

New Chum Community Reference Group

Meeting Minutes

Title: New Chum Community Reference Group

Date: Monday June 22 2015

Time: 6:00pm – 7.30pm

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	Geoff Yarham - Secretary of 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

Paul Tutin – Member, IRATE		
----------------------------	--	--

Not in Attendance

Bruce Morton, Manager Environmental Health, WMHHS	Cr Victor Attwood	Cr Bruce Casas

Notes & Actions

Item	Minutes	Action/Decision
1. Welcome & Apologies	Formal apology received from Paul Tutin (PT). No other formal apologies received.	
2. Review of Minutes	<p>Nathan Williams (NW) informed the CRG, if they have any changes to make to the previous minutes to email NW before COB Friday 26 June.</p> <p>Jim Dodrill (JD) gave NW a hard copy of the last minutes with notes from IRATE on it.</p>	
3. Community Fund	<p>Doug Hughes provided the CRG with an update of the Community Benefit Fund (CBF). Five community organisations have been chosen and funds have been distributed to three of these organisations to date. The fourth organisation's funding will be distributed on Thursday. The fifth organisation that has funding approved has had its payment deferred as the CBF was unable to fund the full amount requested at present. This payment will be deferred until the CBF is in a position to fully assist this organisation. The organisations funded to date are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riverview Community Centre • West Fallen Community Gardens • St Luke's Anglican Church • Ipswich Karate Association • Ipswich Historical Association (Deferred) <p>Advertising for the second round of funding will begin in July for Financial Year 2016 (FY16). Updates and requests shall be distributed through the CRG and local councillors. CRG members will receive a flyer via email from NW, which they are requested to distribute to potential applicants.</p> <p>DH is able to provide detailed information regarding the approved organisations on request of a CRG member.</p> <p>Neil Perry (NP) reiterated the guideline criteria for the CBF: organisations should be within a 3km radius of the landfill to be eligible, hence prioritising businesses closest to the landfill.</p> <p>The CBF will meet again in August and is aiming to have the second round of funding completed by the end of the first quarter of FY16. DH believes this is achievable, as they have now set up a procedure, making the process smoother.</p>	

<p>4. Operations Update</p>	<p>DH provided the CRG with an operations update.</p> <p>Cell 5B floor has been completed. Lining on the batter has been done up to the first bench (10-15m high). The company is waiting on a formal quality assurance sign off from a Registered Professional Engineer of QLD (RPEQ). This is a requirement of Transpacific's (TPI) development approval – cell construction must be signed off by an RPEQ. Once this has been signed off, TPI will inform the Ipswich City Council (ICC) and the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (DEHP) that TPI will commence filling in Cell 5B. TPI is aiming to have this completed within the next few weeks.</p> <p>Fencing: TPI has commenced installation of a fence on the Eastern, Southern and Western sides of the property. This is for safety and to prevent unauthorised access. TPI is talking with Powerlink regarding a fence that will run across an easement line where there are existing power lines.. The fence line is within the property boundary. This should be completed in 2-3 weeks. NP clarified that the fence is being constructed on land that will not be landfill. There is a section on the Southern border where the fence is quite close to the final profile (in regards to added dirt for correct storm water run off). TPI may need to move that fence out at a later point in time. DH emphasised that this is not to do with waste, but the dirt profile and is subject to approval.</p> <p>Storm water dam on the Northwest border. TPI has received formal approval to commence construction of a sediment dam and pond. TPI is waiting on final profile approval from Council and better weather to commence construction. TPI have installed temporary fencing along the boundary of the dam. JD asked whether an MCU was received for this. Jo Pocock (JP) answered JD with the application number, 242/2015, and approval date, 19 February 2015. All information is on Planning and Development (PD) Online.</p> <p>Concrete crushing: the recent rain has been dampening the materials, making them clog up. This has impacted concrete crushing operations. The company has crushed 2,170 tons of material in the last 3 months; DH noted this is below average. NP also added that they have been engaged to do an initial batch of 50,000 tons. DH reiterated the times TPI's licence allows them to crush: Monday to</p>	
------------------------------------	--	--

