



Environment Protection Authority – NCCCE Minutes

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Today's Meeting Date: | Tues 12 June 2018 (No 50) | Next meeting date: | Tuesday 11 September 2018 (No 51) |
| Meeting location: | EPA Newcastle | Last Meeting Date: | 13 March 2018 (Meeting Number 49) |
| Meeting opened at: | 1733 hrs | Meeting closed at: | 2007 hrs |
| Present: | John Tate - Chair Dr Craig Dalton - Department of Health Representative Sheree Woodroffe - Industry Representative Trudie Larnach - Industry Representative Mark Manning - Newcastle City Council Representative Rick Banyard - Minister's Community Representative Keith Wilks - Industry Representative Chris Tola - Community Representative Keith Craig - Community Representative Thomas Levick - Environment Representative Karen Marler - EPA Scott Thompson - OEH Anthony Savage - EPA Mitchell Bennett - EPA Emily Ingram - EPA | | |
| Apologies: | Loredana Warren - OEH Matt Riley - OEH Matt Corridan - EPA Heath Thatcher - EPA Adam Gilligan - EPA | | |

Matters arising from the previous Minutes: (No 49, 13 March 2018)

| 1 Review Minutes from last meeting | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------------|------------------------|
| No | Agenda Item | Action | Person Responsible | Completion Date |
| 1.1 | Adoption of previous minutes. | The minutes were adopted without change. | John Tate | 12.6.18 |
| 1.2 | Meeting No. 46 (17 May 2017) Action 7 - The Committee would like an update on the EPA funding for contaminated land management | Mrs Marler advised that while a package of funding has been announced, the EPA does not have information on how these funds will be allocated. The EPA will provide a briefing for the Committee when this information is known. | Karen Marler - EPA | |
| 1.3 | Meeting No. 47 (19 July 2017) Recommendation 2 - EPA to prepare a communications strategy for the Committee's consideration, detailing key messages on air quality, audience groups and costs and benefits of communication channels. | The EPA is currently drafting this strategy. | Emily Ingram - EPA | |

General Business:

| 2 Air Quality Network Review | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|--------|
| No | Agenda Item | Notes | Action/Decision | Status |
| 2.1 | Newcastle Local Air Quality Monitoring Network Review presentation | <p>Mr John Tate stated that the network has been very valuable. It functions well but it can be improved by monitoring other pollutants such as Benzene. The network is reliable from a mechanical perspective and is reliable in what it is measuring.</p> <p>Mr Keith Craig stated that the timeliness of the summary reports of air quality could be improved and requested that the report be provided well before Committee meetings to allow the Committee more time to consider the information.</p> <p>Mr Rick Banyard stated the web links to air quality information and the network on the EPA and OEH websites are very good, but the written interpretation of data in the air quality monitoring reports could be improved/simplified. The 15 minute time frame is to help record the spasmodic and short term emissions from factories, passing vessels and sudden wind changes that are a characteristic of the port area.</p> <p>Ms Trudie Larnach stated that for industry purposes it would be useful to get air quality and weather data in 15 minute increments for better monitoring of operational responses.</p> <p>Mr Mark Manning asked if the EPA finds the network data useful for its investigations.</p> <p>Mrs Karen Marler advised that the data is very useful – particularly in determining if air quality changes are region wide or localised. Because of the large amount on industry and air emissions sources in Newcastle, the EPA tends to rely on site based monitoring for compliance.</p> <p>Mrs Sheree Woodroffe asked if the network data was assisting in assessing air quality impacts from specific sites.</p> | <p>Action 1: A copy presentation <i>Newcastle Local Air Quality Monitoring Network Review NCCCE 12 June 2018</i> to be sent to all committee members</p> | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Mrs Karen Marler advised that the network provides a great source of local ambient data which helps the EPA to understand how its regulatory activities are leading to changes in air quality.</p> <p>Mr Keith Wilks commented that he wants to see consistency in terms of what is monitored across regions throughout NSW to allow for state wide comparisons of air quality.</p> <p>Mr Craig Dalton commented that he wasn't sure if the network is monitoring was useful for the wider community, because it is not clear how many people are aware of the information available. This should be a focus for the Committee and possibly the review – how do we ensure the community has accurate information about air quality.</p> <p>Mr Keith Craig stated that the network monitoring has been very useful in identifying air quality issues at the Orica facility both through the data obtained, and particle characterisation studies.</p> <p>Mr Rick Banyard stated that the network is as good as the current monitoring technology available. Mr Banyard commented that as technology improves he would like to see more monitoring station, monitoring for more pollutants.</p> <p>Mrs Sheree Woodroffe stated that OEH's analysis of data over the long term provides useful information regarding seasonal patterns of air quality and the impact that meteorology has on air pollution.</p> <p>Mr John Tate questioned what the network should be monitoring that it currently does not monitor – for example diesel emissions and wood smoke.</p> <p>Mr Rick Banyard stated he expects the network to be improved over time as monitoring technology improves. Mr Banyard repeated his request for data to be published in 15 minute intervals and that more work is done to let the community know that this information is available.</p> <p>Mr Mitchell Bennett asked how would we pick what these new pollutants should be?</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Mr Rick Banyard stated benzene, toluene, and diesel emissions.</p> <p>John Tate stated that the Committee relies on advice from the EPA regarding what air pollutants are of concern and should therefore be part of the monitoring program. As the Local Newcastle Network consists of only 3 monitors the Committee needs to frame its comments on the review to focus on what is reasonable and cost effective.</p> <p>Mr Chris Tola stated that ease of access to air quality information should be a priority action. Mr Tola supported Mr Craig's call for a hard copy newsletter, but suggested that the information needs to be targeted to a younger audience. A mobile app could be developed, more use of social media etc to notify of air quality information.</p> <p>Mr Mitchell Bennett commented that infographics could be developed or other communication tools developed.</p> <p>Mr John Tate stated that media articles seem to throw out (distort) Upper Hunter data. He knows through this work with the Committee that often what is reported in the media is not the true case. How do we get the right message out? There seem to be too many opposing stories between the EPA and the Newcastle Herald. Perhaps a newsletter now and then, saying if you want to check the facts, this is how.</p> <p>Mr Thomas Levick stated that City Councils Newsletter summaries have normalised issues through the use of infographics. He sees a collaborative approach between Councils as an opportunity to adopt the same narratives. It can be hard for people to know who to recognise and understand; and using short videos and having a presence on all social media sites can help create an easy to recognise image. These forms of communication are easy to consume.</p> <p>Mr Keith Craig asked was it worth getting Anthony Kelly from the Herald in to address these issues of misrepresentation.</p> <p>Mr Mitchell Bennett stated that Stakeholder Engagement will address some of these issues, and these issues and others from Keith will be passed onto the Review Board. He thanked the Committee for their input and stated that Loredana Warren from OEH is the coordinator for the Review.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| 3 ORICA Ammonium Nitrate Emissions | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--|--------|
| No | Agenda Item | Notes | Action/Decision | Status |
| 3.1 | Orica to present on Ammonium nitrate PM2.5 emissions study. | <p>Mrs Sheree Woodroffe provided a power point presentation titled NCCCE Briefing PM_{2.5} Particle Investigation 12 June 2018 Orica. This presentation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background on the Lower Hunter Characterisation Study detailed composition and major sources of PM_{2.5.1}- particles from March 2014-February 2015 at five stations which showed annual PM_{2.5} levels were 40% higher at Stockton due to sea salt, and ammonium nitrate. Winter was a time for more ammonium nitrate and the likely source was Orica at Kooragang Island. • PM_{2.5} Particle Investigation which this lead to Orica developing a Pollution Reduction Program • PM_{2.5} Source investigation highlighted five sites were identified as pollution sources, and the prill tower the main site to address • PM_{2.5} emission reduction technology and research into suitable reduction technologies. This included six options based on effectiveness, operability, implement options and safety, health, environment and community considerations. • The most suitable technology is irrigated fibre-bed scrubbing and plan is to be prepared for the installation of this project including costings. <p>Mr John Tate stated he had some questions about dissolving PM_{2.5} particles of ammonia into a water solution and whether that was a viable option to help with reducing air pollutants.</p> <p>Mrs Sheree Woodroffe stated that option is possible, however this then makes an ammonium nitrate solution in water which then poses certain complications on how that water can be used and processed. This would then add polluted water issues and challenges with how that polluted water is then managed.</p> | <p>Action 2: A copy of the presentation <i>NCCCE Briefing PM_{2.5} Particle Investigation 12 June 2018 Orica</i> to be sent to all committee members.</p> | |

