



HYDRO

NB: Note that minutes are paraphrased to an extent and may not exactly match actual statements.

Project	Hydro Kurri Kurri site redevelopment project	From	Janita Klein
Subject	Community Reference Group	Tel	02 4979 9933
Venue/Date/Time	Thursday 18 September 2014 Hydro offices, Kurri Kurri 6.00pm – 7.30pm	Job No	21/23175
Copies to	All committee members		
Attendees	Mr Richard Brown – Managing Director, Hydro Kurri Kurri Mr Kerry McNaughton – Environmental Officer, Hydro Kurri Kurri Clr Morgan Campbell – Cessnock City Council Mr Ian Shillington – Manager Urban Growth, Maitland City Council Mr Ian Turnbull – Manager Natural Environment Planning, Cessnock City Council Mr Rod Doherty – President Kurri Kurri Business Chamber Mr Colin Maybury – Kurri Kurri Landcare Group Ms Debra Ford – Community representative Mr Alan Gray – Community representative Mr Brad Wood – Community representative Mr Andrew Walker – Hydro Mr Michael Ulph – CRG Chair, GHD Ms Janita Klein – CRG minutes, GHD Ms Lesley Morris – delegate for Mrs Kerry Hallett, Hunter BEC		
Apologies	Mr Bill Metcalfe – Community representative Mr Toby Thomas – Community representative Mr Barry Miller – Community representative Mrs Kerry Hallett - Hunter BEC		
Others not present	Clr Arch Humphery – Maitland City Council		



Notes	Action
-------	--------

Michael Ulph (Chair)

*Welcome and Acknowledgement of Country
Introductions for technical specialists and observers*

Meeting commenced at 6.05 pm

2. Meeting agenda

- Welcome and meeting opening
- Apologies
- Adoption of minutes from the last meeting
- Project progress
- Questions and Answers
- General business
- Meeting close

3. Welcome and meeting opening

Michael Ulph welcomes the committee and records apologies for

- Mr Bill Metcalfe – Community representative
- Mr Toby Thomas – Community representative
- Mr Barry Miller – Community representative

Michael also welcomes Lesley Morris who attended as delegate for Mrs Kerry Hallett.

Last meetings minutes and CRG Terms of Reference

Michael Ulph confirmed the minutes from last meeting were emailed in draft copy to each committee member for review and made available on the Hydro website. There had been no committee amendments to the draft minutes.

Minutes moved as a true and correct record by Alan Gray and seconded by Debra Ford.

Thank you Alan and Debra. I don't think there were any action items from last month's minutes. Generally we put action items in the appendices, however we had only one action item. We had the statement from Colin which we were going to have Hydro respond to all the statements and questions. So that was the only item, and that has been done. I have here a response, which I will hand out.

Michael handed out a hardcopy of the response to each committee member.

There is a fair bit of detail in there, but at your leisure please read through the statement and responses to questions. Some of them are talking about



HYDRO

Notes

Action

historical issues and so forth. I would like to put on record that Colin has emailed through retracting the statement.

Colin Maybury: I don't know about retracting, but in the case of getting ahead I would prefer to put it aside.

Michael Ulph: Okay. On the back page of the minutes, we have the actual words of the email which say:

Richard, Kerry, Michael I hereby withdraw my comments and reports from residents and apologise for any angst I may have caused.

I appreciate that Col, and thank you. But nonetheless Col has raised lots of questions and I think it's appropriate that Hydro has answered them and given a response to each of the different parts of the statements. If you find anything that doesn't make sense, or that you'd like some clarification on anybody please come back to us and Hydro can go into more detail.

Alan Gray: I don't know if there is anything in there quickly, but there was one question raised last time for which we got the answer, though I'd just like to make sure I'm on the right track. We said that there were only two sites that Hydro had identified that the pot lining was being dumped at, yet in the newspaper and other had identified several others. In the general discussion was that if should any other location be identified, while it is others job to clean it up but they could put the Spent Potlining back here to go through whatever process we go through.

Richard Brown: I think you'll find this reflected in the minutes.

Alan Gray: Thanks. I just didn't want to be telling stories in the public.

Michael Ulph: That's right. And again it's an ongoing discussion. We are here for a long time, so if anything comes up at all please feel free to bring it up. There's no such thing as a wrong question.

