

# New Chum Community Reference Group

## Meeting Agenda

**Title:** New Chum Community Reference Group

**Date:** Monday July 17, 2017

**Time:** 6.00 – 8.00 pm

**Facilitator:** Nathan Williams

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

Nathan Williams – Chair, New Chum CRG (NW)	Neil Perry – General Manager Queensland, Cleanaway (NP)	Jim Dodrill – President, IRATE(JD)
Michael Simmons – Acting Team Co-ordinator for the Eastern District, Ipswich City Council (MS)	Doug Hughes – Regional Manager, Cleanaway (DH)	Geoff Yarham - Secretary of IRATE (GY)
Cr Kerry Silver (Ksi)	Cr Kylie Stoneman (KS)	Scott Blanchard – Regional Manager, DEHP (SB)
Meg Saunderson - Principal, Riverview State School (MSa)	Duchense Broad – Community Member (DB)	Greg Broad – Community Member (GB)
<b>Apologies</b>		

Item	Details	Decisions/Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Welcome &amp; Apologies</b></li> </ul>	NW welcomed all.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Review of Minutes</b></li> </ul>	Review of minutes from the last CRG meeting on Monday April 24, 2017. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update on Action Items</li> </ul>	

	<p>NW: We have collated some of those items for later in proceedings, but asks DH as he had the majority of action items if he wished to address any of them now.</p> <p>DH: I wanted to mention a couple of them now if that is okay?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The first is the number of views that the New Chum subpage on the Cleanaway site has received in the past quarter. We have seen an average of 160, 127, 143 unique impressions, respectively in the past quarter.</li> <li>2. I would also like to note that Cleanaway will post the full community fund data to the website once completed</li> <li>3. Re-profiling compliance – I would like to note that the New Chum landfill site is at full compliance.</li> <li>4. The third question was how long was the wheel wash out? The wheel wash was out for 16 weeks in total, however Cleanaway had a number of other mitigation measures in place over that period including street sweeping to minimise the impact of dust.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation of Minutes - last input received mid-May 2017</li> </ul> <p>Three final amendments noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Top of Page 7 there is a double up – please remove</li> <li>• Council and DEHP – both fines \$12, 000</li> <li>• Remove the R in Fallern</li> </ul> <p>Group accepted minutes on the basis of those amendments at 6:17pm.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>FY16 community benefit fund</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update proceedings regarding the FY16 Community Benefit Fund</li> </ul> <p>DH: There is one payment outstanding from the FY16 fund and that is for the Ipswich Historical Association for the relocation of a miner’s hut.</p> <p>There have been communications with the group and they are needing co-funding and approvals from Council (ICC) to progress activity. They believe this is approximately 2-3 months away. Cleanaway has committed to hold the money for that period but would like to close activity for the FY16 from that point onwards.</p> <p>FY17 funding – seven (7) projects in total:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members to consider best timing for FY18 applications.</li> <li>• DH to post full list of Community Benefit recipients on the New Chum website.</li> </ul>

	<p>Three funding announcements have been made since the last meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collingwood Park State School Association</li> <li>2. Ipswich Knights Soccer Team (soccer jersey under 6s/7s and 8s/9s)</li> <li>3. Riverview State School</li> </ol> <p>Outstanding Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Riverview Community Centre</li> <li>• Ipswich Genealogical Society</li> <li>• Westfallen</li> </ul> <p>DH to post full list on the New Chum website once all distributions have been made</p> <p>SB: On behalf of DEHP, I would also like to note a successful prosecution for DEHP, the payment from which will contribute to the Beautiful Ipswich Program at Redbank. This funding will buy plants and planting along Six Mile Creek</p> <p>DH: FY18 community will also start soon so I would love member feedback into potential timing etc. to announce opportunities.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Operations update</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development application submission update</li> </ul> <p>DH: There are no new submissions since our last meeting in April. There are some applications with Council for additional hours including an amendment to cell 4b lining systems.</p> <p>MS: Minor alternations will appear on PDOnline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety update</li> </ul> <p>DH: There have been five occurrences of the fence around void 10 being damaged. We are still getting a lot of activity, despite the public campaign, so any assistance from the CRG and the community to emphasise the danger in that area is greatly appreciated. Cleanaway has taken the additional step of installing a rock barrier on the inside of the fence for approximately 2kms, to stop vehicles. Council and Police are also working with us to help identify individuals who are accessing the site illegally however any community assistance is greatly appreciated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CRG members to confirm open day date preferences</li> </ul>