| 4 Air Quality in the Upper Hunter: Summer 2017-18 | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--------|
| No | Agenda Item | Notes | Action/Decision | Status |
| 4.1 | OEH presentation on Summer 17-18 Air Quality Monitoring Report for Newcastle | <p>Mr Scott Thompson, Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) presented on behalf of Loredana Warren (OEH), and provided a power point presentation titled Newcastle Air Quality Monitoring Network Summer 2017-18 OEH. This presentation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A summary showing the Newcastle region had below average rainfall for this period with a dry December and a very dry January and average wet February due to rain later in the month. Temperatures were above average. Particles over the benchmark were PM₁₀ for 28 days. These were mainly at Stockton with sea salt spray under easterly winds 83% of the time. The most extensive event on 15 February was all sites of Newcastle region (plus 37 monitoring sites across NSW were over the benchmark and ranged from between 53.1 to 78.9ug/m³), which was due to a long range dust from a large fire in Wollemi National Park (8033ha burnt) • PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} rolling averages to the end of Summer 2014-15 50 2017-18 show PM₁₀ levels to the end of Summer generally the same except for small increased at Mayfield and Stockton. PM_{2.5} similar to previous years. • The request by Health to show a graph for annual averages for PM₁₀&PM_{2.5} were PM₁₀ benchmark levels were low at all sites from 2015, expect Stockton due to sea salt with onshore winds). PM_{2.5} benchmarks varied at certain sites. • Onshore winds during Summer 2017-18 were typically onshore. • There were some disruptions to the monitors throughout the period to a number of reasons including bird damage, maintenance and checks, instrument calibration and communications faults. <p>Mrs Karen Marler advised that there was an increasing trend at Mayfield during this time which wasn't shown in the data as a trend.</p> <p>Mr Scott Thompson commented that he understood this trend and offered he knew there were earthworks being carried out at Mayfield at that time.</p> | <p>Action 2: A copy of the presentation <i>NCCCE Briefing PM_{2.5} Particle Investigation 12 June 2018 Orica</i> to be sent to all committee members.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Mrs Sheree Woodroffe added that at the same time period there were works being carried out near the Orica site.</p> <p>Mr Keith Craig commented that Stockton's wind direction influenced the peaks for sea salt spray during the westerlies.</p> <p>Mr Scott Thompson advised that this was correct and also that there was a dust storm in Tamworth around the same time which influenced the data.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| 5 Stockton Air Monitor | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|--------|
| No | Agenda Item | Notes | Action/Decision | Status |
| 5.1 | OEH presentation on ammonia monitoring technology for the Stockton air monitoring station | <p>Mr Scott Thompson provided a power point presentation titled Stockton Ammonia Analyser Replacement Technologies and Options. This presentation will give an overview of the current monitoring status of Ammonia monitoring at OEH's Stockton Air Quality monitoring site and viable options for the replacement of current technology.</p> <p>This presentation detailed the different methodologies for ammonia measurement by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hybrid NOX analyser with external converter for Ammonia measurement- Serinus 44 (Current Method) • Direct NH₃ measurement using tunable diode laser absorption spectroscopy (TDLAS) in Herriott chamber. • Direct NH₃ measurement using photoacoustics with cascade laser technology • Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscopy (CRDS) technology <p>A final comparison of the methodologies was detailed.</p> <p>Mr John Tate thanked Mr Thompson for this update and as there were no questions from the Committee on the subject, he asked if a copy of the presentation could be send to all members for further reading. Mr Thompson replied that yes that would be fine.</p> | <p>Action 3: A copy of the presentation titled <i>Stockton Ammonia Analyser Replacement Technologies and Options.</i> This presentation will give an overview of the current monitoring status of Ammonia monitoring at OEH's Stockton Air Quality monitoring site and viable options for the replacement of current technology will be sent to the Committee members.</p> | |

