

Linwood Marino Community Working Group Meeting

Meeting notes

5.30pm Wednesday 15 February 2006

Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club

Attendance: Beryl Hall (Marino Residents' Association)
David Parsons (Marino Residents' Association)
Fran Southern (Marino Residents' Association)
John Dunsford (EPA)
Gerard Hocking (EPA)
Serge Caplygin (Mines)
Orlando Puccini (Mines)
Adam Betterman (Boral)
Alistair Kelsh (Boral)
Ann Shaw Rungie (QED)
Josephine Telfer (QED)

1. Welcome, introduction and overview

A meeting of the Linwood Quarry Marino Community Working Group was held on 15 February 2006. Notes from the previous meeting on 26 October 2005 had been circulated prior to the meeting.

Ann Shaw Rungie, from QED Pty Ltd, welcomed members to the meeting and asked if anyone had any comments on the notes from the previous meeting.

The notes that follow provide a summary of key points discussed at the meeting.

2. Discussion of agenda

Ann suggested that the agenda reflect the actions since the last meeting. The Group agreed that the agenda should include the following:

- Proposed new location of truck parking area
- Noise results
- Dust Monitoring results since last meeting
- Dustrak Monitoring Proposal
- Communication issues
- Potential web page

Section 3 provides a review of the issues covered at the Working Group meeting and any resulting actions.

3. Review of issues and actions

3.1 Proposed new location of truck parking area

At the last meeting Adam advised that Boral were investigating the relocation of the truck parking area 400-500m away from its current location with a view to reducing noise at start up.

The proposed new truck parking site is, however, of a size and orientation to enable trucks to park with trailers still attached and enables trucks to drive in and out without needing to reverse. Given that clanking of trailers being attached and unattached and reversing beepers are a significant cause of noise disturbance, it is considered that there will be an advantage in terms of reduced noise generation from the use of the proposed new truck parking area.

Adam detailed the work that has been done to date in assessing the potential new truck parking area in order to reduce noise impacts (especially in the early morning) of truck movements on the site. Some testing has been undertaken at both the present and proposed truck parking sites to determine how noise travels from each site. The testing involved trucks doing the same activities at each site (on different days). The noise associated with this activity was then monitored in front of Beryl's house. While the alternative truck parking area was further from the residential area, the results of this testing showed that there was not much difference in noise levels measured on Beryl's property, however with the eradication of reversing in the new area noise levels will be reduced. The proposal has been costed, including new fencing.

Action: Adam to provide advice about progress at the next meeting.

3.2 Noise monitoring

Noise monitoring results from last year were discussed. The measurements taken were all below the standard.

The noises heard from the quarry however, were the occasional reversing beeper from trucks and from loading operations. The majority of noise measured was found to be from:

- Traffic noise from Ocean Boulevard
- Trucks starting up
- Birds and dogs

When noise results are averaged over time the "spikes" of noise, or individual short events are not reflected. This may need to be considered when reviewing how much noise reduction would be achieved at the new truck parking location.

3.3 Security and access to the quarry

As a follow up to issues raised last year about access to the quarry, Adam advised that he had installed a video camera at the weighbridge so if any trucks are heard entering the site beyond the curfew he can use the surveillance camera to determine who it was. The camera runs continuously. The tapes will be reviewed if a complaint is made but will not be reviewed as part of general routine.

In addition to this Adam also receives a report as to when staff log in and out of the quarry security system. Next financial year Boral have budgeted for an electronic swipe card activated gate, which will also track who is entering and exiting the quarry.

3.4 Dust monitoring

Adam discussed monitoring results from the existing static monitors and the Dustrac monitors and also some new proposals for dust monitoring.

There are static monitors at five locations, as shown on the aerial photograph. The results were slightly higher on the eastern boundary suggesting that the prevailing wind had been in this direction. On the whole the results showed a reduction in dust generation for this time of the year. One of the monitors has had issues of repeated vandalism and was moved during the period so it did not produce useful data for comparison purposes.

Boral has two Dustrac monitors which measure the volume of dust in the air continuously in milligrams per cubic metre. Only one of the monitors was operating during this reporting period. This was located on the hill inside the quarry next to the aggregate crusher. Dust volumes recorded were generally low over the reported period, September 2005 to February 2006, and show some reduction in dust generation from that source. Comparison of data over the same period 2004-05 and 2005-06 shows lower dust levels over the period between September and February. The readings generally are more consistent with few spikes. There were, however, two spikes showing higher volumes in October and December.