	<p>DH: On the southern boundary a third party truck operating on the southern easement near the New Chum landfill site on behalf of Cleanaway noticed something strange, which appeared to be a bone fragment. Further inspection and testing was conducted and the bone was found to be bovine.</p> <p>The new wheel wash was out of operation for a few days, after a truck accidentally ran over it and broke one of the support legs.</p> <p>A driver blacked out leaving the tipping area on the site. The vehicle coasted down a small hill came to a halt in concrete barrier, all were safe (and suffered no damage) and the driver was escorted away for a medical review after receiving first aid.</p> <p>DH:</p> <p>Other updates are that Cell 4a is fully operational and has been approved by a certified engineer. Cell 4b: full construction will be mobilized next week and run through until January 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment update</li> </ul> <p>DH: No changes to employment numbers but there have been three replacements to replace existing positions. One of those new additions is a local person and the other two are still going through the recruitment process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Open Day update – Sep 10 or Sep 17, (DH notes that he is unavailable on the 17<sup>th</sup>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NW asks CRG members to recommend dates</li> <li>○ Group discussion ensues and Oct 8 emerges as the date most suitable and is penciled in, DH asks to confirm by the end of the week</li> <li>○ GY would prefer the open day to be whilst operating</li> <li>○ DH and NP agree it is possible to change it to the 7<sup>th</sup> in the afternoon</li> <li>○ May be possible to do between 2-4pm on Saturday Oct 7. Final date is agreed for October 7, 2017.</li> <li>○ Group to advise DH if not suitable</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Equipment Update</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New equipment arrival</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DH: There has been no new equipment since our last meeting in April.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Complaints Update</b></li> </ul>	<p>Any complaints made in relation to the site after our last meeting on Monday April 24, 2017 to today.</p> <p>DH: There have been three complaints since the last meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A smoke complaint in relation to the fire (this is discussed in detail later in the meeting)</li> <li>2. A customer complaint for tyre damage</li> <li>3. A single odour complaint – only last Friday, with DEHP at present. This is too recent to comment in any detail at this stage as we have no further information to hand.</li> </ol> <p>ICC has had five (5) visits to the site to conduct inspections since April</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Operations and Management information requests</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IRATE requests for Cleanaway to release the full annual environmental report to the community.</li> </ul> <p>GY: IRATE has emailed DH and requested to fully aware of all things on the site. To date only the summary report is on the website.</p> <p>IRATE has requested the full report. We want to be fully aware of all things occurring at the facility. I have read the summary report but even within that document we have some issues. We want the full report provided and uploaded.</p> <p>SB: The full report is available via DEHP for a small charge.</p> <p>GY: I think it's a few hundred dollars.</p> <p>GY: Can Cleanaway provide the full report so IRATE does not have to pay a cost to DEHP. We are a community based volunteer organisation and can simply don't think it's reasonable for us to need to pay for this information.</p> <p>DH: We believe this report is the best context for community members to receive this information. It records all exceedances individually, only the detailed appendices are missing.</p> <p>SB: The only parts that are not provided are tables, or appendices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DH to come back with % reduction in exposure of tipping face at the end of each day</li> <li>JD to provide evidence of the number of fires at the facility since Cleanaway took over the site.</li> <li>NP – Cleanaway happy to investigate appropriate mechanisms for community communications channel</li> <li>DH: To investigate if water is tested before release from sediment pond.</li> </ul>

<p>GY: I have seen one detailed report in soft copy. We would prefer to see the detailed report. I have one question, the dust report on page 9 of the summary report is that the same in the full version?</p> <p>DH: I believe that it is.</p> <p>GY: Is Cleanaway still declining to offer the full report free of charge?</p> <p>DH: We believe the published reports provide the best context for results for interpretation for the community. GY: And Neil do you support this approach?</p> <p>NP: I support this.</p> <p>KSt: Does DEHP have concerns? Is there anything in the detailed report that requires further investigation?</p> <p>SB: No, we don't. The detailed report has been reviewed in detail.</p> <p>MSi: Do you cross reference to the two versions of the report?</p> <p>SB: Yes, we do.</p> <p>JD: Are they two different reports?</p> <p>Is DEHP sent both?</p> <p>SB: Yes, we do, and we do cross reference. However, they are not two different reports. I believe they are one report, one is simply a version with a few more additional tables and appendices.</p> <p>DH: There are no formal requirement to publish this but we do. I'm not aware of any other landfill that does the same</p> <p>GY: I am here as a local resident. I'm not disputing the information but my preference is to receive free access to the full information. We are being denied knowledge to the full data.</p> <p>SB: I would say that whilst we have rights to information there is an expansion of what is on the public register and free. Other information is available via DEHP. The public register is a suite of information made available via clients and free and I believe that may extend to monitoring reports.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DH: To investigate how many times the sediment pond has been emptied since construction.</li> </ul>
--	--

SB: The daily waste monitoring data is considered to be part of the Annual Monitoring Report and therefore would likely be able to be accessed under 'Public Register' provisions of the Act. This information may need to be reviewed to remove any sensitive info or identifying particulars.