So tonight, we basically have a couple of segments to the meeting. I suggested to Richard that we have an ongoing topic each time we meet which is "what has happened since we last met", and "what's planned to happen next". So essentially an operations report on where things are up to. Richard is prepared to do that. And afterwards we will have an open question and answer session. No doubt you've been addressed by people in the community with questions and you surely have your own questions. We've allowed 35 minutes for a question and answer session, before we go on to general business. I'll know pass it over to Richard who is going to take us through a project progress report.

Progress report

Richard Brown: In first week we talked about how we have three main strains of activities: the remediation and demolition project, there's the activities around the site rezoning and potential future land use, and there's also the divestment of the site.

I've broken up each aspect, and while the description of these is quite brief, so talk about each of those activities as we go forward.

Activity Update

1. Remediation / Demolition Project
2. Site Rezoning
3. Divestment Strategy

(1)

Demolition and remediation project

Richard Brown: With regard to the demolition and remediation project, we indicated at the last meeting we have been preparing a Preliminary Environmental Assessment and that has been lodged with the Department of Planning. And that is the request for what's now called Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARS - formally called DGR's). And they form the basis for the requirements for the environmental impact statement (EIS).

The first step that the Department of Planning takes is that they organise what's called a planning focus meeting. That planning focus meeting was held here last Wednesday, and that's simply an opportunity for the various stakeholders to get a briefing of the project. So on site last week we had the Department of Planning, Work Cover, Department of Health, Trade and Investment, RFS and Cessnock Council. We gave them a briefing of the project, and that briefing was more or less the same as the one given to the CRG last time.

From here, the Department of Planning then gets input from the various stakeholders and they will provide their requirements for the EIS going forward. We expect we will have these by the end of the week, or early next week. The SEARS are to be provided to the proponent within 28 days of lodgement; this is one thing that has a deadline. And then we go through the process of working through those environmental assessment requirements.

So they are the main activities we have been focussed on over the last few weeks: the preparing for information to the CRG and that.

With regard to the demolition side of things, we are doing work on site

Remediation / Demolition Project

- Request for Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARS) + Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PEA) has been lodged with Dept. of Planning and Environment.
- Planning Focus Meeting held with representatives from: Dept. of Planning, EPA, WorkCover, Dept. of Health, Dept. of Trade and Investment, Rural Fire Service and Cessnock Council.
- Currently doing hazardous material assessment across the smelter to help plan activities to reduce and risk from these hazards during demolition.
- Working on development on a strategy for the Demolition works: what, how, when



Notes	Action
<p>including looking for potential locations of hazardous materials. Those hazardous materials are things like asbestos, lead paint, PCBs, things in buildings which may be there from historical use, oils and fluids and other materials.</p>	
<p>CRG member: Shouldn't have any asbestos on the site?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: We have.</p>	
<p>CRG member: From illegal dumping?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: No, this is more in the actual buildings themselves. There are old gasket, particularly dated back to the 1960's where we've found gaskets in concrete. There's asbestos in buildings. You probably haven't noticed, but you might see walking out of here tiles with corners chipped out of them – even some old vinyl tiles have got asbestos within them. Not that they are presenting any hazard to us, but in terms of demolition we need to make sure any demolition contractor that comes in is fully aware of any of these materials. And in fact, our intentions are to, where possible take measures to remove those hazardous materials prior to a demolition contract being awarded. It's good practice for us and them from a risk mitigation and cost mitigation point of view. It is tools down if these sites are not known and found during works, which then means we have multimillion dollar machinery sitting there doing nothing. So if we can go though and eliminate as much of that as possible up front with approved asbestos management contractors, we will go ahead and do that.</p>	
<p>CRG member: Would this be happening with the houses around as well?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: No, not necessarily with the houses. It is mainly about the demolition of the site. At this stage we don't have any thoughts around the demolition of houses. Where there's asbestos in the ground or illegally dumped asbestos, we will take care of that. But that we will be done as a different piece of work.</p>	
<p>CRG member: There are sheds on the site, what about these?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: Where there are houses or sheds that are posing a risk, then we will look at these as well. The other thing we've been doing is looking at the whole of the site in terms of the demolition that is required. We're working on a strategy, and one of Andrew's main tasks is to look at the strategy for the demolition. First of all we need to understand what it is we are going to demolish, so what buildings and structures won't have a potential future use. There are some facilities on site which we think may have a potential reuse, be it general purpose type of structures. Then how that demolition is actually going to be done. Clearly we have big structures requiring potentially some explosives to bring them down, such as the stacks. We are getting specialists in to study that and understand what's got to be done. And then next thing is when, so what buildings will go first and what sort of time frame that will take over the longer term</p>	
<p>Site Rezoning</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: We've not talked much about this to the CRG at this stage. That's something that when you feel it is appropriate we will talk in a lot more detail about the thoughts around potential for land use. We've talked about remediation and demolition, and this is definitely an opportunity to gauge questions this week.</p>	

