

# New Chum Community Reference Group

## Meeting Minutes

**Title:** New Chum Community Reference Group

**Date:** Tuesday January 28 2015

**Time:** 6:00pm – 8.45pm

**Facilitator:** Amanda Newbery

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

## In Attendance

### Attendance

Amanda Newbery – ‘Interim Chair, New Chum CRG’ (Filling in for Nathan Williams)	Jim Dodrill – President, IRATE	Greg Broad – Community member
Jo Pocock – Development Planning Manager, ICC	Neil Perry – General Manager Queensland, TPI	Janet Tutin – Proxy for Paul Tutin - Member, IRATE
Doug Hughes – Regional Manager, TPI	Olga Ghiri, Stakeholder and Community Relations Manager, TPI	Hugh Wright, Operations Manager, New Chum TPI

### Apologies

Bruce Morton, Manager Environmental Health, WMHHS	Cr Bruce Casas	Scott Blanchard – Regional Manager, DEHP
Duchense Broad – Riverview Community	Paul Tutin – Member, IRATE	Cr Victor Attwood
Nathan Williams – Chair, New Chum CRG		

## Notes & Actions

Item	Minutes	Action/Decision
<b>Welcome &amp; Apologies</b>	Apologies received from Nathan Williams, Paul Tutin, Bruce Morton, Cr Bruce Casos, Scott Blanchard, Victor Attwood, Duchense Broad.	
<b>Review of Minutes</b>	<p>Janet Tutin (JT) noted a number of typographical errors in the draft of the minutes of the previous meeting.</p> <p>Neil Perry (NP) and Doug Hughes (DH) agreed with JT that the minutes need to be a summary of what was said; a true representation of the CRG's meeting and the discussions made.</p> <p>Amanda Newbery (AN) apologised for the typographical errors and it was decided that the future meeting minutes would be proofed by an additional staff member.</p> <p>JT accepted this apology, and would like to see all future minutes written to a higher standard. Following accepted changes, the minutes of the previous meeting were approved; moved by GB, seconded by DH.</p> <p>Updated Terms of Reference: DH said that most of the changes to the terms of reference were grammatical and everyone was in agreement on those changes.</p> <p>Moved by DH, seconded by GB.</p>	AN and Nathan Williams (NW) will review and correct the previous minutes.

<p><b>Site Role Updates</b></p>	<p>DH noted that part of the CRG process is that the Operations Manager would be part of the group. The previous Operations Manager left in June 2014. DH introduced Hugh Wright (HW) as the new Operations Manager.</p> <p>HW was a Department of Environment Officer and has great experience at some competitor sites around Brisbane. HW is welcomed to the group.</p> <p>HW introduced himself and his experience, including a degree in science and a post-graduate degree in land management; work in the EPA in Brisbane, specifically in the waste management division managing compliance of landfills in SEQ. HW had oversight of the New Chum landfill between 2000-2006, prior to TPI's ownership in 2007. In addition HW worked at Ti-Tree Willowbank, and during this time was also on the Willowbank CRG.</p> <p>HW has been Operational Manager at New Chum for 3 months and noted considerable change in operational and safety aspects as well as environmental compliance. He stated that his role is to make sure the landfill is operated in a safe and compliant manner in order to have minimal impact on the community.</p> <p>HW, DH and NP share the same opinion that they would like to turn New Chum into the best landfill in Transpacific's portfolio. GB spoke on behalf of the CRG, saying that they would all like to see this too.</p> <p>Jo Pocock (JP) said that Brett Davey (BD) is the Team Co-ordinator in the West team. JP is now the Development Planning Manager for the whole city. BD will deal with day-to-day issues, and owing to JP's representation on the CRG, does not have a formal role in the decision-making in relation to this site. JP will provide planning advice on behalf of Council. BD is also the liaison with the DEHP.</p>	<p>DH requested that NW distribute HW's contact details to the CRG.</p>
---------------------------------	--	---