GY: I think we will need to disagree on this point.

- Requests for details on the Cleanaway annual environmental report including why it does not include all items documented in the environmental licence (EPPR00445713).

GY: IRATE has taken a review of the summary report; against the environmental licence. IRATE is still of the view that Cleanaway is not in adherence to its operating licence in environmental monitoring in particular across sections 1H1, 1H2, 1H6 1H8, 1H10, and 1H15. Doug has responded twice and stated that he is of the belief that Cleanaway is complying of its licence however because it is sharing its monitoring data. Those items I stated are in relation to annual monitoring.

SB: They are not actually. A number of those items you stated have nothing to do with annual monitoring data.

GY: We have forwarded Doug's response on to DEHP. And DEHP will provide a response as Scott alluded to. However, it certainly says including waste reporting, back to my past question what percentage of waste is construction and demolition waste? It's not in the report.

SB: Waste reporting is in the full report I understand.

GY: This is why we want the full report; this is exactly why we want it.

SB: How does this assist IRATE?

GY: This would help IRATE be informed. But we really don't know as we don't have the data.

SB: Our office has provided some, but I thought we had given a breakdown of waste types in the past.

DH: We have given that information in the past.

Ksi: Can we see a breakdown of waste types? For me, I believe that construction and demolition is the primary waste, but do you have further details on that, which you can provide.

DH: We do have that data. The question however becomes what component of that information becomes commercial in confidence. Because this information is published on a public forum this then creates some challenges for Cleanaway with our customers.

NP provided the group with an example of the types of information that is provided in these reports that is commercially sensitive.

DH: Volume numbers into our facility also gives our competitors insights into our capacity versus construction works which enables them to use this information to target our customers.

KSi: If we can provide details as commercial confidence and perhaps show it and not record it?

NP: The information that we could provide I don't believe would be enough for IRATE. I could break it down into three categories 1. Regulated waste, 2. C&D waste and 3. Soil waste. They are the main types of waste and I'd be happy to provide that.

JD: No it wouldn't be enough. Public safety comes first and environmental safety. For example, we went to great lengths to find out that you guys accepted aluminum contaminated soil, cadmium contaminated soil, and mercury contaminated soil, these are things that we are concerned about.

NP: These are in condition of our licence.

JD: These are things that we think are a public safety issue.

NP: This is exactly why we have our regulators to monitor and enforce regulation.

DH: And why we publish our environmental report.

Ksi: Why are you not lobbying the state government if you believe that the legislation needs to be changed? Because at the end of the day DEHP enforces the licence on the basis of the legislation.

JD: I think the legislation is fine I believe that the conditions of the licence should be changed. The legislation could be applied in a more stringent way, I believe that is down to DEHP and Council to apply the conditions of the licence more stringently.

SB: We can't change conditions of an approval unilaterally. It does not work like that. Some of the things you mentioned as soil contaminates, that is a very low level in soils and in line with internationally accepted standards for trace levels of contaminates in soils.

JD: They were removed from somewhere else to here for a reason. That's the problem, there's a risk. Cleanaway has put liners in to manage it

SB: Liners are common practice.

JD: The community is simply asking for full disclosure of what is going in there and to have the discussions from an informed basis.

SB: Okay but I just want to point out that it may be disingenuous to bring up contaminate levels in soils, when the contaminate levels are so low, so trace and they are going into an engineered facility. They are much better there (at the landfill site).

JD: As long as there are no fires or damage to liners. They are too many variables.

Ksi: What is the alternative however? Do we not have to some faith that we have monitoring organisations and legislation in place to protect us?

SB: There are tiered facilities like the Teatree installation at Willowbank for instance, which are different. They have the capacity and ability to take the next level up in contaminates.

GY: We accept that. We won't be happy as Cleanaway has not always accepted and stuck to licence conditions. This is why I am asking for them as I believe it is in the public interest.

