

**SUEZ
Taylors Road Landfill
Community Reference Group**

MINUTES OF MEETING

Meeting Date :	20 April 2016	Meeting Time :	5:30pm
Meeting Location :	Taylors Road Landfill		
Status of Minutes:	Confirmed by CRG 08.06.16		

Chairman :	Ron Bowden (RB)
Presenters / Observers :	Jaye Muir (JM), Stephanie Salinas (SS), John Stewart (JS)
Apologies :	Kelvin Sargent, Leigh Bryant, Cr Angela Long, Eliza Hobba, Mal Baker

Attendance:

MEMBER NAME	13/05/15	23/07/15	09/09/15	28/10/15	18/02/16	20/04/16
Mal Baker (MB)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Cr Angela Long (AL)	No	No	No	No	No	No
Jim Houlahan (JH)	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Ian Jenz (IJ)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tony O'Hara (TOH)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Paul Richardson (PR)	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Thelma Wakelam (TW)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Miles Weidemann (MW)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jason Wood (JW)	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Warren Wood (WW)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Item	Issue	Action	By
1	Welcome Attendees and apologies.		
2	Minutes of previous meeting Were updated in response to comments received from TW, JM - to be further updated when comments received by email.	RB	
3	SUEZ Update SS – TRL Update		

Item	Issue	Action	By
	<p>SS - Compliance team restructure, introduced JS starting at TRL, and mentioned Chris Watkins joining HRL. TRL currently providing assistance to HRL due to staff shortages, which are being addressed.</p> <p>SS – Now accessing section of layback, safety a priority regarding entry, currently restricted access to area; single truck access.</p> <p>SS – New auditor requirement regarding liner protection layer ‘buffer sand’ brief description of purpose of the liner, and continuing operational practice of not compacting first layer of waste. Has had potential impact on safe access to site due to delays in approvals with the new requirement of auditing process. SS – although TRL already placing a protective layer, the additional audit visits and surveys currently very frequent requirement; costly and can cause delays. TRL currently conducting as required however awaiting further comments/guidance from EPA and Auditors.</p> <p>HRL will also be required to conduct these audit inspections/reports.</p> <p>TRL awaiting approval for additional area for filling</p> <p>Current filling area restricted also by safe accessing requirements</p> <p>JH –</p> <p>IJ – question regarding thickness required for protection layer</p> <p>SS – LFG extraction is reducing and investigation being conducted; assessment of individual wells and potential drilling program.</p> <p>Potential regarding targeted leachate extraction through gas extraction wells to improve gas extraction</p> <p>TOH – asking about age and mentioned seasonal dry period</p> <p>Surface emission monitoring discussed. IJ – mentioned potential spot pressure between extraction locations, wells.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Question regarding infrastructure integrity monitoring; SS = required to work with EDL <p>IJ – mentioned previous issues with HRL</p> <p>IJ – Question regarding current fid monitoring SS – currently 90% through current round, with no issues found</p> <p>General question – back to leachate level non-compliance. Additional GW checks?</p> <p>TOH – potential for PAN. What other tools do EPA have if they don’t intend on issuing PAN. SS – EPA unlikely to issue PAN in this instance.</p> <p>TOH – suggestion – improve timing regarding the monitoring of GW to weekly to prevent potential future risk.</p> <p>SS – timing is risk based, and relates to the auditor approved monitoring program.</p> <p>MW + TOH what is the potential response if the pump in this area is ‘lost’ no current redundancy. No redundancy reiterated – SS – no</p>		

Item	Issue	Action	By
	<p>current plan to put in redundancy SS will have to re-drill if required MW – worst case scenario? SS – suggested potential extended time in non-compliance and potential for PAN. However noted unlikely to actually damage liner system if addressed asap. High importance to EPA and SUEZ – regarding GW quality. Potential for airwells, we already have dual extraction in roughly that area. MW – confirmed how these work</p> <p>IJ and MW – confirmed they wanted notification regarding these type of non-compliances. (closest GW bore to his location).</p> <p>IJ – requested that the next GW results by supplied to him, due to proximity to the site. SS – confirmed she would look at providing notification and GW results relating to incidents of this nature.</p> <p>Cat C Soil Trial SS –</p> <p>Soil Processing Facility – joint venture SS – continued meetings and additional works on design. Current design on air filtration system – bag house ; potential system switch to improve HOS – why are SUEZ going forward, questioned if we can still operate when landfill closes. SS – standalone permit for soil processing. TW – clause in permits that require landfill to be open for soil processing to be operated. SS- permit and works approval remain open business is still planning on going ahead.</p> <p>TOH – questioned if soil being accepted from nearby works SS- no</p> <p>Other Operations EPA officer compliance officer site visit new weighbridge staff – part time</p> <p>Tonnages update TW - clarified amounts Placement of specific wastes mentioned, current space restrictions Compaction 1.04</p> <p>Sump 18 confirmed 2 pumps stuck in sump; cell 20 managed using other location, connecting area.</p>		

