LeProvost – Interim TPI Operations Manager for New Chum	Doug Hughes – State Manager, TPI	Ben Sawley – General Manager, TPI

Apologies

Georgina Davis

Responses & Questions

Questions	Responses
Q1: What is TPI's response to concerns relating to site risk, in particular, subsidence? (Paul made a small presentation on coal mine subsidence)	Any subsequent application for construction of stage cells at operational works detailed design stage will be in detailed consideration of geotechnical issues and signed off by an RPEQ Engineer.
Q 2a: Can TPI provide more clarity on the estimated remaining life of the landfill based on remaining capacity at the approved height and anticipated annual fill rates?	Expected to be >10 years. Cannot be confirmed at this point in time.
Q 2b: Can TPI provide the Group with a dated copy of the Survey Report which shows that the height of the landfill is between 60m and 70m AHD? Is this the current height, or the	Copy of aerial survey report provided for viewing. Date of survey 20 March 2014. The height has not increased since the survey in cells 1 and 5.

height that was current at the date of the report? Has the height increased since the site was surveyed?	
Q 2c: In May, TPI gave verbal assurances that it will not seek an increase in height above 70 metres AHD but will seek to change the shape of the final landform to one which it considers more appropriate to the management of the landfill. Can TPI provide more information on the changes to contours it is seeking and a written assurance of undertakings on height?	TPI advised no current plans to increase the height however cannot advise what may happen longer term into the future. Details of possible changes to landform are not yet formalised. ICC reiterated that any material change in scale and intensity of the use would necessitate a new application and could not be considered as a permissible change to the existing approval.
Q 2d: Can TPI supply a copy of the company's currently approved site rehabilitation documentation?	TPI currently working towards rehabilitation proposal to include progressive rehabilitation requirements.
Q 2e: TPI has recently stated that it is developing a new "whole of life" plan for the New Chum landfill. Can the company supply the Group with a copy of this plan?	TPI has agreed to share at a future CRG meeting on this 'whole of life plan' has been prepared.
Q 2f: A significant portion of the 75 hectare site is unvegetated which encourages raised dust. Can TPI provide details of progressive rehabilitation to rectify this?	As per response to 2d above.
Q 2g: Can TPI provide more clarity on the likely uses of the site after closure?	No post closure uses identified at this stage. All options will be investigated including possible public uses.
Q 3a: Can TPI provide further or updated information on – a) The cause of the August and November fires on Cell 2 b) The development of procedures for floc handling on-site d) The development of procedures for disclosing the composition of on-site materials to QFRS, and c) The development of procedures for disclosing information about potentially hazardous fires to the community. Suggest TPI (in addition to emailing CRG community members) also publish a message on the TPI New Chum website so that the community can be immediately informed of material events.	<p>This issue was discussed at length.</p> <p>Yes – procedures held on-site. Aligns Floc handling on-site with best practice.</p> <p>HASMAT documents produced for and reviewed by QFRS who are satisfied. Site based management plan also updated. Bob Crotty is happy for anyone to review.</p> <p>Agreed by TPI.</p>
Q 4a: What is the particular purpose of this activity and how long will it be done?	Concrete crushing – it is to recycle the concrete currently stored on site. It will be done on a "batch" basis (e.g. crush for a few months at a time and then stop for a period) and is expected to take a number of years to work through the existing stockpile
Q 4b: How will TPI prevent dust and noise being a nuisance to nearby residents?	Dust suppression and noise mitigation will be employed to ensure the operation complies with licence conditions

Q 5: What is the rationale for requesting this change?	To ensure it aligns with industry best practices
Q 6: How is TPI going to convince the community that the company's response to the issue of compliance has permanently improved?	TPI to be judged on its future actions. Engagement activities such as open day and CRG to build relationships.
Q 7a: What uncombusted gases or particulates will be released to the atmosphere?	The flare stack is restricted under scrutinised conditional guidelines by EHP. These are monitored by a third party provider. Landfill gas flares are a very common and proven way to combust landfill gas without impact on the environment. A temperature controlled enclosed flare built by ABM Combustion Pty Ltd has been constructed on site which has a very high destruction efficiency, typically 99.9%+. Hence there will be no significant un-combusted gases emitted from the stack. Particulates will not form during combustion from the landfill gases entering the flare.
Q 7b: Will TPI make the results of flare emissions testing publicly available on the New Chum website?	Yes
Q 8: What will TPI do to help turn this trend around?	No comment.
Q 9: What will TPI do to correct information regarding proximity to residential areas?	TPI request Irate forward a copy of the plan they are relying on to demonstrate where they are measuring distances to be forwarded to TPI via Georgina to enable cross referencing by TPI. There is uncertainty around where measurements are taken from.
Q 10: What will TPI do to ensure their heavy vehicles and those of 3rd parties using the New Chum landfill remain outside residential areas and shopping centres?	Condition with vehicle routes relevant to MCU 4250/11. Cannot retrospectively condition other approvals with haul routes. Nevertheless TPI have undertaken corporate messaging within their organisation and will continue to do so to encourage all drivers to travel on the identified haul routes.