The Dustrac real time dust monitor data is presented averaged over a 24-hour period. David pointed out that this did not allow for spikes in dust generation to be reported on. It may be useful to check whether these spikes were associated with any particular activity or conditions. Boral had previously discussed linking the Dustrac monitors with alarms to alert staff when high levels of dust were being generated and to enable remedial action to be taken.

Action: Adam to consider whether it is useful to try and identify the reason for spikes in retrospect, as well as how sudden high dust levels can be identified and acted on as quickly as possible.

Adam advised that the monitoring process had identified that dust generation is more directly linked to aggregate sales than to production. It was explained that this was due to double handling when moving stock piled supply.

The upgrade of the pugmill bin loading area to incorporate a shed like structure to capture airborne dust is expected to be completed within 6 weeks.

Boral staff asked the residents in the group whether they had noticed a reduction in dust. They all agreed that while there has been a notable reduction in dust, although the levels present are still too high at times.

Adam reported that the reduction in dust generation recorded recently was in large part due to the use of a water cannon and sprinklers on stockpiles. Adam is working on developing a system of sprinklers for the loading area. Presently Boral ensure that stockpiles are watered regularly.

Dustrac Monitoring Proposal

Adam presented a map showing possible locations for new Dustrac monitors, which had been proposed to provide background dust levels, as well as real time information on dust levels and to link with alarms to alert staff when high levels of dust were being generated.

Adam has now received advice that while the locations for the monitors are appropriate the technology proposed is not likely to meet Australian Standards to be introduced within the next three years. Boral want to ensure whatever actions they implement best meet their needs and the requirements of the Australian Standards.

Boral will continue to investigate the best means of monitoring and recording dust generation.

Action: Explanation of Australian Standards to be provided at the next meeting (EPA and Boral).

Action: Adam to provide update on approach to future dust monitoring.

3.5 Communication issues

The Community Update Newsletter discussed at the last meeting was prepared and distributed just before Christmas 2005. A copy of the Newsletter was available for those at the meeting who had not seen it.

The distribution of the Update was discussed, as it was noted that some people might not have seen the newsletter as it was distributed to letterboxes with a pile of 'junk' mail. Some members of the community (including Fran) did not receive the newsletter at all as they have 'no junk mail' plaques on their letterboxes.

Beryl pointed out that most people read the Messenger. There was some debate as to if people discard junk mail would they do the same with the Messenger or Messenger inserts.

Suggestions for informing the community included:

- Putting a column in the Messenger paper
- Inserting the newsletter inside the Messenger
- Putting the newsletter inside an envelope with Boral's logo on it
- Using a Boral envelope printed with something like: "Community Information Update, Linwood Quarry" was considered to be more effective and should be considered when another newsletter is thought appropriate.

A couple of members thought the newsletter contained a bit much information and was slightly overwhelming. It was agreed that QED could provide a cut down version of this, containing information that would not date too quickly, and this could be useful for members to hand out to others. A couple of people thought it would be better in colour.

Action: QED to prepare short version of newsletter.

3.6 Potential web page

Prior to the meeting Adam asked the members of the group to review a series of web pages on the Boral web site. These pages were about Montrose Quarry in Victoria, which has similar issues to Linwood. It was suggested that there might be scope for Boral to produce a similar type of web page for the Linwood quarry.

The group generally agreed that the Montrose Quarry site was well presented and informative and that something similar would be useful for the Linwood Quarry.

Alistair felt that the website would be worthwhile pursuing if the community would use it. The group discussed the potential for the website to be a means of communication with the community informing them of relevant information such as when the Quarry would be operating out of regular hours. Ann mentioned that it would be important that the site was designed so it would still be relevant even if it was not updated for a period of time as web site maintenance is a time consuming task.

The group decided that they were happy with the format of the Montrose Quarry site and they felt the community would use it.

Action: Adam to set up a page to be presented at the next meeting.

4. Where to from here

The Working Group agreed that the next meeting would take place on Monday 26 June 2006; the location is to be confirmed.

If you have any comments on these notes or any other issues you wish to raise please notify Adam on 8298 8810 or 0401 896 810.