<p><b>Community Fund</b></p>	<p>DH gave an update on the Community Fund. Over the last 2 months the Fund Committee has been formed, including 2 community representatives - Savali Harvey and Theresa O'Connell.</p> <p>NP said the company asked for representatives that have a background in grant review and financing consideration. They were given a site tour prior to Christmas.</p> <p>Grant Applications for the Community Fund were advertised prior to Christmas in numerous locations including: Ipswich Times, QT and by word-of-mouth. Should the CRG have any further recommendations on locations to advertise, please contact DH. 10-12 expressions of interest and 1 application have been received so far.</p> <p>JT recommended advertising in all local schools through their newsletters. DH believes it was circulated to the 2 Councillor offices. However it was not given to the State Government MP Jo-Ann Miller's office yet.</p> <p>GB suggested providing a link to the Riverview Community Centre for further circulation. DH requests that the CRG spread the word regarding the availability of community grants.</p> <p>JT raised concerns regarding the visibility of the New Chum website. NP directed JT to the search bar on the homepage of the Transpacific Corporate Website to bring up the New Chum page, however JT believes there still needs to be better navigation. She suggested adding the New Chum site to TPI's website site map. JP reminded JT that this was raised in the last meeting and it was agreed it was an improvement to the website. The group viewed the website and the navigation.</p>	
------------------------------	--	--

<p><b>Operations Update</b></p>	<p>DH gave an update. Cell construction update: TPI is currently landfilling in 3 locations; Cell 5A, Cell 2, Sub-Cell 2 (asbestos area).</p> <p>JT asked about the landfill used in Sub-Cell 2 and was specifically interested in whether or not bonded asbestos disposal had been resumed. DH confirmed they have are landfilling asbestos contaminated soil and have been open about this, and they recommenced accepting bonded asbestos the week of the meeting. DH has informed DEHP about the upcoming re-acceptance of bonded asbestos impacted material, so they are aware.</p> <p>DH confirmed that sub-Cell 2 does not impede on Cell 3. It was originally called sub-Cell 2 because it's part of Cell 2, originally designed to be the subgrade to Cell 2 to bring it out of the water table. What is being currently filled, in the north of sub-Cell 2, will become the basal liner on Cell 2. HW explained that the batter is currently too steep, so they will reduce the slope by filling/grading it up.</p> <p>DH clarified why asbestos impacted soil is classified as clean soil, and not classified as contaminated soil for JT. When the soil was tested they found traces of asbestos, but did not find traces of other contaminated material. DH also clarified that within their licence they can put asbestos impacted soil (sub-cell 2 only), contaminated soil, regulated and contaminated waste within Cell 2.</p> <p>JT is concerned from a public point of view that asbestos impacted soil contains loose fibres that may become airborne and would like clarification about why/how it is still safe to use as fill to remodel the cell.</p> <p>HW replied that they have standard operating procedures for the management of asbestos. HW's prime concern is the safety of his staff, and this is where the standard operating procedures come in, minimising impact to everyone on site, and therefore surrounding areas.</p> <p>GB asked what is in Cell 2. DH replied saying regulated and contaminated waste, restricted by our licence. This is basically limited to stabilised waste and contaminated material such as soil.</p> <p>JT asked for clarification regarding Cell 5.</p> <p>DH explained Cell 5 stage 5 is split into Cell 5A and Cell 5B. The new cell area is of a higher quality and has improved lining</p>	<p>DH to bring A1 site map to future meetings.</p> <p>Scott Blanchard from the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (DEHP) will be requested to attend the next CRG meeting.</p>
---------------------------------	---	---

systems. Cell 5A is being filled whilst we wait for the new lined area. The liner is the highest quality liner available, increasing environmental protection.

JT asked what would be put into Cell 5B.

DH stated that in our Department of Environment licence we are restricted to C & D (construction and demolition) waste only and very low contaminated soil. Everything else will need to be put in Cell 2. We have made an application to the Department of Environment to treat Cell 5B (higher quality cell section) similar to how Cell 2 is being treated – meaning Cell 5B and Cell 2 will have similar restrictions in regards to waste allocation, including contaminated waste. However this has not been confirmed yet. In meetings with DEHP regarding this application, DEHP was satisfied that the application presented no potential for environmental harm and was considered a minor change, meaning it did not require public notification. JP said that she was unable to comment on whether the design would need to be updated as a result of the changes to the waste acceptance criteria by DEHP. She suggested that if the material is to change, the design should be reviewed by Council's operational works engineers to determine if it is still suitable.

DH stated that this does not affect our criteria of zero net increase in overall volume of the landfill; this is simply shifting the placement of waste on site.

DH clarified that Cell 5A is significantly smaller than 5B, with a cell batter slope of 1:3. Cell 5A is only there as a temporary Cell whilst Cell 5B is developed. Jim Dodrill (JD) asked what the cubic metreage of the cell was. DH said it is yet to be fully confirmed as they are waiting on height, but believes it is about 1 million cubic metres.

JT noted that she recently read that the air space of the entire New Chum landfill is estimated to be 30 million cubic metres.