	<p>Friday, 6am to 5pm. TPI is currently operating concrete crushing between Monday to Friday, 7am to 4pm.</p> <p>Incidents that have occurred over the last 3 months: A couple of complaints have been made – DH mention that this will be addressed later in the meeting. A burnt out car was discovered on the Southeast side of the property. Police were called and are currently investigating. There was a small fire on the tip-face, a machine ran over a piece of waste and a small fire was established. TPI has isolated and moved that material out of the way. DH added that this is a very minor event, but that every incident is recorded.</p> <p>Increased compliance work. A driver was seen exiting his vehicle on the asbestos cell with out the proper Personal Protection Equipment (PPE). He was pulled up and reprimanded. There have been 2 regulatory inspections. One from DEHP (license review and audit inspection) and Comcare (Workplace Health and Safety [WHS]).</p> <p>Geoff Yarham (GY) asked why the CRG was not made aware at the last meeting of the application to build a sediment retention dam. NP & DH informed GY that this had been discussed several times. NP quoted the previous minutes that said: “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.” DH also clarified with GY that this construction cannot commence until the approval of the new landform, just in case there needs to be a change. DH also noted for GY that the dam is not on the final landform plan as it is not a permanent feature and will not remain after the life of the landfill.</p> <p>Ground water results: DH provided a hard-copy of the annual report summary to the CRG on behalf of TPI. This is submitted to the DEHP. DH will upload this report to the website. DH apologised for the delay which is due to website updates. DH made a commitment on behalf of TPI to publish this year’s and all future annual reports for ground water monitoring. DH explained that this report includes all the ground water, surface water, leachate and gas field monitoring. DH will also post last year’s report so that there is two years worth of data.</p>	<p>DH to upload annual report to the website.</p> <p>DH to upload 2014’s annual report to the website</p> <p>DH to add his contact details to the annual reports online</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Greg Broad (GB) asked if it would make sense to the public. DH said the report explains it as best as possible for a technical subject.</p> <p>NP said if there are any follow-up questions from any member of the public, submit these to DH or Hugh Wright (HW) and they will help you with those. NP encouraged members to do this as soon as the questions arise, and not to wait until the next meeting.</p> <p>JD asked that in future results be shared promptly after being received. DH agreed, but noted it is an annual report so the results will only be published once a year.</p> <p>DH also added that the CRG are alerted of any incidents at the time of the event.</p> <p>JD asked what triggers an incident. DH explained that TPI has a specific licence that outlines the necessary quality of performance that must be achieved in order to adhere to licence requirements. If there are any deviations to this performance a report must be placed. DH said there are no incidents to report.</p> <p>Scott Blanchard (SB) added that in March there were a few exceeding levels in Zinc but they were upstream and not at Transpacific's New Chum site. Leachate monitoring was conducted to compare and contrast. Leachate levels were a lot lower than what was observed in the upstream bores, so it was determined that the exceeding levels were from another source.</p> <p>GB asked if this reports includes air monitoring. DH confirmed and clarified that raw data is not included, but any incidents are included in the report.</p> <p>JD said IRATE are not satisfied with annual reports, but request monthly updates. DH said he would investigate to see what TPI could do.</p> <p>DH provided an update on the profile application with the ICC. DH said it was still with council. JP gave a further update and clarification on this. JP clarified that it is not an application, but a request for a minor alteration to vary a condition. She explained that an error was made where the request was entered into the system as an application. Owing to this error the application that was created had been cancelled. JP will request that a letter be issued to TPI outlining that the application was incorrectly entered in the system was formally cancelled on the fact that it is a request relating to another application and not an application.</p>	<p>DH to investigate more frequent reports regarding monitoring results.</p> <p>JP to request assessment officers to issue TPI with an explanatory letter regarding the application error on PD online and make that available on PD Online</p>
--	--	---

Update on application including prospective relocation of leachate ponds. (Reference: MA4629/2013A)

DH gave an update on this. DH explained there is no leachate pond going on the northern boundary, but a sediment control dam. DH added that TPI is only required to relocate leachate ponds when they start construction on the final cell - Cell 3. Leachate ponds will stay where they are for the time being. Location of these will come down to operational needs at the time. When it comes to moving these, the CRG will be informed of the plans.

