

New Chum Community Reference Group

Meeting Minutes

Title: New Chum Community Reference Group

Date: Monday September 21 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

Scott Blanchard – Regional
Manager, DEHP

Elly Read – Site Officer - Ipswich
DEHP

Hugh Wright, Operations Manager, New
Chum TPI

Meg Saunderson - Principal,
Riverview State School

Duchense Broad – Community
Member

Jonathan Blight – Scribe

Apologies

Paul Tutin – Member, IRATE

Doug Hughes – Regional Manager,
TPI

Leanne Burley – Head of Curriculum,
Riverview State School

Not in Attendance

Bruce Morton, Manager
Environmental Health, WMHHS

Cr Victor Attwood

Cr Bruce Casos

Notes & Actions

Item	Minutes	Action/Decision
1. Welcome & Apologies	<p>Formal apology received from Paul Tutin (PT) and Doug Hughes (DH). Leanne Burley is travelling (LB). No other formal apologies received.</p> <p>Scott Blanchard (SB) introduced Elly Read (ER). ER is the DEHP site officer for Transpacific and has recently been acting in SB's role. SB has been working as a state-wide compliance manager for DEHP in an acting capacity. ER previously worked as a compliance manager for the Ipswich City Council (ICC).</p>	
2. Review of Minutes	<p>Nathan Williams (NW) began reviewing the minutes from the previous meeting. NW commented that two CRG members had noted that they did not believe they had viewed the last meeting's minutes. NW will send out another copy of the minutes tomorrow morning (22 September) and will enable the CRG members to have another week to review the minutes, with any changes due by close of business September 28th.</p> <p>NW noted that there is an assumption that if he doesn't receive a reply it acts as approval. SB said he had reviewed and approved.</p> <p>Neil Perry (NP) had a small number of corrections for the previous minutes. He corrected the spelling of Paul Kristensen's name. On page 7, 'offices' should be 'officers' from Jo Pocock (JP).</p> <p>Geoff Yarham (GY) raised a concern that there was only an agenda available on the New Chum website for the 23rd March meeting, and no minutes. He raised concerns on behalf of IRATE that the CRG is not following protocol in regards to uploading these minutes and agendas.</p>	<p>NW will resend the previous minutes to the CRG on September 22nd.</p> <p>NP will ensure all finalised documents will be uploaded to the CRG website.</p>
3. Community Benefit Fund	<p>NP gave an update on the Community Benefit Fund (CBF). DH had sent the launch document to NW for circulation to the CRG. It will not be publicly advertised, Transpacific (TPI) believe it would receive broader coverage if information was to be spread by word of mouth. The document was also sent to the councillor's offices as well. Responses are due back by Friday 23rd October. NP reminded the CRG that the CBF has \$50,000 per annum to allocate. NP also stated that this is for community groups within the Collingwood Park, Riverview, Dinmore and Ebbw Vale areas.</p> <p>Duchense Broad (DB) asked about the FY15 grant recipients. NP referred to the last meeting minutes for further explanation and details about grant recipients.</p> <p>GY said he saw the kitchen at St Luke's Anglican Church, which received funding last financial year from the CBF. He said the community greatly appreciates it, and it has allowed</p>	

	<p>them to offer that facility to other community groups in the area.</p> <p>NP added that any funding unused in one financial year carries forward on to the next. There is also no limit to the amount community groups can request in their applications, so the applicants must consider the project and how much they wish to apply for.</p>	
4. Operations Update	<p>NP gave an operations update, starting with cell development.</p> <p>Cell 5B is completed and the cell is fully operational. There were delays for a variety of issues (some climatic). TPI is now in early stages of planning for the next development, Cell 4A.</p> <p>Cell 5B's quality assurance sign off was conducted by Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland (RPEQ).</p> <p>TPI has almost completed the fencing around the operational areas of the property. One area on the northwest corner is not complete – this is where the storm water sediment dam is being built. There is temporary fencing at the moment, and it will be properly fenced once the dam construction is fully completed.</p> <p>Hugh Wright (HW) reported that the sediment dam adjacent to Chum Street has been completed, TPI is conducting final clean up works. As soon as this is finished and formally signed off, the fencing contractors will complete installation of the final 250 metres of fence.</p> <p>NP reported that there has been a delay in the concrete crushing activities as the concrete crushing contractor has gone into liquidation. TPI is waiting on what happens with the liquidation but at the moment the contractor, OnTrax, has left equipment on site. NP reported that at the moment nothing is happening on site in regards to concrete crushing. TPI had planned to do batches of 50,000 tons at a time, and at the moment they have not achieved this quantity in the first batch.</p> <p>NP gave an update on safety and operations. TPI has had several incidents of theft or vandalism on the property. These incidents all occurred whilst the fence was being built, none have occurred since its construction. Jim Dodrill (JD) asked what equipment was effected. HW responded that some kids broke in with bikes and rode up and down on the batter where TPI had lined and broke windows of some machines. NP added that some equipment of the fencing contractor was lost as well.</p> <p>DB asked if the police were called regarding these incidents. HW confirmed and said they came and took reports. The commitment from the local police was to increase monitoring of the area.</p>	