| 6 Koppers Update | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|---|--------|
| No | Agenda Item | Notes | Action/Decision | Status |
| 6.1 | EPA brief update on Koppers Benzene issue | <p>Mrs Karen Marler advised of the following updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) had been provided to EPA on the 8 June 2018, and has been subject to an EPA “first-pass” review. This report was then sent to Department of Health for expert review. It is expected that Koppers will host a Community Information Day 8 July 2018 at Koppers, pending the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) scrutiny from Department of Health (DoH). New site orientation tours of the Koppers Mayfield facility for Committee members can be coordinated through Emily Ingram. Please let Emily know if you are interested and she will co-ordinate this for you. The action of adding benzene to the Mayfield monitoring station had been addressed by Adam Plant and the following points were made: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It could be done, at a very rough estimate of \$5000. This needs to be weighed against its value, given: what the modelling predicts in terms of very low numbers at this location; distance to Koppers; seasonality with wind direction, and other potential sources of benzene in the area. A mobile unit is how specific campaigns have been managed previously, and the cost benefit analysis would have to be considered carefully. In initial outlay of approximately \$120 000 to purchase the unit and ongoing costs of around \$10 000 per year. <p>Mr Keith Craig asked if these options provided by Adam Plant be industry funded?</p> <p>Mrs Karen Marler responded that it would have to be a cost bourn by the industry as the EPA does not have that significant budget.</p> <p>Dr Craig Dalton asked if there are other sites that receive complaints of air pollution where a mobile unit would be useful to have for campaigns?</p> <p>Mrs Karen Marler advised that there were other sites like Boral bitupave and concrete, oil refineries, waste plants that could be possible campaign sites in our area.</p> | <p>Action 4: The list of questions in hard copy that Rick Banyard gave to all Committee members tonight (DOC18/390273) will be scanned and added as Attachment 1 to these minutes.</p> <p>Action 5: Karen Marler to respond to Rick Banyard questions and have placed on next meeting agenda to address.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Mr Rick Banyard asked if there are monitors around and owned by other organisations of companies that could be hired. He stated that portability is a good option and doesn't see why the cost shouldn't be borne by Koppers and Orica?</p> <p>Mr Scott Thompson advised that it would be around \$3500 per month to hire a portable unit and that he considered this expensive.</p> <p>Mr John Tate stated that we have to ask ourselves what is the most effective way to get a result.</p> <p>Mrs Karen Marler advised that it is worth bearing in mind that we are looking at very low levels of pollutants. Is it worth the expense? These monitors are sensitive and delicate things that need love and attention. It's not just a simple matter of moving it between sites easily and being left unsecured. We can certainly ask if they are available for hire.</p> <p>Mr Scott Thompson stated that he agreed with Karens' comments, that moving a monitor about is not an easy thing to manage and would need to be planned and coordinated properly.</p> <p>Mrs Karen Marler advised not to forget that Koppers have been instructed to measure benzene as part of their ongoing monitoring program.</p> <p>Mrs Sheree Woodroffee stated that it would be premature to not wait for the Human Health Risk Assessment results from Koppers, and see what Koppers response is to these results.</p> <p>(Mr Rick Banyard brought up an issue on Koppers after the Presentation by Mr Scott Thompson on Ammonium) where he stated he liked his site visit and found Koppers to be a very interesting site. He still wants a community meeting to be held with explanations to say more about what has happened and that he has provided a list of questions (in hard copy which was handed out to all Committee members) and wants answers to these questions – to which Mrs Marler responded she would be happy to help with this request.</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| 7 Coal Fired Power Station Emissions and Monitoring Review | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--------|
| No | Agenda Item | Notes | Action/Decision | Status |