NP confirmed that Cell 2 is in use. DH stated that we are not currently taking flocculant because, effectively, we can't spread it at present. This eventually will go to Cell 5 to prevent fires. HW said that the best practice for flocculant is to lay it in very shallow depths and then march over it the next day with general rubbish. They had permission in Ti-Tree landfill from DEHP to use it as day cover. It is also a good odour absorber.

Question asked by JT: If Cell 5B is filled up, would you make subsequent applications to receive regulated waste into Cells 3

and 4. Answer from DH: The plan is to fill these sites. The current sequence is Cell 4 next, and Cell 5 finally.

JT asked what would happen once the workers build upwards and the machinery movements and waste are visible to the residents of Collingwood Park. DH said this is an issue we will need to approach at the time, but he believes there will be something we can do to reduce the impact on the community.

JT then asked for an estimated date to reach the top of nearby cells. DH said this depends on their fill rate (which is constantly changing) and also on the development application and the approval of Cell 5B. Ballpark timing is a few years.

DH then stated that in Transpacific's financial returns from last year, they advised the market that they had brought in Civil and Environmental Consultants (CEC) from the USA. Transpacific is currently working with these specialists to go through the new 'whole-of-life' process. The specialists started work on some Victorian sites, and are now working on New Chum as well. This process should be completed within the next 2-3 months.

DH hopes to be able to provide information regarding the 'whole-of-life' time frames in the June CRG meeting.

NP said, estimating from current fill rates, the remaining life of the landfill is most likely to be around the 10-11 year mark. Note: these fill rates do vary.

DH continued his update on Cell 5B construction. The floor is almost done; they are finishing off the HDPE liners and putting in the river rock drainage aggregates. Estimated completion is late February / early March – weather depending.

JD asked for clarification regarding the operations licences. JD expresses concern that council will approve the operational works, but are seemingly not concerned by what goes into the landfill site.

JP and DH disagreed with this and said that the operational works is the construction work, approved by council, the waste acceptance criteria is approved solely by the DEHP (an environmental authority that is issued by the state government).

JP clarified that there are two separate processes: the town planning process and the environmental authority process. She further clarified that the operational works was approved based on the current town planning approval and the existing environmental authority.

JP said the operational works on Cell 5B may have been over engineered to allow for further licensing to be approved if possible, but was not aware of any intention of putting unapproved waste in the cell. JP advised she was not qualified to comment on the detailed engineering issues.

JP advised that operational works were consistent with the approved DA to her knowledge and that she was unable to comment about whether the design would need to change as a result of the changes to the waste acceptance criteria by DEHP. JP suggested that if the material is to change the design should be reviewed by Council's operational works engineers to determine if it is still suitable.

GB added that the fact that the company has decided to over-engineer everything to the best practice and above is not a problem. It also gives them the opportunity in the future to use it for more than it is currently approved for. GB would rather it be over-engineered than be the bare minimum.

JP asked that should the group wish to discuss the matters of the environmental authority and waste acceptance criteria that Scott Blanchard (SB) be requested to attend the next CRG meeting to answer specific questions regarding the waste criteria of the cells.

JD said he would like a breakdown of waste types and possibly records of receipt and had asked on previous occasions for this.

HW: Cell 5B has a clay barrier, a geo-synthetic impermeable barrier and then a 1.5mm high-density polyethylene liner. That's three protective layers sitting on top of each other, and then a protective layer on top of the plastic as a physical protection and then a drainage blanket on top of that.

JD asked if the cell liners in Cell 2 were ever examined to see if they were compromised by previous practices and events. DH said they were damaged and they are currently going through a rectification process to repair this. The floc, which was the cause of the fires because of the way it was landfilled, has been moved out of any areas where there is a potential issue.

JD asked if asbestos was ever accepted into Cell 2 before the existence of Sub-Cell 2. DH took this on notice; he said that our license, as long as he has ever known, has never allowed us to put asbestos into Cell 2. He clarified for JT and JD that the only material in Cell 2 being moved is on the top-most section, which