DH informed the CRG that Civil and Environmental Consultants (CEC) have been engaged to perform a study on leachate services at New Chum. They will report and review any possible improvements TPI can make to the leachate collection and disposal processes. This review is currently underway.

JD asked: when TPI finally cap the site, what happens to the leachate ponds?

DH answered: there are leachate risers installed throughout the site. The basal liner of the landfill will be angled into a corner. A leachate riser is then used to extract as much leachate as possible. The risers will stay in place for a period of time, and once the final capping is done effectively all leachate should have been removed. DH explained that this is because once the final cap is completed, water will not be getting into the landfill. There will be a period of time where the site will effectively have both the final cap and leachate risers.

Update ICC works requirements. DH explained that there are two major works to be done in regards to building and construction.

1: Certification of the workshop. A Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland (RPEQ) is required to sign off on this. A formal assessment has been done, and there are a few modifications TPI is required to complete this assessment and the modifications in order to have it formally signed off by RPEQ. These modifications are currently underway.

2: Relocation of weighbridges and offices. The design work is almost done. DH provided the CRG with an A3 map with proposed locations. DH said this is close to the final version and a few minor changes will be made before it is submitted to the ICC for approval. TPI is required to submit an operational approval to ICC, once approved construction can begin. DH believes this to be a 3-6 month process. The application will be submitted by 3rd July.

NW added that any comments or questions should be directed to DH.

Underground Mining: DH discussed underground mining in the area and under where the weighbridges were. DH provided the CRG with an A3 map of where the underground mine areas are. DH explained that this has made it difficult for TPI to place the weighbridges.

JD asked if TPI has researched possible noise or visual problems for neighbouring suburbs with the new proposed locations for the weighbridges. DH confirmed it will not be visible from the higher sections of Collingwood Park and that it should also be quieter than it is currently. JD confirmed that it is not currently an issue.

NP added that the neighbouring property to the North has had a material change of use and reconfiguration for industrial uses. DH believes 50 industrial properties will be developed on that piece of land.

GY asked about the rumble strips for tyre cleaning. DH pointed out the new wheel wash and the paved road. This is to give the vehicles time to lose the sediment on the road before leaving the property.

Concrete crushing update (previously discussed): TPI haven't been able to perform any further noise monitoring, only the initial background noise monitoring. This is because there hasn't been any consistent crushing to date. This will be undertaken when the weather clears up and they have a consistent run of crushing. JD asked about total running times – DH informed the CRG that they have performed 8 days of concrete crushing, at about 4-5 hours each day.

Council permissible change (previously discussed): JP added that the offices would be in a position to make recommendations and finalise that decision in the next couple of weeks. ICC is waiting on finalisation from the internal experts and then there will be an internal consultation process. ICC will determine that request using the criteria that has always been indicated.

Factors of safety for underground mine pillars IRATE sent a question to the CRG in advance of the meeting. It was as follows:
"As part of Paul's work in risk consulting within the mining sector, the below information on pillar stability recently came to

his attention:

The University of NSW calculated factors of safety based on the probability of pillar failure gathered from global data. The numbers were checked and affirmed by the Manager of Geotechnical Engineering at a leading international mining company.

As a guide it is considered that safety factors above 1.2 will provide stable pillars in short term panels and above 1.8 will be stable for longer term mains areas. A safety factor of 2.11 should be used for the design of Life of Mine pillars. It is recommended that at least 2 methods of calculating safety factors should be utilised.

The safety factor of 2.11 should be compared to the following factors of safety provided in the Moreton Geotechnical Services Report dated 4 Sept 1998 which was written by Ken Grubb for Environautics P/L regarding the New Chum Landfill prior to the issue of TPC192/98:

Cell 1 indicative factors of safety 2.4 and 1.7

Cell 2 indicative factor of safety 3.5

Cell 3 indicative factor of safety 1.3

Cell 4 indicative factors of safety 1.2, 1.2, 1.3, 2.4

Cell 5 indicative factors of safety between 2.5 and 7.4 (calculated for selected pillars on 6 sets of workings)

Generally, a Factor of Safety of 2.11 is thought appropriate for the safety of people entering a working mine during its life (the length of which is highly variable) and is also generally thought appropriate for longer term stability.

