

# New Chum Community Reference Group

## Meeting Minutes

**Title:** New Chum Community Reference Group

**Date:** Monday March 23 2015

**Time:** 6:00pm – 8.00pm

**Facilitator:** Nathan Williams

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

## In Attendance

### Attendance

Nathan Williams – Chair, New Chum CRG	Jim Dodrill – President, IRATE	Greg Broad – Community member
Jo Pocock – Development Planning Manager, ICC	Neil Perry – General Manager Queensland, TPI	Paul Tutin – Member, IRATE
Doug Hughes – Regional Manager, TPI	Leanne Burley – Head of Curriculum, Riverview State School	Hugh Wright, Operations Manager, New Chum TPI
Scott Blanchard – Regional Manager, DEHP	Duchense Broad – Community member	Jonathan Blight – Scribe

### Apologies

Olga Ghiri, Stakeholder and Community Relations Manager, TPI

### Absent

Bruce Morton, Manager Environmental Health, WMHHS

Cr Bruce Casas

Cr Victor Attwood

## Notes & Actions

Item	Minutes	Action/Decision
1. Welcome & Apologies	Formal apology received from Olga Ghiri. No other formal apologies received.	
2. Review of Minutes	<p>Nathan Williams (NW) began reviewing the minutes from the last CRG. A few points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doug Hughes (DH) corrected that the current sequence is to fill cell 4 next, and cell 3 finally. He said Transpacific wishes to maintain the acceptance criteria they currently have, which involves filling in subsequent cells with that acceptance criteria.</li> </ul> <p>Paul Tutin (PT) arrived</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PT asked if TPI intended changing the current 10% comingled regulated waste to unrestricted regulated waste volumes. DH said that this change would involve a major amendment to the company's licence, and reiterated that the company currently has no intention of changing their licence. The only exception to this is applications to accept materials into new cells, which is compulsory as they are developed.</li> <li>Jo Pocock (JP) discussed the next point; regarding council receiving a request for a change in the requirement of landfill plan. PT concluded that the confusion came from a grammar error, and requested the minutes read 'foremostly' not 'fore mostly'.</li> <li>DH requested that in section 5, in regards to the asbestos impacted soil, it be changed to read 'Sub-Cell 2' not 'Cell 2' as this is where the asbestos contaminated soil can be filled.</li> <li>DH clarified that when the minutes read "Cell 5A is significantly smaller than 5B, with a ratio of 1:3" that's actually referring to the cell batter slope, not cell size. He requested it be changed to read "Cell 5A is significantly smaller than 5B, with a cell batter slope of 1:3."</li> <li>PT queried the comment from the last minutes, which stated that the CAT 836 compactor released cleaner air than they received. DH confirmed that this is definitely regarding the engines, not limited to the air-conditioning of the machinery. DH took this</li> </ul>	<p>DH to bring confirmation of the 836 air filtration system to the next CRG.</p>

	<p>on notice, at PT's request, to confirm with Cat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DH also requested that, in regards to the cell liners in Cell 2, the language be changed from 'compromised' to 'damaged'. Damaged infers that it is still operational, however compromised infers that it is not safe. He confirmed that the cell liners were damaged on the edges, but not compromised.</li> <li>PT requested that the CRG be more particular when using the words flocculant and floc, as they are each unique.</li> <li>PT also requested the minutes be in third person. Therefore any 'we', 'us', 'our' should be replaced with 'the company', 'Transpacific' or 'TPI'.</li> <li>The CRG decided that IRATE can speak as a representative of the community, unless another community member of the CRG disagrees with their statement, in which case IRATE will speak on behalf of IRATE members.</li> <li>DH answered a follow up question from the minutes: TPI does not have approval to operate at all on a Sunday, unless with expressed permission or in emergencies.</li> </ul> <p>Jim Dodrill (JD) expressed that he would like to see a reviewed copy of the minutes before they are published.</p> <p>PT requested that the CRG follows the agenda and discusses each point one at a time, to ensure legible minutes for community members.</p> <p>NW also finalised that if no one speaks up against a statement at the time it is said, it will be documented as said.</p> <p>Minutes were accepted by the group with corrections above made with the single exception of the request from JD to review minutes before publishing. In order to progress the meeting the Chair agreed to this activity.</p>	
<b>3. Community Fund</b>	<p>DH updated the CRG on the Community Fund. The fund has been established, and two members of the community have been elected after receiving applications from the public advertising campaign. Savali Harvey and Theresa O'Connell were the community members elected. Savali is a community development worker and has a large amount of experience in fund management and community</p>	