	<p>they are 100% confident does not contain asbestos material.</p> <p>DH stated that they have been following the fire damage to remove and repair the liner completely.</p> <p>DH said there are currently two development applications in process with Council. One is the profile change, previously discussed, for Cell 5B (lodged in December, yet to be approved). Second has only just been lodged regarding the sediment basin, to collect water.</p> <p>JD raised concern regarding the overfill on the northern end of Cell 5. He stated that he would be very opposed to the council giving leniency and allowing the overfill to stay as is. He believes that there has been too much allowance for non-compliance retrospectively.</p> <p>JP clarified what JD's concerns were: that they retrospectively did that (the overfill) without approval.</p> <p>JP added that it was her view that if Council refused the request (and was required to defend the decision in court) the court would consider the impacts fore mostly and whether the impacts are greater or lesser owing to the re-profiling.</p>	
<b>Enforcement Notices</b>	<p>JT asked if TPI had met all compliance deadlines that had lapsed, in relation to the Enforcement Notice. DH responded that we have met all deadlines with council. The only remaining deadline is in July regarding building works – looking at moving the weighbridges further up the hill (this is only preliminary).</p> <p>JT asked if the weighbridges are in the wrong spot geo-technically. DH took this on notice, but stated that the new location would not be.</p> <p>DH hopes to have a better idea of the new locations of the weighbridges by the next CRG meeting.</p>	

<p><b>Equipment Update</b></p>	<p>DH gave updates on equipment. We've purchased a new water cart for dust management. We've just purchased and are currently operating a brand new landfill compactor (836k model, 55t machine). It features new air filtration processes, so it pushes out cleaner air than it sucks in. It drives over the waste to compact it.</p> <p>JT asked what machinery would be used for concrete crushing. DH said they are looking at having a contractor come in to do this. They are currently in negotiations from a financial and legal point of view. If this goes through, rock-crushing activities will commence late February.</p> <p>DH said they have just finished a background noise analysis, meaning when they use heavy machinery they know how much of the noise is coming from those machines.</p> <p>JT said the community is concerned about noise and dust, as concrete crushing is supposedly going to be happening for 12 hours a day. DH corrected that our Operational Works permit only allows a 10-hour workday (7am-4pm weekdays, 7am-12pm Saturday)(however TPI has refused to do concrete-crushing on weekends out of consideration for the community). NP said the expectation is that the concrete crusher will only be on site for roughly 6 weeks.</p> <p>JT asked what happens after the crushing is complete. NP said they then sell off the crushed material into the market, he is unsure how long this will take. They will then evaluate how successful that was from a commercial perspective, and then start the process again. NP noted that this is a trial to see what we can sell into the greater Ipswich market.</p> <p>JT asked if TPI anticipated committing the landfill site to large-scale concrete crushing operations in the future – DH and NP both said that is not yet known.</p> <p>NP explained the importance of recycling this concrete; JT agreed, however doesn't believe it is suitable to do so 800m (conservatively) away from a residential area.</p> <p>JT stated that if this concrete crushing activity grows to become the main activity on this site once the landfill closes; the community would be strongly against this. She added that she does not agree with it becoming the primary activity because of the potential for noise and dust nuisance in proximal areas.</p> <p>JT said Collingwood Park and Riverview community residents</p>	
--------------------------------	---	--

	<p>were never consulted that the landfill was going to grow into the sized site that it now is.</p> <p>JP replied that the original development application was visible to the community.</p> <p>JT continued that the community may have had visibility but did not have a say. She stated that for example the community said they didn't want concrete crushing but it was still approved. Had they (JT and her spouse) known the future of the site they would not have bought their land.</p> <p>JP and NP added that the current licence does not allow a fixed plant on site, only mobile crushers. It is also an ancillary activity to the landfill. JP said that concrete crushing as a primary activity would represent a major change / intensification of use of the site and would trigger a new Material Change of Use application.</p> <p>JT asked if TPI are intending on concrete crushing becoming the primary use for this site. NP replied saying they do not know at this time. JT said the original intention for the site was to return it to grassland. NP restated that it has been said on record numerous times that they reserve the right to use the site for commercial purposes, and if that requires them to make applications to council they will follow the necessary processes to do so.</p> <p>NP said future uses have not been decided yet. We have an expectation to create a high quality landfill – with \$15 million being spent to upgrade this facility.</p>	
<b>Local Employment Update</b>	<p>DH gave a local employment update.</p> <p>We are currently in the process of upgrading staff on site from labour hire to permanent, currently 5 people being brought across from labour hire to permanent. The vast majority of staff are local residents, with a total of 14 staff, exclusive of cell-construction activities. These staff will continue after cell-construction finishes.</p>	