However, as we've seen from a 2013 submission by the mining engineer Hugh Taylor

(http://www.minesurveyors.com.au/files/TMS-SET-Submission-RE-QMSF-Consultation-RIS-Nov_2013.pdf), old mine maps are not always accurate. Also quite often, pillars are mined on the way out (towards end of mine life, as was the case under sections of Collingwood Park) and this is not always recorded on the old maps."

Summarised question from IRATE: How safe are the underground mine pillars and how long will they stay upright?

	<p>DH answered that essentially the higher the Factors of Safety number, the greater the stability process. TPI has undertaken a geotechnical and hydrological review of future developments within the landfill – specifically relating to Cells 3 and 4, which are the next developments. The review modelled worst-case failures and what impact could occur. TPI believes there is no safe way of determining the long-term stability of any remaining underground workings other than by desktop work. The heights that were allowed for in the report were well above the current and proposed profile.</p> <p>The report was completed by highly reputable firm Golders Associates and compiled by two senior principles within the company. DH suggested that if any CRG members wished to obtain a copy of their CVs, to send an email request to NW.</p> <p>DH then read a couple of excerpts from the report:</p> <p>“Underground mining has been undertaken in 6 coal seams underlying the site. And those coal seams are ‘The Bluff’, ‘Four Foot Top’, ‘The Four Foot’, ‘Bergins’, ‘Striped Bacon’ and ‘Rob Roy’.”</p> <p>“The mining methods used were board and pillar mines. i.e. no floor stripping, no pillar stripping, or pillar extraction was undertaken. Many of these works were later removed by open cut mining, but some works still remain at a depth under the footprint of the proposed cells.”</p> <p>“It is concluded that there is a very low risk of the proposed Cells, 3 and 4, floors being impacted by subsidence due to the collapse of the known workings in ‘The Four Foot Top’, and ‘The Four Foot Top’ seams.”</p> <p>DH added that the report goes into detail of the other seams and that these do not factor in, as they do not impact the New Chum Landfill.</p> <p>“These analyses for subsidence, settlement, ground water, elevation and spontaneous combustion have been performed using available site data and our experience on similar sites. The results of our analyses indicate that the development of Cells 3 and 4 are feasible. However some design details such as steepness of the batter, post settlements, cell floor slopes and base liner system components should be re-evaluated based on these analyses and incorporated into the design.”</p> <p>DH gave an example of this in Cell 5B. The floor batter is at 4%, and industry standard is 2%. TPI has done this to account for any subsidence that may occur. DH gave this as an example of where TPI has</p>	<p>DH will investigate what needs to happen and what has happened in the past in regards to drilling tests for pillar strength.</p> <p>JD will send NW a copy of the University of NSW report on pillar safety.</p> <p>DH will ask Golders Associates to comment specifically on this report.</p>
--	---	---

taken into account the recommendations to adhere to the risks that are involved.

JD asked if the Golders Associates report takes into account Ken Grub's report. DH replied yes and that it is a referenced document in the report.

JD quoted Ken Grub's Report specifically regarding Cell 4. JD says Grub's reports factors of safety as low as 1.2 in 'The Four Foot' seam, 1.2 in the 'Burgens' seam and 1.3 in the 'Stripe Bacon'.

JD also commented that IRATE was recently made aware of a current report by the University of NSW. JD says this report questions established assumptions in relation to pillar strength and factors of safety. JD questions how current Golders Associates views are, in relation to this report. DH replies that Golders Associates assumptions are based off year-old studies. TPI has just engaged Golders Associates to do an update. TPI has factored in the major failures, not the pillar strength. This way, TPI will be confident that the liner systems will stay in place. DH added that these failures have been calculated at an RL level that is well above what will actually be placed on them.