	<p>DB asked if school holidays influence this type of activity? HW said these incidents weren't on the holidays but police and TPI are more vigilant during these periods.</p>	
<p>5. Complaints Update</p>	<p>NP reported on complaints since the last meeting.</p> <p>NP reported that there was a complaint of improper waste disposal. This was referred to Commcare (TPI's national safety regulator). HW said Commcare went to the site, interviewed staff and reviewed the site. Commcare then wrote a report and confirmed TPI is satisfactory in asbestos disposal. Operation procedures JD asked about the details of the complaint. HW explained that it was just a general complaint and that no further explanation was offered.</p> <p>NP reported that there was a complaint regarding operating hours and noise early in the morning. Internal investigations by TPI and ICC were undertaken and a fine was issued to TPI. NP said this has been paid and TPI have had conversations with the ICC and have made alterations to their operating procedures in the morning to comply with the requirements of operating hours. NP clarified that this means TPI is not starting up any machines prior to 6AM. Site access for security and safety inspections will continue to happen at any time.</p> <p>GY discussed the noise complaints further. GY said JD was awoken at 4:35AM by noise on site. JD then went to the site at 4:45AM and saw machinery being used. NP reconfirmed that the results of the investigation were that no machines (discussed as 'yellow gear') were moved at that time before 6am, and the noise was not attributed to the TPI site. GY said, following up on JD's complaint, the following day he went to the site at 5am and saw machinery being used on the south-western corner of Chum street, moving up to Cell 2, down to the working face. GY then quoted an email that NP sent to GY on the 13th of July, where NP said that the noise complaint couldn't be attributed to the TPI facility as no one was on site before 5am.</p> <p>JP asked GY to clarify what he is asking. GY responded that he would like to know who is believed to be lying. NP asked GY if he had any further tangible evidence by way of a recording or a photo with a time stamp. GY was unable to provide any further data than what had been tendered already. NP added again that TPI had investigated the matter with the information available to them and at this stage there was no evidence, internally or provided by GY, to substantiate any operation of the machinery at the time in question on the basis of the information provided to date.</p> <p>JP further clarified that the fine issued by ICC was not for noise. The fine was in regards to breach of hours of operation. There are no conditions on the Development</p>	

Approval regarding noise, so this was referred to DEHP. GY then asked who is responsible for enforcing the noise restrictions. SB confirmed that is the responsibility of DEHP. JP added, responding to the complaint, compliance action was taken, and now there is a compliant situation.

GY asked for clarification of what constitutes 'operations' on site. JP clarified this:

- A security vehicle running the premises is not part of the operations
- Activities that run ancillary to the landfill or are integral to the operations of the landfill are part of the operations
 - E.g. lighting up the working face of the landfill and doing workplace health and safety checks on that working face is part of the operations

JP said she investigated the site for three days and on those days there was no acceptance of waste before 6am. JP said the basis of the fine was: lights on the back of a trailer - not large floodlights, vehicles with flashing lights with no audible sounds, the only sound heard was 2 employees yelling across to each other. Those were stated to TPI and as they are integral to the operations of the landfill they need to be conducted after 6am.

GY requoted the email from NP on 13th July where NP said there was no machinery in use before 6am but there were WHS checks undertaken. NP said that this email was sent prior to the enforcement action. JP also added that audits have been undertaken since the enforcement and operations have been compliant.

NP mentioned that now that the gates are shut until 6am there may trucks banked up on the road, rather than on site.

JD added that he had been complaining to DEHP weeks prior to his formal complaint regarding noise. He claimed DEHP took no action on this, however when he formally complained they took enforcement action and no noise has occurred since. SB believed this to be an unfair statement for JD to say DEHP took no action regarding this matter. SB had records that action had been undertaken by DEHP and communication provided to JD via email. DEHP undertook investigations and noted noise but there was not any way to determine that it was unlawful noise from the TPI site. DEHP then liaised with the co-regulators (ICC) to see what action they were taking and were satisfied with that.