We are preparing for rezoning proposal to go to Council later this year.

Michael Ulph: Is that for one Council, or two?

Richard Brown: That will be for both, a lot of the stuff is for Cessnock Council but the proposals will be split to their appropriate Council depending on the LGA on site. And the sorts of things that impact on the nature of the development and extent of the development footprint, and also the subsequent rezoning and considerations we've listed in the power point slide. We have engaged consultants to look at Aboriginal archaeology, biodiversity which is a key issue for the development of the site, potential noise and vibration impacts, visuals impacts, social and economic impacts, bushfires, traffic, European heritage surveys, services infrastructure and the subdivision design. There is quite an extensive list of studies that are being prepared for that rezoning application, and will ultimately form the outline for the potential development footprint.

We will discuss with CRG and community about how we potentially see the development of the site.

Divestment

- Limited discussion with real estate consultants to gauge market for different land types
- Consideration for future "soft" marketing



Divestment Strategy

Richard Brown: This is probably the area that we've worked the least, but it's something that we're keeping in mind particularly when it comes to works on site. We've started to have limited discussions with real estate consultants to gauge what the market is looking for in terms of uses for the site and different land type. And looking at even the smelter site itself and asking would there be market for a site that's remediated that has some buildings retained. Asking what would the market be interested in for potential residential development; what do they need.

Colin Maybury: Or a hospital?

Richard Brown: Or a hospital. And further to that, we are looking to engage someone in the next little while to do some soft marketing. Because we are not in a position to sell anything yet, but this would let interested parties know there is a potential site here, be it developers or land users, government or non-government.

CRG member: You've put together a document, the preliminary master plan, which you've provided for consideration in the Lower Hunter Strategy, which is isn't released even yet. In your

Rezoning

- Detailed studies being conducted to inform a rezoning proposal including:
 - Aboriginal Archaeology
 - Biodiversity Assessment
 - Noise and Vibration
 - Visual Impact
 - Socio Economic Impact
 - Bushfire Assessment
 - Flooding and Stormwater
 - Traffic Impact
 - Geotechnical Impact
 - Heritage Impact
 - Survey
 - Servicing and Infrastructure
 - Subdivision Design
- When plans have taken more shape we will present to CRG for discussion.
- Aiming to lodge rezoning proposal with Council by the end of the year.

discussions with the Department of Planning, are they considering that option of including this in the strategy?

Richard Brown: We've had some discussion with the Department of Planning, and we're not getting any feedback whether it is or isn't being considered. At the last meeting we had about two months ago, we briefed the new Regional Manager regarding the site and opportunities. Unfortunately we didn't get anything out of it. So as yet I don't know the answer to that question.

CRG member: We talk about engaging markets, though we really need to know how what will be included in the Hunter Growth Strategy.

Richard Brown: Yes, that's true. We are proceeding at this stage along a path that is consistent with how we approached them in the first place. It would certainly be ideal that the site is listed in the strategy along those lines, which gives a lot of strategic support to something that's going to happen on the site. If it isn't, there are still mechanisms in place that we can still do that, though it's not as seamless and smooth I don't think.

So that's where we've focussed our attention over the last few weeks. The other thing that has been made clear in discussions with the CRG and media is that there are questions and comments being raised in all forums. It is appropriate that you get an opportunity to make any comments or ask any questions that you may have. Whether or not we can answer those questions at this point remains to be seen, though we'll give it a shot.