NW: I believe we are going off on a tangent and in the interest of time I would like to draw us back to our question.

Group agrees.

JD: One last point, Kerry, in response to your question, I don't know where I would like waste to go. My question to you is are you happy with contaminated soils being shipped in?

SB: If it's within the guidelines then that is acceptable.

NW: I believe we have explored the original question so I am now going to suggest that we move on.

- Discussion on the fire at the site on Sunday, 2nd July, 2017.

DH: At 8:45am on Sunday July 2, 2017

Cleanaway received a phone call from on-site security to advise that a fire had broken out in the in Cell 4 area.

The offsite management arrived at 9am, and found two emergency fire trucks already on site. The fire was approximately 200 square metres in area.

Staff used heavy machinery to put out the fire. The fire was under control; in an hour, in 2hrs it was fully extinguished. Staff remained on site until 4:30pm, and there was a security officer on site watching for 3 nights to observe flare ups.

DEHP and ICC were notified.

ICC attended at 11:30 and noted asbestos wasn't burning and he left the site. A full report was provided to DEHP and ICC.

NP: I would also add that at this stage the cause is unknown.

DH: That is correct. As heavy machinery were involved in extinguishing the fire, this meant that the cause is difficult to note.

However, we recognize that the smoke plume was large and in a north west and predominantly avoided Collingwood Park. However, we do apologize for any impact caused.

JD: I disagree there was smoke in Collingwood Park until Monday.

DH: This isn't what our information would indicate but again I can only say that we apologize for any inconvenience caused.

KSi: It would probably hit north eastern end of Collingwood Park.

JD: Were there attempts to warn/notify?

KSi: What are you seeking? Scott, is this a DEHP issue?

SB: QFES. We would have to investigate.

NP: They (QFES) left after 11:00am on the day of the incident.

Ksi: IS there any ability to know what would have been in there? The concern is what types of things went in the fire, for example could there be tyres.

DH: There are no tyres accepted under the licence of operation for the New Chum facility. What was noted was construction and demolition waste, this is including materials such as wood, plasterboard and some small bits of plastic. This is what was believed to have ignited the fire.

GY: What percentage of waste of construction and demolition was accepted on the site on the day prior around that area?

DH: We would need to do the analysis on that in more detail.

GY: I have a feeling there may be more general waste.

DH: We don't accept general waste.

GY: We have observed that there recently there are more birds on the site than usual so are keen to understand – what products were consumed on the site in particular what percentage of construction and demolition waste is on the site? What products were consumed in the fire is our major concern.

DH: As I said, what was noted from the QFES officer on site and myself was construction and demolition waste, this is including materials such as wood, plasterboard and some small bits of plastic, here and there.

GY: How you can be sure that the liner of the cell was not compromised?

DH: We are confident the liner was not compromised in the fire. The physical location of the fire was in the middle of the cell. When the bulldozers took the top layer of waste off to help resolve the fire nothing underneath was burnt. This indicates that the fire was not in any way endangering the cell liner and very localized. The full depth of the waste cell (where the fire was) was about 15-20 metres.

JD: How would you see evidence of that?

DH: You would see a darker plume coming up through the fire and you would actually see burnt material. We didn't see either of these indicators once we pushed that burnt material pushed onto an isolated dirt area.

GY: Has Cleanaway considered covering or sealing tipping face at the end of each day?

DH: Yes, we have considered. We have taken as an action item to improve our covering procedures and made some changes to the operation of the site. Cleanaway has added more machinery and more trucks to provide more cover to the tip face area at the end of each working day.

NP: To the extent of covering the tipping face every day no, but we will bring the area 'back-in'. The total exposed area has been reduced.

Ksi: Is there no smoking on site?

DH: There is one specific smoking area on the site well away from the tipping face, up near the front entrance driveway.

Ksi: There is no evidence that anyone came onto the site, or there are other factors, I guess I am just trying to explore what other potential factors may exist?

JD: I believe that spontaneous combustion is why this occurred. If you look at the roadway next to Cell 4 there is smoke, there all of the time.

SB: I disagree; the most obvious place the fire was sourced is from material coming onto site that is already smoldering. This is by far the most common reason for fire on landfill sites.

JD: Given that there is an average of a fire per year at the site would we as a group agree that this is acceptable?

DH: I disagree with that number, where has this information been sourced from?

JD agrees to confirm number.

JD: Does ICC and DEHP think this number is acceptable?