| 7.1 | Coal Fired Power Station Emissions and Monitoring Review Project | <p>Anthony Savage, EPA introduced himself and provided a power point presentation titled NSW EPA Review if Coal Fire Power Station Air Emissions and Monitoring NCCCE Meeting 12 June 2018 EPA. This presentation detailed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why was the review under taken • Overview which included review of 5 base load coal fired power stations in NSW, over 5 years of data (2011-2016) using 1200 + data files. • Findings of the review were extensive compliance, no evidence of deliberate misreporting or under reporting, some inconsistency in regulatory requirements, satisfactory NPI reporting and 13 recommendations for improvements. <p>Summary of review questions were</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. what emission limits apply to power stations, 2. are power stations compliant with monitoring conditions, air emission limits and reporting obligations, 3. is the monitoring representative, and 4. are emission controls being operated in a proper and efficient manner. <p>Follow up actions to date have been</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an internal EPA working group established to steer review follow-up work, • responses to identified non-compliances, • engagement with the Australian Energy's Council Environmental Working Group, • prioritised and initiated EPL consistency review • input to Commonwealth NPI review • Mt Piper CEMS discussions. <p>Next steps will be through the internal EPA working group and EPA policy work.</p> | <p>Action 6: EPA to develop a Community Engagement Plan to show results of the Coal Fired Power Station Emissions and Monitoring Review Project</p> <p>Action 7: An Update on this Review process to be at the next NCCCE meeting.</p> <p>Action 8: Copy of this presentation <i>NSW EPA Review if Coal Fire Power Station Air Emissions and Monitoring NCCCE Meeting 12 June 2018</i> EPA to be sent to all committee members.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>John Tate asked if the presented emission summary from the EPA air emissions inventory included Singleton.</p> <p>Anthony Savage responded yes, as the power stations are located in the Singleton LGA which is included in the Greater Metropolitan Region defining the extent of the EPA's air emissions inventory.</p> <p>Anthony Savage made a point to highlight the fact the we are dealing with a fleet of aging stations and this has to be considered when doing regulatory work and setting revised regulatory requirements. Limits for a new station would be lower.</p> <p>Keith Craig asked to give an example of requirements would be different if they were new power stations.</p> <p>Anthony Savage mentioned NOx limits differing for different plant vintages. Anthony also advised that the limit levels shown in in the slides are maximum limits, not actual emissions. The review shows actual emission performance can be much lower. Actual emissions and reasonably achievable performance will be considered when EPL's are reviewed.</p> <p>Keith Craig asked will there be a load base limit.</p> <p>Anthony Savage said the LBL scheme is currently being reviewed by the EPA under a separate project.</p> <p>Rick Banyard asked about the reporting limit for sulfur.</p> <p>Mr Anthony Savage advised the fuel sulfur limit is a proxy for sulfur dioxide emissions - as sulfur does not burn in the stations.</p> <p>Mr Rick Banyard stated that the Mount Piper and Bayswater station are similar ages so should have similar requirements.</p> <p>Mr Anthony Savage advised the consistency review would look to standardise conditions where practical but site and plant specific differences must be considered.</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>(Craig Dalton made a discrete apology and exited the meeting at 1932 hrs)</p> <p>Mr John Tate thanked Anthony for his presentation and stated that he had a lot of questions but was aware of the time. He stated that a communication plan is needed to get the review results out. Could Anthony come back and present to the Committee again in September for an update?</p> <p>Mr Anthony Savage stated that this would be possible once the review follow-up work had progressed and updates were available for discussion.</p> <p>Mr John Tate stated that it is such good work and it is right on our doorstep. He was looking forward to the next update on this process at the next meeting and ongoing.</p> <p>Mr Anthony Savage agreed that there is a lot of good work to be communicated from this review process.</p> <p>Mrs Karen Marler advised this communication is part of Emily's work that is coming, and she will be working on producing a communication strategy to present the findings of the Review once it is completed.</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