	<p>grants. Theresa has owned a family business for a long time and has done lots of volunteer work for the community.</p> <p>DH said they received around 9-10 applications for grants, and may be able to inform the CRG of where the funds will be allocated in the next meeting and would be calling for applications for FY16 grants in June / July 2015.</p>	
<b>4. Business Arising from Previous Minutes</b>	<p>DH discussed the site in relation to re-profiling. The company is working with council to have the site profile changed. A meeting has been requested, however until that meeting has taken place DH is unable to update the CRG further. JD asked to see the information given to council, DH reminded JD that this was presented by two representatives from Golders Associates at a CRG meeting late last year.</p> <p>DH updated the meeting on the whole of life plan. The company is working with the consultants CEC currently and the process is going well. The company expects to receive details in June. DH reminded the CRG that TPI will disclose timelines provided in the document, but not financials.</p> <p>DH said that the company applied to the Ipswich City Council for a sediment basin in the northwest of the site. The Operational Works for this have been approved, and construction should commence in April.</p> <p>DH gave details of this application at JD's request. DH said that council requested the plans be changed so that the discharge of the dam runs over New Chum road, instead of under it. Hugh Wright (HW) clarified that this discharge is treated before being released. JD asked JP if this is normal practice. JP replied that it depends on the circumstance of the road, and that a council engineer determined these plans.</p> <p>DH stated that the storm management plan comes after the approved profile and the cell design work. This means the company has to wait for approval from the Council about the profile change before they can produce this plan.</p> <p>DH updated the CRG that TPI's application to DEHP to take regulated waste into cells 3 and 4 was approved on February 4<sup>th</sup>. DH stressed that they have no change to their licence acceptance conditions, this only affects where they will accept materials.</p> <p>JP clarified for the CRG the difference between licences and permits. The licence refers to the waste acceptance criteria, and the permit refers to the land uses and the Operational Works. These are the only</p>	

major development approvals we have on site. These have undergone minor amendments occasionally, but there is only ever one relevant version.

DH discussed the Operational Works approvals for cell 5B. TPI provided Council with further information regarding this application and the company believes this satisfies their approval and no further action is required.

JD comments in relation to Council's examination of engineering drawings in relation to Cell 5B. JD stated that the community would be concerned if cells 5B, 3 and 4 changed from construction and demolition waste, to regulated waste. HW assured JD that they have operational procedures for safe disposal of regulated waste. DH also added that these applications are only asking to continue accepting what they are currently accepting. DH reassured PT that TPI will not abandon the site once it is full, and that they have post-closure requirements and responsibilities. DH added that in the future the company will begin capping Cells 1 and 5 and will keep the community very well informed.

JP added that it is her understanding that TPI would not pursue a putrescible option, so it's not an option that needs to be discussed or worried about.

DH clarified for the CRG what materials come under 'contaminated waste': asbestos, shredded tyres, contaminated carpets and treated tank sludge. DH also discussed the process of accepting contaminated soil:

- There's a base inquiry from an external consultant.
- A report is forwarded to the TPI environmental team for acceptance.
- Commercial negotiation
- Letter of acceptance sent to consultants stating that TPI believes they can accept this material under their licence and with environmental approval.
- Consultants then take the acceptance letter, reports, and analysis and provide this to the DEHP.
- The DEHP contaminated lands unit then review, cross-reference and check it, and eventually approve.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A disposal permit is then issued from the DEHP stating that 'X' waste from 'X' facility must be accepted into Transpacific's facility.</li> </ul> <p>DH wanted the CRG to know that this is a very careful and thorough process.</p> <p>JD asked why the CRG cannot be provided with the records of what has gone into the site. DH said TPI is unable to disclose this information without compromising client privacy. DEHP and Council can review these at any time. Scott Blanchard (SB) assured JD that Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) testing has been done, and that the contents pose no threat if it meets TCLP testing, which it does. HW agreed, and stated that these tests are very strict, and conducted by independent contractors. DH said these reports are commercial in confidence.</p> <p>Neil Perry (NP) also stated that all the factual information about acceptable criteria is in the Environmental Authority (EA) document.</p> <p>JD said he wants to know how much of each material has been accepted, and SB said it's about the leachability potential, not the quantity.</p> <p>DH confirmed that TPI would require approval for a new asbestos sub-cell to keep landfilling this material once asbestos Sub-Cell 2 is full. TPI will cater for this material, i.e. buried in a dedicated sub-cell in the lined area that is away from the active working face. This could be in Cell 5B or potentially Cells 4 or 3. SB added that burying this material in a sub-cell is better than best practice.</p> <p>DH said that TPI is looking at GPS tracking their equipment. This allows them to see compact ratio data and also allows TPI to catalogue exactly where certain materials are.</p> <p>DH confirmed TPI have mobilised support services for concrete crushing. This means there is an excavator and a front-end loader on site. The site has begun sorting and hammering activities, breaking up concrete for crushing.</p> <p>Equipment that will be on site for this activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jaw crusher (Metso 3054)</li> <li>• Screen (Augly A8)</li> <li>• A loader</li> <li>• And 2 excavators.</li> </ul> <p>DH said the big crusher is due to arrive Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> March. HW noted that during sound tests, the cicadas in the area were making more noise than the crusher will.</p>	<p>DH to provide a full equipment list for the minutes.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>DH responded to the question of whether the weighbridges were in the wrong spot for geotechnical reasons. DH had a look through the Geotech material he has and he cannot confirm it. DH said TPI is moving the weighbridges for compliance reasons, to minimise dust and resolve parking issues.</p>	
<p><b>5. Any other Business</b></p>	<p>PT queried a modification to the EA on February 16<sup>th</sup>. JP explained that this is a technical issue because the State Government changed the Environmental Protection Legislation, under their green tape reduction program, removing several ERAs. JP explained this is viewed as “contemporising the approval”, by implementing standard approaches instead of site-specific approaches.</p> <p>DH clarified for Greg Broad (GB) that TPI is contracting the concrete crushing to an external company. They still operate under TPI’s licence. JD asked if zero audible noise still stands in regards to concrete crushing. DH said he would need to check.</p> <p>DH stated there have been a few reportable incidents to the DEHP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very small fires in the tip face (one battery, and one misused flare)</li> <li>• A burnt out car was found, police notified</li> <li>• And a few turned away vehicles (waste coming from outside the site’s catchment of 150km into NSW will be turned away, and DEHP informed).</li> </ul> <p>JD asked when the last set of environmental tests were conducted (air and water). DH replied that air tests are done quarterly and water, monthly. DH is in the middle of updating the website to reflect the most up to date results. JD said they found a dead platypus last Saturday at Six Mile Creek. SB said a member of the DEHP has already been informed and was going to contact JD regarding this. JD confirmed he had been contacted and advised how to continue.</p> <p>DH also commented that the maps have been updated.</p>	<p>DH to check noise restraints specifications.</p> <p>NW to add ‘Complaints &amp; Incidents’ to the standard agenda for CRG meetings.</p>
<p><b>6. Next Meeting</b></p>	<p>PT would like the next meeting to coincide with the whole-of-life plan release.</p> <p>The next meeting has been tentatively arranged for June 22<sup>nd</sup>.</p>	

	<p>DH informed the CRG that he will not be able to provide information regarding the Community Fund grants for FY16 at this date.</p> <p>Meeting concludes at 7:45pm.</p>	
--	---	--