Michael Ulph: If you could go back to the top of your slides and use the headings as a point of reference for anyone to think through. In terms of Richard has said, we have the preliminary environmental assessment, a planning meeting has been held, and the hazardous materials assessment has been done. Are there any questions around this? I'm just trying to pin down Richard's presentation first and get any questions on that before we move on to an open Q and A session.

CRG member: I'm aware there is a fair bit of media and people asking us on the street about whether we're going to contain hazardous materials on site or not. I noticed on television the plant at Tomago that reprocesses materials. Can you make money that way? Is it a better way to go? These are the questions that are being thrown at us on the street. I realise we have problem the buried waste here because it's leaching, which probably needs to be dealt with in the short term. But I hear on the street the need for a long term option, and can you make money that way?

Michael Ulph: That's certainly been the most topical subject I've heard of in the last little while. Is anyone else hearing the same sort of discussion, or being asked the same questions?

Colin Maybury: People tell me all the time about the troubles that have come from here. And while they may get them incorrect they are still full of enthusiasm for not burying the material on site. I'd like to table a complaint from one of the residents.

Material Streams Identified			
Material Stream	Volume and Quantity	Key Materials	Key Pollutants
Demolition wastes	30,000m ³ 20,000t	• Non-recyclable reusable demolition materials	• Asbestos
Contaminated soils within the buffer zone	32,000m ³ 40,000t	• Smelter waste • Asbestos • Municipal and general waste	• Asbestos • Fluorides • TPH • PAH
Contaminated soils within the smelter footprint	17,000m ³ 27,000t		• PAHs • Fluoride
Spent pot lining in storage and in pits	Up to 44,000m ³ Up to 70,000t	Spent pot lining	• Fluoride • Cyanide
Capped Waste Stockpile	100,000m ³ 100,000t	• Spent pot lining • Cyclone and alumina • Shot blast dust • General waste	• Fluoride • Cyanide
Impacted groundwater - secondary			• Fluoride • Cyanide • Dissolved salts
Estimated TOTALs	230,000 m ³ 355,000t		

(5)





Notes

Action

Colin provided hard copy of a letter to Michael Ulph.

Michael Ulph: Is this Helen? I will put that to general business.

CRG member: Can I just add to what Colin is saying there, cause I can remember years ago we used to have grey powder all over the house. It has been cleaned up over past 10 years; there have been changes. There are still people here who have lived here for over 40 years who remember it. There are now perceived pollutants.

CRG member: Yeah, we used to wash the car and it would be white again five minutes later.

Colin Maybury: Fluoride is a cumulative poison. Half of it goes out in the urines, but the other half is retained and added to and added to. I've known people who have been here 50 years and they have bad lesions and things. It is a worrying thing for people in the community.

Michael Ulph: So it is important that this clean-up is done properly. Have others around the room been chatting to locals?

Rod Doherty: I've been doing my own independent research, and not on Wikipedia, on naturally occurring fluoride in the environment. That was the heading I used to search. The longitudinal health study carried out at the smelter was because we had an employee who had a high concentration of fluoride in his system, which had to be investigated. He wasn't a pot lining employee but a casting employee. When we went through and looked at his personal habits, it was found he was having about a gallon of tea each day. Tea has one of the highest concentrations of fluoride of any plant in the world.

The other thing I researched was some African and native Indian tribes in India were deep well chasing water. They suffered from severe fluorosis, and what they were doing was drawing heavily fluoridated water from deep down in their wells. When they took those people off the fluoridated water and put on normal water, within six months they were back to normal. So when we say people get concentrations of fluoride in their system, it can be taken out, because the blogs that I read from scientists are saying exactly that. People who suffer from arthritis as result of fluorosis, when taken off the fluoridated water the pain resided. There are different sides to the story.

Here the smelter has stopped producing fluoride. Kerry will remember when we were doing the bone samples on the cattle and sent them away for independent assessment, the results told us that the cattle were eating grass that had been absorbing too much fluoride, or they'd have to move the cattle off that grass. Is that correct?

Kerry McNaughton: That is correct. Certainly the surveys indicated a fluoride source in area, however the levels obtained at all monitoring locations did not indicate a health issue for cattle. They never did, and the reports are still there, for verification.