HW added that in response to these complaints they changed all the reversers from 'loud beepers' to 'squawkers', which are a lower frequency but still compliant to safety regulations.

JD clarified that he meant no enforcement action had been undertaken by DEHP. JD communicated that he would prefer the minutes to state this.

GY asked JP what the council could do to support the community in regards to the trucks banking on the road. JP said, from a planning perspective, ICC has no regulation of the roadway for lawful users of the road. GY asked if it can be made a 'no standing' zone. JP said that is no longer a planning issue so she is not able to respond to that specific request. JP referred GY to his local divisional councillor or the traffic division. JP also added that it is a business and industry area, and not a residential area.

SB asked what offence is being committed by the trucks queuing on the side of the road. GY said they are blocking the roadway. SB and HW confirmed that trucks are not blocking the road at present and JP added that they are lawfully parked.

JP added that in the three days she inspected the site she saw no one untarping their trucks on the road. JP said there might be some scope for the relocation of the weighbridge to provide some limited opportunity to get off the road and start the untarping protocol. JP said this is something ICC will work on and it may be that they consider enabling a number of activities to happen outside of the hours of operation so that this can be done safely. JP said ICC would prefer to work on a solution to that effect rather than a 'no standing' zone.

GY asked what he should do if he sees a truck untarping on the road. JP said this is an issue for the trucking company and that this should be reported to the police. HW also added that TPI has an untarping area within the boundary of the landfill in which trucks can undertake this activity safely.

JP added that she has seen TPI send emails of notifications and alerts to all of their contractors and drivers advising of what is acceptable practice in this situation so the responsibility is on the truck drivers.

SB clarified that the police should be involved if it's a safety issue. And the Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR) also have a compliance unit that can be contacted.

NP continued on the safety update.

TPI are continuing to receive some vehicles that are overweight. TPI informs the incoming company of that oversight, and then handle the overweight vehicle on site using various site procedures to manage the increased risks. Some drivers have also entered the TPI site without wearing the correct Personal Protection Equipment (PPE). TPI has reminded several contractors or customers disposing of waste of the PPE requirements, especially regarding the asbestos cell.

There has been an occasional engine oil spill on site. TPI handles and cleans these up. There has been one instance of this occurring since the last meeting in June.

There have been four small fires or smoke emanating from the landfill. These are quickly isolated and extinguished according to procedures.

There have been five instances of fires around the property, not on it. Some of these quite large. TPI or other parties reported these to the fire brigade. In most instances DH has called JD (as the President of IRATE) to inform him that those fires are not on TPI's site.

NP added that this is one of the benefits of the new fence as it acts as a significant firebreak around the landfill. JD asked how the fence makes a firebreak. NP clarified that they have had to clear around the fences so it has put a break and it will be kept clear.

HW made a comment that there have been a couple of instances of drivers coming in not using the right PPE. When drivers come on the TPI site, at the weighbridge they sign a declaration that they will wear the following items of PPE whilst on site. If they don't have these items, TPI has them available for purchase and drivers are obliged to use them.

NP gave an environmental monitoring update. TPI has updated the website to include both the 2013 and the 2014 environmental annual reports.

NP gave an update on the profile application with ICC. ICC has approved the updated profile design. TPI has commenced the work required to comply with this profile. This requires the relocation of some waste on the edges of Cell 1 and Cell 5. NP asked HW for a time update on that. HW said TPI is currently working in Cell 5B. Under the current profile there is still a portion of air space in Cell 5A to be filled. HW said they would probably move into that area within the next 2 months.

JD asked where the waste will sit on the new liner on the western side of cell 5. HW said the waste and the capping will marry with the liner. JD said it is very visible in most of Collingwood Park. HW said TPI would try and put screens up so that residents can't see it.

NP mentioned PT's thoughts in the last meeting regarding underground mining and the pillar factors of safety. NP said that unless there are some particular questions tabled that TPI is to answer, TPI is satisfied with the matter.

JD summarised PT's comments from last meeting. NP said this was referred to two senior associates of Golders Associates; TPI was satisfied with the situation after their response.