<p><b>Whole-of-Life Plan</b></p>	<p>JD said the CRG are interested in part of the plan that discusses the future use of the site, plans for Cells 3 and 4, and concrete crushing plans. DH clarified that these will not be locked in with this whole-of-life plan, but plans will be suggested. DH said the whole of life plan would provide a more detailed view of the future of the site, including closure and post-closure maintenance.</p> <p>JT asked about the concrete crushing process. She was speaking to Eric LeProvost who said we were looking at adding an additive to the concrete to minimise the amount of airborne particles. DH said this is correct, it's called polocitrus, and it's a wetting agent that works effectively at binding loose particles. DH confirmed that they would be adding polocitrus to the concrete during crushing so that it binds loose particles and reduces noise.</p> <p>DH will upload a map of the dust monitoring stations onto the New Chum website as well as update the monitoring data (water and air) on the New Chum website, as requested by JT.</p> <p>NP asked how many dust complaints had been made recently. DH replied there were no dust complaints since the last CRG. One odour complaint was made, but that was unrelated to the landfill activity.</p> <p>DH said we were doing reverse osmosis on leachate in the storage ponds as a trial. It worked great but discharge of the treated water was a problem, as we do not have an active sewage connection. At the moment we are tankering it off site, which is quite expensive.</p> <p>DH confirmed we have approval to tanker leachate off site to the Bundamba plant for treatment and is the best solution for the community. Bundamba is a licensed facility.</p> <p>We've grown grass for containment of soil erosion, however there is not a lot of inactive area on the site.</p> <p>DH and HW outlined erosion control measures, to rehabilitate Cell 5A through successful seeding of batters, sediment fencing in water channels and a rock catchment at the current outfall onto Chum Street.</p> <p>JT stated that the more vegetation on site, even interim, the better. DH: if the final profile is approved they will start formal capping of Cell 1 and Cell 5. We cannot start this until the final profiling is done.</p>	<p>Whole of Life to be an agenda item for the June CRG meeting.</p> <p>DH to post map onto the website</p>
----------------------------------	---	--

<b>Dust Mitigation</b>	<p>JT requested that we are proactive, not reactive, about dust mitigation</p> <p>DH said we have a new water cart on site, which improves the reliability of our water handling capacity.</p> <p>JT asked if we have sprinklers. DH said we used to have sprinklers for leachate reticulation. This may be a part of the final capping system.</p>	
<b>New Chum Website</b>	The CRG agreed that the website has been thoroughly discussed.	
<b>Stormwater Management</b>	<p>DH discussed stormwater management.</p> <p>DH said the Environautics design included water flow in the same direction. The direction of flow should not change significantly due to a change in profile. Rather the current flow should be improved.</p> <p>DH said the updated Stormwater Management Plan would follow approval of the proposed re-profiling of the site. The question was asked by JD – would the proposed new landfill profile result in adverse changes to stormwater volumes, flow paths or cause erosion or flooding due to concentration of water flow. The answer provided by DH was that volume would not markedly change, that water would still flow towards the lowest point in the SE of the site but flows were anticipated to be gentler as they would not be concentrated into narrow gullies as is the case with the current profile plan.</p> <p>GB asked about the potential for contaminated water to get into the waterways. The answer given was that this does not happen once the site is permanently capped due to modern engineering, leachate capture and off-take systems.</p>	

<b>Quorum</b>	<p>DH noted the last question on the agenda was that quorum does not include anyone from council or DEHP.</p> <p>DH commented that the purpose of the CRG is to communicate with the community and it is for this reason there is an expectation that at least one member from the statutory authority should be required for a quorum. DH added that SB is available if requested.</p> <p>DH highlighted that the minutes and agenda are very important in that regard.</p> <p>JD asked that when we do need a DEHP representative, if there is anyone else other than SB we could invite.</p> <p>NP commented that SB is the 'manager of DEHP's local office'. We continue to go to SB, and if he wants to send a delegate, that's the protocol we should continue with.</p> <p>JP added that it would not be fair to ask someone with no prior site knowledge to come and join the CRG to answer questions. This would require them to do a significant amount of site research to answer questions SB already knows.</p>	
<b>NSW Legislation</b>	<p>NSW Legislation and the impact on transportation of waste.</p> <p>DH stated we operate under QLD legislation.</p> <p>DH also added that the amount of waste transported to site has dropped due to their legislation.</p>	
<b>Close of Meeting</b>	8:45pm	
<b>Next Meeting</b>	<p>DH suggested a CRG meeting in March and June, and then quarterly from there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- March 23<sup>rd</sup></li> <li>- Tentatively June 22<sup>nd</sup> 6pm-8pm.</li> </ul> <p>NP said that Rob Dean is the acting principal for Riverview State School, replacing Neil Randall. Mrs Leanne Burleigh is the head of curriculum at the school and has offered to be the replacing representative for Neil Randall.</p>	<p>June action item to reassess meeting dates (bi-monthly or quarterly).</p>