CRG member: I'm sure the longitudinal health study reports would be at Newcastle University, so if we wanted to get them we could and pull out those employees who had higher levels of fluoride in the system and how we had to look after them.

Michael Ulph: Thank you for the comment, which is historical data.



Notes	Action
<p>Colin Maybury: And I'm sorry it's not exactly correct.</p>	
<p>Michael Ulph: What I'm getting at is that I'd like to see us talk about where we are now. Clearly Hydro has said there is Spent Potlining on site which needs to be remediated as it does leach fluoride and cyanide, and it's a hazardous waste. This is the job in front of Hydro right now. Let's talk about what is happening now and in the future.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: If it helps Michael, I could stick up that table to remind people of the material streams that require remediation. This may help with discussion about what can and can't be done with various things.</p>	
<p>Michael Ulph: Alan has talked about the recent stories and about what can be done with the containment cell or whatever can be done.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: I'd like to tender this please from Doctor or Professor Brett Turner regarding his impression of what goes on in containment cells. As far as India is concerned and natural fluoride, as far as I can find on the internet the fluorosis coming smelters is very very dangerous. Look up some of the Indian sites on fluoride and you'll see it's very worrying.</p>	
<p>Michael Ulph: Certainly in Australia fluoride is listed as hazardous and Hydro has acknowledged that.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: It's worth noting that as we describe that the aims of any remediation is to remove the risks of impacts to people and the environment. And that's the ambition of remediation and what the regulator will be looking to ensure happens on this site. That's something that we have to satisfy ourselves. Clearly there are concerns in the community about that approach, and I can assure you that they are being expressed through the regulators as well. They are also requiring that we've done our analysis appropriately and that the remediation we've planned is the best solution for the site. And that's the process we're working through now, it's certainly not a fait accompli but a process that we've started and we're working through.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: on that basis Richard, I think in last month's minutes someone asked the question wasn't the Regain Plant working that night, and you agreed it was.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: Yes, it still is.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: And is it working tonight?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: I don't know.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: How much are they doing per year?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: What I can't tell you are any of those sort of facts because the agreement we've got with Regain is confidential.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: That's garbage Richard. This is a community reference group and we are supposed to report back and get the information from the community. Now surely we can ask the question, how much is being processed?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: I'm bound by confidentially, though what I can tell you they are processing material. Regain have been processing Spent Potlining from Kurri Kurri for well more than four years, they've got a plant in Victoria, they've been shipping spent potlining down there and processing material.</p>	



HYDRO

Notes

Action

Most of their processing actually happens at Tomago, the facility on site is not the whole process. The facility on site here is actually the back end of a process. They have just a fine grinding plant on the site here.

Colin Maybury: Why isn't it the front end and doing the processing there? How much did they process in 2012?

Richard Brown: I don't know Col.

Michael Ulph: Do they have maybe an annual report, that company?

Colin Maybury: It's in the AEMR, surely, and it says 1300 tonnes. Now that indicates to me that it would take 160 years at that process plant to treat it. 160 years is quite a long time. So we shouldn't be burying it in the ground but operating that processing plant there.

Richard Brown: What I can tell you Col is that the amount of material that gets processed through that plant is not at Hydro's discretion, it's Regain's.

Colin Maybury: Richard please. It's on your site, you're paying them, yet you say you have no control.

Richard Brown: We pay them to process it, and that's the issue with the spent potlining. It's market dependent. They process what they can to supply a market. If there is no market for that material they don't process.

Colin Maybury: They sold 20,000 tonnes last week, to Morocco. It was on the TV. I've seen their processing plant, they are going through it.

Richard Brown: In our experience, that market is highly variable.

Debra: Hydro is not the only place they are getting the Spent Potlining from, there are many other places.

Colin Maybury: I'm not saying that they're not getting it from anywhere else, but just think about it. There's 150,000 tonnes (or so) down there, they have a processing plant which was opened by the Federal Environment Minister in 2010, and what I can see is that it's only treated 1300 tonnes. Surely it should be working flat out, be twice as big or four times as big and be doing more.

Richard Brown: To do what with it? What do they do with their end product?

Colin Maybury: Sell it.

Richard Brown: They've got no one to sell it to.

Colin Maybury: It can be stored in the sheds for the time being anyway.