NP gave an update on the Whole of Life modelling. TPI has completed the modelling. NP quoted DH notes on the report:

	<p>“There are a number of significant variables that can alter the outcome to our (TPI’s) Whole of Life process, these can include: incoming volume rates, product mix and densities, compaction densities achieved, operating cost and efficiencies, significant events, regulatory changes and requirements. Based on assumptions made of all those variables our (TPI’s) overview of it is: operations are currently scheduled to cease around 2024 or Financial Year 2025. The breakdown of the cell timing is: Cell 1 is complete with rectification works still outstanding. Cell 2 will be completed in 2017, rectification works still outstanding. Cell 3 will be constructed in 2020 with an estimated timeline to go through to 2025. This is the last cell to be completed on the site. Cell 4A 2016 construction with completion in 2021. Cell 4B construction in 2018 with an estimated timeline of 2021. Cell 5 to be completed in 2017, which is both Cells 5A and 5B. We do have obligations to perform progressive capping once cells have been filled. Final capping and contouring will occur after final waste placement. To note: we have after care obligations forecast for the next 30 years. Things not covered in the Whole of Life modelling: after landfill use, buffer zones and ancillary area usages.”</p> <p>SB asked about Cell 4A. SB’s understanding from his assessment team is that Cells 4 and 3 are not currently on TPI’s Environmental Authority and no applications submitted as of yet. HW said TPI is still going through the design phase. SB asked when an application should be expected. NP said TPI would need to come back to SB on that, as TPI is unsure of the exact details at present. SB queried how TPI is expecting to begin 4A in 2016. NP clarified that that is construction of the Cell, not the filling of it. SB was satisfied with this response.</p>	
6. Employment & Equipment Update	<p>HW updated the CRG that TPI has recently employed a fulltime operator. The individual lives in Ipswich and is experienced with machines. They have a very good safety ethos that they have utilised from their experience in the mining industry.</p> <p>HW updated the CRG on the new equipment on site: a 33 ton Cat excavator, 730 Cat dump truck and TPI is in the process of updating a second hand dozer with the necessary safety modifications.</p> <p>GY asked for an update on the wheel wash. HW said TPI have not submitted an Operational Works for the construction yet. They have submitted a conceptual design. GY asked when the wheel wash is used. NP informed GY that they use the wheel wash all the time for all outbound trucks. GY then asked about the design and why there is a bypass around the wheel wash. HW said this is for site vehicles. JP said this is</p>	

	<p>common. HW said all trucks will use the wheel wash prior to an outgoing weighbridge.</p> <p>GY then asked another question about operations. He said the licence, in condition 32, mentions the requirement of an operations manual. GY asked if this manual exists and if it's suitable for the CRG members to review it. JP took this on notice and will investigate it further.</p> <p>GY said he would be happy for the Site-Based Management Plan to be the Operations Manual. JP believes they would be very similar but will still take it on notice to confirm.</p> <p>SB said ER and himself completed a compliance inspection against the conditions of the approval yet to be finalised. There were no non-compliances to write. They also conducted it for the Mining Environmental Authority for the adjacent area on the top of the hill. One concern for DEHP upon visiting the site was the time taken to action the Cell 2 remediation. SB said TPI recognised it was an issue for them as it costs them large amounts of money to remove the leachate that is produced from the exposed area there. SB said DEHP is continuing to follow up TPI on that issue as they don't see it as optimal as it costs TPI money but is also a safety issue. HW informed SB that there has been significant change to that cell now. HW said the stabilisation of the batter is nearly complete. TPI is now relocating material from there. HW said almost all leachate has been removed from Cell 2 over to the leachate ponds. HW said TPI has been quite vigilant in addressing this. JD asked how large rains during summer will affect the amount of leachate in Cell 2. HW said that this is a possibility but it is at their own cost as it is expensive to move the leachate.</p> <p>SB informed HW that TPI has been targeted for a wet weather inspection program this year. DEHP will go on site before, several times during, and after wet weather season with a specific focus on wet weather aspects of the site.</p>	<p>JP to investigate the Operations Manual requirement.</p>
<p>7. Next Meeting</p>	<p>NW reminded the CRG that the meetings will be moving to quarterly. This mean the next meeting will be in December. JP will be unavailable from 2 Oct – 4 Nov. GY recommended the first week of December. JD asked that if there are any other Operational Works or other applications made that IRATE receives notification of these. NP said he would inform DH to advise NW if this occurs. NW will then notify the CRG. SB asked about disposal of waste excursions for schools. NP directed any inquiries of this to DH or HW and they are happy to accommodate.</p> <p>The next meeting has been tentatively booked for Monday 7th December at 6pm at the ICC building.</p>	