8. New Business

| No | Agenda Item | Action | Person Responsible | Completion Date |
|----------|--|---|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| A | Q & A Summary | Given to all committee members | Emily Ingram | 12.6.18 |
| B | Sitting Fee Forms | Given to all committee members for signature then collected for submission to finance | Emily Ingram | 12.6.18 |
| C | Profile images of all Members | Taken of Committee members present to upload to NCCCE EPA webpage | Emily Ingram | 12.6.18 |
| D | ASMA regulation of vessels and their emissions and the international nature of the regulation and where ASMA are going with the 2020 Sulphur cap and the GHG | Presentation to be included in next meeting 11 September 18 | Port of Newcastle and AMSA | |
| E | Summary of the number of calls to the Environment Line | The summary was available on the night, however the Committee carried over for next meeting | Emily Ingram | 12.6.18 |
| F | Stockton dump and removal of material recently exposed by storms and high seas | Update on current issue – This issue was not able to be dealt with tonight due to timing constraints. However, the emails previously sent to Karen Marler from Keith Craig re this issue will still be addressed via email out of session and placed as Attachment 2. | Karen Marler | 18 June 2018 DOC18/389332 |
| G | Cargill and biofilter for odour control and relevant updates to reporting options e.g. smart phones | Update on current issue – This issue was not able to be dealt with tonight due to timing constraints. However, the emails previously sent to Karen Marler from Keith Craig re this issue will still be addressed via email out of session and placed as Attachment 2. | Karen Marler | 18 June 2018 DO18/389332 |

DOC18/390273

Issues re Koppers

Prepared by Rick Banyard 12th June 2018

1. CFCFM is concerned that the public have been treated poorly.
 - a. Koppers is planning an open day.
 - b. When will a public meeting be held?
 - c. It would seem that the issue of high emissions has not been substantiated. What would have been the reaction if the figures had been found to be as originally indicated?

2. The excess Benzene would seem to have been a result of a base error in the method used to calculate the level of Benzene in the atmosphere.
 - a. Who, other than Koppers has signed off on the new calculation method?
 - b. Is the EPA totally satisfied with the new figures?

3. There would seem to have been many years of errors.

Why has this error not been detected much sooner?

4. Is the EPA aware of any other substances or gases that require additional monitoring and or reporting?

5. The plant would seem to have been only conducting production process monitoring with very little reporting.

The plant has an adequately staffed central control room.

 - a. Will the EPL be reviewed to incorporate more frequent reporting?
 - b. Will a real time monitor connected to the control room be required?
 - c. Is it not reasonable for a chemical factory in a residential area to have real time monitoring?
 - d. Will a benzene monitor be attached to the Mayfield Monitor?

6. The plant is at the normal production level with some changes in production techniques pending the installation of additional scrubbing and burning of waste.
 - a. What are the waste elements currently being burnt?
 - b. What will be the waste elements for the proposed additional burning?
 - c. How will the output be monitored and reported?

Emily Ingram

From: Karen Marler
Sent: Monday, 18 June 2018 2:44 PM
To: Keith Craig; Emily Ingram
Cc: Adam Gilligan
Subject: RE: Subjects for comment in the NCCCE Minutes

Hi Keith – responses to your items are below.

Emily – can you include in meeting minutes as additional items address out of session please.

Cheers

K

From: Keith Craig [mailto:kneeboard.keith@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, 13 June 2018 6:01 PM
To: Karen Marler <Karen.Marler@epa.nsw.gov.au>; Emily Ingram <Emily.Ingram@epa.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: Adam Gilligan <Adam.Gilligan@epa.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: RE: Subjects for comment in the NCCCE Minutes

Karen

The couple of issues I wanted to raise however the meeting ran over time are outlined below. Importantly I would like the response also to be included in the minutes and this will assist in following the issues and getting updates.