Richard Brown: I guess there's a risk with that, because the process they apply, as I understand and is on the public record, as we discussed last [month], isn't a detoxifying process, it's a low temperature treatment that renders the cyanides inert, but it doesn't get rid of the leachable fluoride.

Colin Maybury: But the fluoride is available to be used in the cement industry.

Richard Brown: In terms of producing a product that then can sit in a shed, it doesn't reduce the hazard.

Colin Maybury: But it's pure in there now with the cyanide in it.



Notes

Action

Richard Brown: It doesn't change that it's hazardous.

Alan Gray: When I asked the question before and we talked about Mount Alcan, or however it's known, what you said was that what you have stored in the shed is contained at the moment and not causing a problem. Can that material be processed through Regain? I agree, we've got issues with China not taking coal if it's got too much sulphur in it. Everything has got to be market based which is a problem with the capitalist system. There is going to be a lot more of this coming out of Tomago when it closes in three years. But whether this particular mob can build a bigger plant is up to them, but nobody is going to process it.

Richard Brown: To take your point Alan, one thing there which maybe has not been made clear, or clear enough, is that the capped waste stockpile contains Spent Potlining but it is mixed and cannot be treated as Spent Potlining. The same processes don't apply, and so can't be used in the same way or through the same processes.

Michael Ulph: For Lesley's benefit, last month Richard described the capped waste stockpile, or Mount Alcan as it known is a mixture of materials from the smelter process and site waste. The issue is whether or not that can be processed in the same way 'pure' Spent Potlining can be. Hydro says it can't be processed the same way as the Spent Potlining stored in the sheds.

Colin Maybury: I would just ask one question. You've had nearly 30 years to sort this out and yet you've been letting the leachate go into the soil for that 30 years.

Richard Brown: It's an interesting point you've raised there Col, because Brett Turner's relationship with the smelter is exactly due to that. We engaged Brett in the mid to late 1990's and we've funded Brett's research for all of that time to look at the possibilities for installing what he calls a reactive barrier for the capped waste stock pile. And that was basically to maintain the integrity of the storage that's there. Unfortunately two things changed: The first was the closure of the smelter, and so the urgency with which we need to deal with this has changed. Because in 10 or 12 years with copious amounts of research and funding Brett wasn't able to produce a viable technology for an in-situ reactive barrier for that stockpile. So we've had to look for an alternative. That was certainly one of the considerations, you'll recall we've looked at options for how to manage it, or upgrade with an impermeable barrier was considered. However we felt that it was still fraught with too much risk.

The fact that that material doesn't have a processing option means there is very little option other than to look at containing it onsite. I see 'talks' about processing it in Government approved facilities and the like, but if we have a look at the list of materials, I'm interested in your thoughts on each of the potential processing options for the materials. Take the demolition waste.

CRG member: What would demolition waste include? Bricks and mortar?

Richard Brown: It will generate a pile of things, unrecyclable, unusable materials. Rubbish, bricks and mortar potentially though some of that can be reused.

CRG member: You talk about Spent Potlining, you have 3 now sitting in pot rooms but when these are demolished eventually all of that Spent Potlining



Notes

Action

has to come out. It has to be stored somewhere or be recycled. Is that considered in the waste estimate?

Richard Brown: Yes. We estimate about 25,000 tonnes that are in the pots as they are. One thing we've been thinking about in terms of that demolition strategy is can we store that material somewhere temporarily while that demolition is going on? Because as Col indicated, the rate at which that material can be dealt with either through processing or containment, takes time to manage.

Colin Maybury: Let's get back to the leachate. It's been there nearly 30 years and says here that they didn't put lining underneath it. But they tried to put lining underneath it. The engineer told me they couldn't get the sheets to join together.

Richard Brown: I think you'll find that what they did was actually constructed some cells adjacent to the capped waste stockpile that were lined, but what happened when they constructed the stockpile and capped it they excavated those cells and included that material in the stockpile itself.

Colin Maybury: Richard maybe so, but they knew it was leaching all the time.

Richard Brown: Yes, as we said last week we've known that pile has been leaching for some time.

Colin Maybury: They didn't cap it til 15 years later.

Richard Brown: Correct

Colin Maybury: Why would you leave it out in the open, being blown around by the wind, and providing the material to leach it out in to the environment.

