



Reference	Action	Who	Status at 21 January 2017
300316_2	EPA to provide updates on the Community Consultant Assessment at future TLCCG meetings. Update to be provided at next mtg.	Jeremy	13/07/16 Ongoing until report completed. 3/10/16: Update regarding 27/9 site tour provided by Olga via email. 26/10/16: Alistair advises that the report has not been received. He will follow up with the consultant 30/11/16: Update provided at TLCCG meeting.
130716_2	Cleanaway to report on progress of leachate management trial at the next meeting. To be sent via email one month before February 2017 meeting	Kieren	13/9/16 update provided by Olga: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leachate removal trial was completed in August 2016. Wells L09 & L14 were pumped due to having the most amount of leachate in those wells, in addition to nearby monitoring points. Two air lift pumps were used, one to extract LNAPL and the other to extract leachate. Small volumes of LNAPL was removed from waste (L09 = 21 litres, L14 = 56 litres) The drawdown and the recovery was measured as <i>slow drawdown and even slower recovery</i>. Approximately 2,760 litres of leachate was removed from L09 & L14. EHS Support is completing a summary and this will be distributed to the group as soon as it becomes available 23/1/17 – Alan advised that he will follow up with the consultant.
130716_8	Cleanaway to develop and send the groundwater monitoring schedule (pictorial if possible) for the groundwater wells and testing via email as soon as possible. To be sent via email one month before February 2017 meeting	Kieren	13/9/16 From Olga: refer to documents provided: GW Sampling Interval and Groundwater Monitoring Plan (emailed by Olga on 13/9/16) 3/10/16 From Olga: The matrix of sampling provided is a part of the overall groundwater monitoring plan being developed for Tullamarine. The groundwater monitoring plan is currently being finalised and will contain far more detail around the scheduling. It will be provided to TLCCG for comment prior to the next meeting. 23/1/17 – Alan advised that the schedule is ready for distribution



Reference	Action	Who	Status at 21 January 2017
130716_9	<p>Cleanaway to provide the Groundwater Technical Review (Kleinfelder), the Auditor Report (Cardno Lane Piper), the Groundwater Management Plan and Groundwater Monitoring Schedule via email as soon as available and at least one month before the next TLCCG meeting.</p> <p>Groundwater Technical Review complete. Other reports to be discussed at the February 2017 meeting.</p>	Alan	<p>23/9/16: From Olga: The main reason for the delay with the report is the on-going requests for clarification of information between the Auditor Anthony Lane and consultant Kleinfelder. This has been an extended process that has involved a number of meetings between all parties including Cleanaway staff and is taking longer than we anticipated.</p> <p>3/10/16 From Olga: Cardno Lane Piper has been instructed to have the audit report completed by the end of October at the latest so that it can be provided to TLCCG a month prior to the November meeting. They are working to this schedule.</p> <p>20/10/16 Update sent, advising that the above schedule will be met.</p> <p>26/10/16 Audit review report and Kleinfelder report have been received. Links to all reports to be sent to community members.</p>
130716_12	<p>Cleanaway to make further contact with local community groups regarding the stormwater plans and provide detailed plans for 1:100 year event.</p> <p>Ongoing – includes Action 300316_7.</p>	Kieren	<p>13/9/16 From Olga: Golder Associates is still working on the design. The TLCCG and Friends of Upper Moonee Ponds Creek will be consulted on the design.</p> <p>13/9/16 refer to letter from Golder Associates outlining info on design and pond levels (emailed by Olga on 13/9/16).</p> <p>3/10/16 from Olga: The stormwater design will consider the peak volumes of water that may run through that system and this is still being reviewed by our engineers.</p> <p>As promised, Cleanaway will consult the TLCCG with the final design.</p> <p>26/10/16 Site tour to be offered in late Nov/early December (Olga to coordinate w/b 31/10)</p>
301116_1	Cleanaway to provide flare sampling data and the summary report.	Kieren	
301116_2	Cleanaway to report on whether the high salinity reading at MPCL04 was when there was no flow in the creek.	Kieren	
301116_3	Cleanaway to provide LNAPL testing results from groundwater wells.	Kieren	14/12/16 Cleanaway advised that all LNAPL testing data is already presented in the TRAR.