Item	Issue	Action	By
	<p>IJ – again questioned why not immediately notified of non-conformance – linked with communication regarding soil processing and potential stabilization. Looking for further communication, looking for drawings etc.</p> <p>TW – confirmed that we are investigating potential changes but no actual changes made as yet.</p> <p>SS – all remains the same, reiterated potential for change to the bag house system.</p> <p>Plan is for Ventia to come and present to community.</p> <p>IJ – questioned if they were aware of houses 300m from site.</p> <p>JM – Kelvin looking at organizing site visit.</p> <p>TW – question regarding where are they currently operating</p> <p>SS – Queensland?</p> <p>IJ – would like to see an operating facility; will the final facility be the same as presented to the community group</p> <p>SS – we are required to present any changes prior to moving ahead.</p> <p>IJ – sounded like we could go ahead tomorrow.</p> <p>SS – if plan was implemented as already approved then we could.</p> <p>JM – however confirmed that looking at improvement, price saving with joint venture.</p> <p>TW – confirmed has to go back to EPA if changes are made</p> <p>IJ – questioned if capacity remains the same.</p> <p>SS – confirmed name is Ventia (ex Thiess) – like for like project</p> <p>TOH – await with baited breath</p> <p>Planning Permit Amendment Application</p> <p>No new update</p> <p>Leachate Transfer Project</p> <p>No new update</p>		
~6.30pm	Meal Break		
4	<p>Other Business</p> <p>a. Community Outreach</p> <p>JM – fairly quiet during period: No calls to our lines, EPA received 3 calls; given location more likely to be related to other site but will not be allocated differently by EPA.</p> <p>IJ – easterlies recently, no odour noted.</p> <p>JM – mentioned nurseries in area.</p>		

Item	Issue	Action	By
	<p>IJ – additional ‘nursery?’ in area.</p> <p>TOH – blood and bone been reported, farming in area?</p> <p>RB – noted other potential odour sources in the area</p> <p>SS – responded regarding odours noted by SUEZ. Ordish rd?</p> <p>IJ – food odour reported to EPA, poor response to IJ.</p> <p>b. Member Roundtable</p> <p>JM – TOH to start, as he attended a recent EPA update</p> <p>TOH – updated group on EPA event, including that it is meant to be encouraging to uptake use of waste products as stock feed. Gave example of Warrnambool milk plant. Commented that this particular EPA focus does not include liquid or soils.</p> <p>JH – question relating to EPAs response to air monitoring, and current locations etc. including portable unit.</p> <p>TOH – suggested EPA require more focus here given more development in the area – growth areas.</p> <p>JH – is information readily available regarding location of the mobile units.</p> <p>JH – referred to IJ communication (emails) with Troy K EPA – requested TOH follow up with EPA. TOH – does follow up with EPA regarding current air monitoring capacity in the area. JM – will follow up regarding this. IJ – suggests that group writes letter to EPA.</p> <p>RB – suggest CRG conduct this communication separately.</p> <p>MW and JM – discussed limited resources within EPA and changing roles.</p> <p>Discussion regarding pipe integrity – EDL responsibility. SUEZ related responsibility.</p> <p>SS – down time max of 3-4 hours without flaring requirements.</p> <p>Monthly reporting – confirm regarding monthly reporting including downtimes and reasoning.</p> <p>IJ – relayed information regarding potential historic gas control, suggesting a reduced extraction over the weekend due to pricing.</p> <p>JH – would like EDL to speak to CRG regarding current infrastructure and testing regime etc. including current location. SS – which gas line is being discussed? JH – Narre Warren north? SS – understanding is that EDL infrastructure do run above ground on some occasions. TW – questions regarding potential issues around fire and response. JH – talking about 100mm poly pipe above ground (EDL off site)? Requested walk of the pipeline. TOH – request for mapping of line and where they are placed.</p> <p>RB – confirmed that line integrity is an EDL responsibility, and by extension EPA.</p>		

Item	Issue	Action	By
	IJ – why have EPA not responded to previous communication regarding air pollution monitoring – provided JM copy of complaint. Council – advisory committee on hazardous, wrote to committee regarding encroachment issues? IJ – reported additional sources of dust impact, earth works etc.; been reported.		
5	Review of progress / next meeting(s) Next meeting: Wednesday 8 June 2016		
	Meeting Close: 7.30pm		

Action Summary

Item	Issue	Action	By
Meeting # 24 20.04.2016			
4	Request presentation/information from EDL in relation to gas infrastructure and pipeline.	JM	08.06.16