**Question on notice:** How many fires occur per year at New Chum.

KSi: Can we prevent these types of fires from occurring?

JD: IRATE believes that covering up every tipping face every night would resolve this problem.

KSt: What procedures are in place?

JD: Everything should be covered.

DH: Cleanaway has added more machinery and more trucks to reduce the exposed areas at the end of each working day. Our licence requires us to cover materials as required.

KSi: If there wasn't a heavy enough covering of materials there would still be air pockets within that waste, wouldn't there? This may still generate smoldering wouldn't it?

DH: Compacting solves major issues to resolve air pockets. This is the reason that the fire was not deep. The fire could not penetrate that material.

KSi: Plume and the amount of smoke is a concern. What training does on site person have?

DH: Staff are trained to manage this. Hence the fact that two hours after staff arrived, the fire was largely put out.

KSi: I have to say the fire and smoke plume at 8:45 was major however.

DH: I agree; I'm just stating that once staff were on site they did address it quickly.

KSi: What about security staff? Is there more than can be done for them to address this type of problem?

DH: The security guards are simply security guards conducting patrol.

GY: How often do patrols occur?

DH: Irregularly but often.

GY: How does Cleanaway then address the loads coming on site that are smoldering?

DH: We would run what we call hot load procedures. This means that the load is then isolated onto an earthen area away from the tipping face and assessed. Either fire and emergency services called or addressed via having earth placed on it.

GY: What was the number of hot loads on the site in the past year?

DH: I am not aware of any

If it does come into the tipping face then, load is pushed into dirt and then managed as per a hot load procedure. And this is

then watered down etc. This may occur a couple of time per year, at most.

GY: Was the water truck manned on July 1?

DH: A small water truck was manned on July 1. A third party was brought in on July 1 to manage this.

NP: Other sources of a fire may be a flare, or oil drum. They can sometimes be simply put into a load, but we do have procedures in place to address them. \

KSt; At what stage does the community get notified?

NP: QFES makes that call in relation to community

DB: In Riverview, we notify community members via a neighbourhood watch site

NP: In Victoria, for a recent fire, the fire brigade did a door knock and social media.

KSi: The question is what can be done to better notify the community, what alerts etc. can be done to better

SB: QFES are the lead agency and provide communications around the event.

JD: Was DEHP contacted and were DEHP officials on site during the fire?

SB: Yes, they were.

GY: I want to note that in Cleanaway's licence it stated that 2-A7 must not cause noxious, or offensive odours. Therefore, this is in contravention of the licence.

KSt: How do we learn from it? How do we notify the community better to minimize exposure to this sort of thing?

NP: One learning out of this was from the fire authorities may have notified community members. Doug may talk with Council and DEHP about how this may be addressed with Council.

DB: QT online too

SB: Yes, one of the QT articles did provide general advice

NP: I accept that communications to the community on matters like this can be improved. We will talk with QFES about that as

a starting point as I recognize that that may be existing systems we can tap into.

KSi: Perhaps consider a group text to CRG group as well

- Discussion on recent waste truck rollover at corner Ipswich Motorway and River Rd.

GY: I just wanted to note a recent waste truck rollover at corner Ipswich Motorway and River Rd. I had a few questions. Firstly, who pays for the clean-up?

DH: The trucking company, would pay for the clean-up.

GY: Could trucks access the Cleanaway facility?

DH: I believe so, via Aberdare Street.

GY: I had a person say it was blocked. You could turn left at 7-11, but could not turn right.

DH: Our volumes dropped dramatically in that period.

MS: I'm not sure what the question is here?

GY: The question was what happens to trucks in such an incident?

DH: Trucks will be turned off; stay at the facilities they are coming from or try alternative areas. That's a decision for the trucking company but we would communicate any delays as part of our normal operating procedures.

- Current status of ICC enforcement notice compliance.

DH: On July 12, Cleanaway received a letter of compliance from Council in relation to the enforcement notice. Monitoring will of course continue.

- Response to IRATE query on Cleanaway SOP on sedimentation pond on north west corner submitted to Cleanaway.

GY: IRATE approached DEHP and Cleanaway to discuss whether overflow can take place before tests are undertaken.

DH: The SOP provided is old, and only related to the sediment pond in SE portion near Void 10. It doesn't relate to the other pond you indicated, the high efficiency sediment pond on the northern boundary and there is a separate procedure for that. Yes, we do need to test before discharge.

GY: Is that procedure covered in your current environmental licence?

SB: Not covered in the approval itself but is covered in the storm water management plan.