JD commented that some of the residents of Collingwood park had become aware about the issues of pillar strength and factors of safety in relation to subsidence at Collingwood Park. JD said that the mining under Collingwood Park was quite recent and is expected to be stable and any subsidence effects on the surface would be minor. JD said that this has not been the case and also commented on the unreliability of mining maps. JD speculated that miners might have mapped pillars while they were mining, then taken the pillars with them as they were exiting. JD was concerned that there was no potential for this in the Golders Associates report – no possibility that things could be worse than shown through maps. JD raised concerns about this report being a desktop audit, and hence no drilling was undertaken. DH said that this is why they modelled complete failures. DH also said Rod Morphett is very experienced, and hence why he was approached. JD will send NW a copy of the UNSW report on pillar safety. DH will ask Golders to comment specifically on this report.

TPI is putting a submission in to move the front-end driveway. Operational Works will be put through to council in the next 2 weeks.

<p>5. Complaints Update</p>	<p>DH gave an update on site complaints. There have been 3 complaints received in the last 3 months.</p> <p>1) Noise complaint via JD</p> <p>In regards to heavy earth moving equipment and reverse speakers. Based on the description, the activity was believed to be from New Chum's neighbour, Claypave. Claypave have begun extraction of clay from a satellite pit that they own. TPI spoke to DEHP and Claypave. Claypave have now changed their operational hours. Originally they were operating from 5am, Monday to Saturday. They are now operating from 7am, Monday to Friday. JD believes Claypave is not the source. He says the noise is still occurring from 5am, including Saturdays. JD suggests it may be from the earth-moving sector that TPI is in, but may not have been TPI specifically.</p> <p>SB informed the CRG that the DEHP spoke to Claypave. Claypave advised the DEHP that they had just started an extraction campaign on TPI's Southern boundary. They took on board the complaint and were encouraged to take note of their licence limits for noise. SB added that this licence constrains noise from 10pm-7am to 35db. If the complaints continue the DEHP will be doing monitoring on their site and issuing a warning. Claypave informed the DEHP that this is a 4-week extraction campaign. SB is unsure if it is outsourced and said they usually they do their own work.</p> <p>2) Division 3 office alerted TPI that Levy 6 was damaged. They believed that the levy should have gone all the way across like it used to where the water from void 10 enters into Six Mile Creek. The Division 3 office believed this had only just happened, however TPI informed the Division 3 office that that bund has been there for numerous years and it is of no issue. The DEHP was also notified so that they were aware. DH added that this would not be replaced, as there is no need.</p> <p>3) Complaint from the Division of WHS who then referred the matter onto TPI's insurer. TPI comes under the national workplace health and safety standards – regulated by Comcare. TPI was not formally informed as to where the complaint originated. The complaint was regarding improper disposal of asbestos. Specifically that asbestos was being delivered from the Willawong facility to New Chum and subsequently disposed of in an unsafe manner.</p> <p>Two Comcare inspectors came out in mid-April to look over New Chum's processes. They were satisfied that no unsafe disposal was occurring.</p>	
------------------------------------	---	--

	<p>An informal inspection of Willawong was undertaken two weeks later as well and no issues were found. Comcare have commented to TPI that there is no issue going forward.</p> <p>GY asked for confirmation that WHS don't have jurisdiction over the site and that Comcare does. DH confirmed this as correct.</p>	
6. Whole of Life Plan	<p>DH said that the CEC review was due to be finished in June. DH confirmed that it is very close, but not completed. It is likely to be completed by the next CRG meeting. DH also confirmed that TPI would only be providing high-level summary data about whole of life, estimated year of completion and post closure timeframes.</p> <p>JD asked about future plans and if they include what materials are intended to be accepted. DH restated that TPI intends on continuing their current acceptance criteria with no change.</p> <p>DH will send through some data when it's ready to the CRG on JD's request.</p> <p>NP restated what had been publicly said by TPI: based on current volumes TPI is looking at 10 years remaining life.</p> <p>JD asked if that includes the Western Borrow. DH said this is not included in the whole of life plan as it is a separate property and it is not included in the landfill.</p> <p>DH said that they do have a plan being worked through to reduce that stockpile through commercial mechanisms.</p> <p>DH commented that the material quality itself doesn't provide the right capping material to permeate the landfill, TPI will look at other commercial mechanisms.</p> <p>JD said there is an expectation that the owner of the Western Borrow will undertake some rehabilitation on the property.</p> <p>JP asked how the expectation regarding rehabilitation was established. JD said that when the mine was open, before TPI came on the site, the mine's department stated that during the rehabilitation process that the Western Burrow would either go back 'in the hole' or offsite to return the skyline to it's natural horizon. Now that TPI owns that property, JD believes there is an expectation that the owner of this Western Burrow would undertake some rehabilitation on this property.</p> <p>JP commented that she believes you cannot make assumptions on any two mines based off outcomes at one, and that every mining situation is unique. JP encouraged IRATE to do further research if they believe there is an expectation regarding rehabilitation.</p>	
7. Employment Update	<p>DH gave an employment update: 2 operator positions vacant at New Chum.</p>	