1. Cargill Canola oil odours being experienced by the community off-site and over at Stockton now with the onset of the w and NW winds. I have made a few complaints to the EPA and one to Cargill and I now have community members complaining to me now in Stockton about the canola oil odours which while they may not be a health issue and very unpleasant and aesthetically not acceptable to the community.

Cargill were required to install and biofilter to remove these odours due to previous complaints over many years. This filter works well until the biofilter is exhausted then odours begin being experienced again. This media normally last 2 to 3 years then requires replacing however this time can vary depending on the design of the filter bed, the media and the odour load.

The ongoing daily odour coming from the plant when they are milling canola seed would clearly indicate the biofilter is exhausted and the community want to know when the biofilter media will be replaced to remove this odour and what the EPA is doing about this to force Cargill to address this issue.

Filter media is readily available however I understand it is a cost to Cargill and we expect Cargill will be trying to offer up explanations to try and avoid this cost however it is now evident there is an ongoing issue that is not acceptable to the community.

The EPA has received five reports of odour either directly attributed to Cargill or describing odour typical of Cargill so far in 2018 – most from yourself – one from another community member. I understand that other community members are reluctant to notify Environment Line. The one complaint from another community member was received 5 days after they noted the odour – making investigation difficult.

The EPA is aware that Cargill odours can be detected on Kooragang Island and conducts regular surveillance and inspection to ensure best practice controls are applied.

Attachment 2: Cargill and Hunter Water pump station at Stockton (page 2 of 2)

During a routine site inspection at Cargill on 31 May 2018, the odour complaints were discussed with Cargill and the following advice provided:

- In response to one odour complaint, Cargill undertook an odour survey in Stockton, and detected a cooking oil odour from the Stockton RSL.
- In response to recent odour complaints Cargill had their odour consultant attend the premises and review the performance of the biofilter.
- At the recommendation of the consultant, the biofilter bed was topped up with a further 500mm of woodchip in the week prior to the inspection.
- The plant was shut for maintenance at the time of the EPA inspection. Cargill was in the process of installing a new extraction fan that will move about 25% more volume of air from the processing building. Cargill has done this for operational reasons, but it may also improve odour management.

EPA officers are in the Kooragang/Stockton area daily. Officers have noted that the canola odour has been a bit more noticeable on Kooragang Island of late due to prevailing winds, but have not been able to detect Canola odour in Stockton.

Again I encourage you and other members of the community to report odours to our Environment Line.

2. Sewerage odours from Hunter Water's pump station at north Stockton adjacent to their old sewerage ponds and Kooragang Island pump station near the Shell service station.

I have complained to the EPA about this and some other Stockton residents are also complaining about this to me about these sewerage odours. Have the EPA talked to Hunter Water about this and solutions such as install activated carbon filters in the air exhaust from the pumping stations

EPA officers have not detected the sewage odour from the HWC pump stations, however HWC have been doing civil works on and around the Kooragang pump station several times this year which may have caused some localised odour at that site. We will continue surveillance when in the area.

Also update on rehabilitation on the whole dump site where is this up to and what is proposed and issues Stockton dump has been further exposed in recent large seas including the Crown Land section. Can you update us on this dump issue. I understand HWC are commencing removing the material they had dug out. When HWC removed up to 10 metres on material away from the ocean did it also remove this material on Crown Land or is this material still to be removed back 10 metres. If HWC did remove material on Crown Land are they removing this material in the current removal process or will this material remain on-site until the EPA force Crown Lands to remove it and will they have to pay the dump fee to the EPA (as this would come from the NSW Government being Crown Land).

- Hunter Water and Crown Lands are working with the Newcastle City Council to remove the rubbish and rehabilitate the North Stockton Beach heritage tip site.
- The Department of Industry has provided \$1 million to rehabilitate the section of the site that sits on Crown land.
- Crown Lands has advised that further works to complete the removal of waste from the beach is expected to take around two weeks to complete, weather permitting.
- Hunter Water and Crown Lands will also work with the Newcastle City Council and NSW Government to develop a long term management plan for the area once emergency works have been completed.
- The EPA is continuing to monitor the clean-up.

Thanks Karen

Keith