DH: Water sampling is done prior to discharge

GY: Was this sampling completed before the last rain event?

DH: I will take question on notice.

GY: I would think you would know that. How many times has the pond been emptied?

DH: The question that was raised in the CRG minutes was about the SOP not an individual test result so I will have to check the answer in relation to your question about the release around ex TC Debbie. I'm pretty sure I know the answer, but I want to be sure before I come back to you and give you hard facts.

GY: What generally happens though, when they are emptied?

DH: The design of the high efficiency sediment pond is that there is an initial concrete capture area where the sediment is deposited. When the water drops from that area, a machine goes in to excavate the material which is then placed into landfill.

GY: At what point does Cleanaway decide to empty the pond?

DH: We empty the pond as required. It is assessed on the amount of rainfall and sediment. There has been a cleanout since ex TC Debbie and in fact it has been cleaned out a few times since summer.

Ksi: Who monitors that?

DH: There is also a monitoring station established at New Chum for the overflow.

SB: Most sites empty on an annual basis.

KSi: In relation to ex TC Debbie has there been a release since then?

DH: Yes, there has been. So that needed to be cleared out.

KSi: So at this point in time the water is fairly clean?

DH: Yes, it is. We have had a couple of rain events, but yes fairly clean. The drains and sediment ponds have been cleaned out since summer.

MS: Is this what you were alluding to at the start?

DH: No the SOP IRATE had got was in relation to a sediment pond over the other side of the site and was very old.

Prior to the high efficiency sediment pond being put in place there was a pipe that used to run through the bund and then when rain would come it would run through the pond and over Chum St. As part of the enforcement notice, Cleanaway corrected the process. Storm water will always flow that way so that water had to be captured and sediment reduced before it left the site so hence the design. In the original design Cleanaway asked for a pipe under Chum St but this was knocked back by Council.

MS: It was more about letting water disperse than letting it be concentrated and causing issues downstream.

DH: It's all about the storm water flow in the area.

GY: Various reports call for a monitoring station at the outlet. Is that in place?

DH: Yes, it is. It looks like a bucket but in it there is a device that analyses water.

KSi; Asks that this is reviewed in the open day.

GY sites the details for operational works condition that calls for a 2mx2m slab for pump and monitoring station –

GY to provide details from operational works condition application number 242/15.

- Discussion on new gas collection wells and gas heads.

GY: Has the gas fill land management plan been adjusted with the new installations?

DH: Yes, absolutely.

GY: Was DEHP given a month's notice

SB: Yes

DH: So was Ipswich City Council.

- Discussion on auxiliary gas line near sedimentation pond.

GY: Was waste excavated with sediment control measures in place?

DH: The contractors safe work method statement had sediment control measures in place.

GY: I didn't observe that when I was on the site.

DH: Our operational managers noted that there were no adverse impacts with environmental monitoring in place.

DH: Just a point on that that gas lines are above the earth gas line, in white pipe. It is coloured white to disperse heat better.

KSi: Is it poly pipe? Would it weaken or erode?

DH: It will need to be replaced at some point in time. For example, the flare has a life of approx. 20 years, so it will need to be replaced through our aftercare processes.

Ksi: Just on the aftercare process, what would happen if Cleanaway was to fold?

DH: DEHP holds a bond and Cleanaway pays to that bond annually. As more waste goes into the facility that provision grows. If Cleanaway sells the property that responsibility is passed on.

JD: To put Kerry's mind at ease what would the bond be at time of completion?

DH: It's difficult to say, exactly.

	<p>Ksi: I'm just thinking along the lines of abandoned mines to ensure that the community has funds to do things.</p> <p>NW: Scott, just to confirm this sits with DEHP?</p> <p>SB: Yes</p> <p>JD: Does this impact Claypave Hill?</p> <p>DH: Yes, there is a bond that covers Claypave Hill.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Next Meeting (s)</b></li> </ul>	<p>Planned dates for remaining meeting next year.</p> <p>Date of Next New Chum Community Reference Date to be determined – bimonthly, suggested date: tbd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nov (earlier the better) Monday the 13<sup>th</sup> is the suggested date for the next meeting.</li> </ul> <p>Venue – Ipswich City Council Administration Building, 50 South Street, Ipswich Time: 6:00pm – 8.00 pm</p> <p>GB: Left at 7:00pm Meeting closed at 8:26pm</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Any other business</b></li> </ul>	<p>Open Day – any suggestions on communications methods to distribute</p>	