Reference	Action	Who	Status at 21 January 2017
301116_4	Cleanaway to investigate new technology that may be suitable for LNAPL extraction as part of the next technical review.	Alan	
301116_5	Cleanaway to investigate further sites for testing of DNAPL.	Kieren	
301116_6	EPA to notify Jen when there is decision on the distribution of the independent consultant's report.	Alistair	
301116_7	Cleanaway to circulate the amended Flare Emissions Report Nov 25 with changes noted.	Kieren	17/12/16: Update requested by Graeme 23/1/17 – Alan advised that the revised report was circulated on 21/12/16.
301116_8	Cleanaway to report on the factors affecting the flare chemical destruction rates and testing results.	Kieren	
301116_9	Cleanaway to ask Ektimo what changes were made to the flare sampling processes.	Kieren	
301116_10	Cleanaway to advise via email of the next meeting date proposed for 2017.	Olga	Next meeting 22 February
Graeme email 7/1/17	I have been trying to compare the Flare Report dated 5 Jun 15 and the Flare Report dated 25 Nov 16 but this is proving difficult for a number of reasons. I note that the Flare Report of 25 Nov	Kieren	13/1/17: Kieren advised that he has sent the question to their experts and will receive a response before the next meeting. 23/1/17 – Alan advised that a response will be provided to Graeme w/b 30/1, and that time should be made available at the February meeting for further discussion.



Reference	Action	Who	Status at 21 January 2017
	<p>16 is more comprehensive in that it appears to have tested for a greater range of chemicals.</p> <p>In an effort to determine what improvements had been made to the flare efficiency in the stack – noting that the commitment is 99.9% (TLCCG Meeting 26 Feb 14) destruction in the stack - I prepared a comparison between the results of the two Flare tests using Attachment A from the report dated 5 Jun 16 and then searching for the same products in the Report dated 25 Nov 16.</p> <p>My comparison is confined, in the main, to those chemicals where EPA SEPP toxicity levels listed in Attachment A to the 5 Jun 15 report.</p> <p>In my comparisons I note that the tables contained at Report R002960r Page 11 of 24 and Report R002960r Page 13 of 24 of the 25 Nov 16 report list the same products but contain widely different concentration readings - refer attached file. An explanation at the 25 Feb 17 meeting would be appreciated.</p> <p>Dioxins and Furins: SEPP sets limit at 0.0037ng/m3 but test 1 on 25 Nov 16 exceeded these limits.</p>		



Reference	Action	Who	Status at 21 January 2017
	<p>Test 2 was within the SEPP parameters but no explanation given. But the averages as shown Report R002960r Page 8 of 24 exceeds the SEPP by approx. 30%. If we used the EU and USEPA criteria of 0.002ng/m3 then the divergence is greater.</p> <p>As Dioxins and Furins are particularly nasty substances what action is proposed to ensure the destruction of the I-TEQ to within the allowable limits (preferably the EU/USEPA level)?</p> <p>Arsenic, Chromium, Sulphur Dioxide and Acrolein emissions are many times greater than the allowable limits. What action is proposed to ensure their destruction conforms to the allowable limits?</p> <p>Given the above I contend that the Flare is not meeting the level of destruction performance as per the TLCCG Meeting of 26 Feb. The Flare is not meeting the criteria on an individual chemical basis.. I disagree with using a mass weighted average where there are known exceedances of especially toxic substances.</p> <p>The narrative relating to Table 4.6 states the destruction efficiency of the flare is compared to the Landfill BEPM</p>		



Reference	Action	Who	Status at 21 January 2017
	<p>but at no point does the report relate the results back to the commitment of 26 Feb 14.</p> <p>In addition, the conclusion states the modelled concentrations were calculated at a point 235 metres from the flare. Again, there no reference back to the commitment of 99.9% destruction within the stack. There is much to explain.</p> <p>At this stage the flare fails to meet the commitment given by Cleanaway and endorsed by the community.</p>		