	<p>Also recently hired a new weighbridge operator due to a previous staff member moving overseas.</p> <p>SB asked HW to clarify what happens with new employees. HW elaborated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New staff go through induction (which incorporates environmental management) • Toolbox meetings also cover this. • TPI is in the process of amending its site based management plan – TPI will submit this to DEHP in the next few weeks. Once TPI is happy with that, a formal toolbox meeting will take place with staff to go through it. <p>SB said it is important staff are aware of requirements and responsibilities. HW said part of his role is to make sure that supervisors are aware of TPI's environmental responsibilities, so that it is an ongoing education process with site staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DH said TPI has a standard suite of induction packages as well as a site specific one. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consumer and competition awareness ○ Safety and zero harm ○ Environmental awareness • TPI's Environmental Officer, Paul Christiansen, is the go to person if there are any questions regarding acceptance criteria, if Paul Christiansen is unsure he contacts DEHP. • HW said that they are conditioning weighbridge staff to hold trucks if they are not sure. <p>DH informed the CRG of a huge improvement in regards to the new weighbridge design: the de-tarpping area will be prior to the weighbridge. This stops people de-tarpping on the street or blocking the driveway, and also allows for an improved inspection process.</p> <p>JD asked if New Chum is still accepting Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) from the ICC.</p> <p>DH said that New Chum does not accept any MSW waste except for street sweeping. TPI accepts dry waste from Council transfer stations. This gets inspected and checked using the following method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspected at a weighbridge and when it gets dumped (dozer operator and compactor operator are observing it at the tip point). <p>SB said council has its own requirements in regards to the transfer station as well.</p>	
8. Equipment Update	<p>A brand new caterpillar 730 dump truck arrived on June 17. And on June 23 the arrival of a new water cart 740, 8,500-gallon tank (32,000 litres) is</p>	

	<p>scheduled. This will be New Chum's primary dust suppression and emergency response vehicle. A new 36-ton excavator is due on site in the next week (June 29). This is a hybrid unit and the slew mechanism is battery powered. More environmentally friendly. Part diesel, part electric. DH replied to one of PT's questions last meeting about the emissions. DH provided the CRG with a report from Caterpillar regarding the air quality with these machines. JD took this report on Paul Tutin's behalf. Electronic copies are available on request, CRG members are encouraged to email NW with any requests.</p> <p>NP added a point about the equipment update. TPI has invested several million dollars into better equipment in the past 12 months, which improves the practices on site. NP believes this to be a sign of TPI's investment in the facility, improved operational excellence and better outcomes. All new equipment is maintained by the CAT distributor - Hastings Deering. All staff use daily checklists, raise any faults, and equipment is not to be used if it is not fully operational.</p> <p>DH added: TPI has changed the beepers on the back of the yellow gears. They've been changed to 'quackers'. These are lower tone and lower decibel. These will be implemented over the coming months. NP confirmed safety is paramount, and this is not a sacrifice.</p>	
9. Next Meeting	<p>NW discussed the decision to move meetings to a quarterly basis. The next meeting is proposed for September 21. CRG members are encouraged to get back to NW about this in the coming weeks. JP tentatively booked the council boardroom.</p> <p>JD raised a concern regarding quarterly meetings: If there are any new applications made, he requests that these should be indicated to the group. DH said this can be done, and they will also be online. Any queries can be put through to NW between now and the next meeting.</p> <p>SB notified the CRG that he would be away from July to mid August. If anyone needs to contact him, call his landline as someone in the office will answer. Emails will also be forwarded to another DEHP staff member.</p>	