Rod Doherty: That was 30 years ago.

Richard Brown: I can't explain Col. It was a decision taken by the smelter management at the time. Right, wrong or indifferent, that's what they've done. Clearly in hindsight it's not been a good decision.

Colin Maybury: You have carried it on. What did Kerry say; 16 pumps out there now. How many pumps do you have out there now?

Kerry McNaughton: Two

Richard Brown: There's one pump and two leachate interception systems.

Colin Maybury: The sampling points, do they have pumps in them?

Richard Brown: No, they are just ground water monitoring.

Colin Maybury: It's horrific to see the amount of fluoride that's in it.

Richard Brown: Yeah, absolutely.

Alan Gray: Coming back to where we are now and trying to move ahead. I can understand 30 years [later] technology is now better for containment for the short term. What are you looking to do about cleaning up Mount Alcan, remove or take out any of it? That's the one that has all the leachate.

Michael Ulph: What we've heard last month then is that Hydro understands that the capped stockpile is no good, it's leaching and that's not acceptable to Hydro, especially ongoing. So their proposal, that is going through the



Notes	Action
<p>regulators, is what this consultation is all about, is to build an engineered containment cell with two foot of clay underneath, on a clay base with many different layers so it can be managed and so on. It would contain the contents of the existing capped waste stockpile, plus all the other waste material that can't be recycled or reused. Because the current stockpile is leaching and is not acceptable to Hydro to manage it, so they are going to build something new and put everything in it. This proposal is going through the regulators for approval.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: We did look at options for that material. Including the barrier walls like those that Brett studied and processes like the plasma arc technology to render the material inert.</p>	
<p>Rod Doherty: 9000 degrees.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: Yes. The technology suppliers agreed that out of this plasma arc process they can't guarantee an inert product. So given the fact that that technology doesn't exist at this point in time, our proposal is that we construct a cell in the best location that we can find on this site, we use the best technology that is available today.</p>	
<p>Granted there are certainly comments that Brett has made about the type of material, but onsite containment as a concept is certainly well known and well understood. There's been a lot of developments in terms of the types of protection layers that are built into this, the design can be constructed in such a way that provides risk mitigation for the leachate that may be generated in that cell. We can detect it, collect it and treat it before it ends up in the environment, and that's the intention.</p>	
<p>That covers off, if you exclude the spent potlining, which we understand has processing options, we are aware of and we've been using one of those options for a number of years, that covers off about 280,000 tonnes of that 355,000 of material that does not have any other processing options.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: If that is so, why is Hydro Norway saying they are processing Rockwool out of it?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: Because they're sending the first cut spent potlining from the Norwegian and German smelters to Rockwool. Rockwool are using it as a supplement to their fuel system, so it's not just spent potlining, the spent potling doesn't get turned into Rockwool. They use the first cut as a fuel to provide input into that process.</p>	
<p>Like Regain are doing with their product to cement kilns. Like I said last week there is a lot of spent potlining that gets sent directly to cement kilns because of the same reasons that Regain is able to use it. It really comes down to how much of this material can be absorbed by that industry and where that industry is. You get the development of different solutions. Take Norway for example, fifty percent of all Spent Potlining goes into a hazardous waste landfill facility.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: They boasted that they are making money out of it, and so are Rockwool.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: I don't think you'll find Hydro wrote that they made money out of that process. It costs companies to do that; it doesn't come with a profit. For processing spent potlining, aluminium companies pay people to do that.</p>	



Notes

Action

Colin Maybury: Read Bakke's report on it and you'll find it went into the 2012 Financial Report for Hydro.

Richard Brown: I'm aware of that Col.

Colin Maybury: Why don't you mention it then?

Richard Brown: Because I don't believe they are saying they made money out of it.

Colin Maybury: So you are saying your superiors are lying or untruthful?

Richard Brown: That's not what I'm saying at all. I'll have a look at that and get back to you because if that's what there are saying that they can be making a profit out selling it. Because I know the details of the contract that they have.

CRG member: If Regain wants it and want to make money out of it, and if Weston Aluminium want it and want to make money, why don't they buy it off you.

Michael Ulph: Bear in mind we are talking about the Spent Potlining found in the sheds and pots – to be clear.

Richard Brown: We have an agreement with Regain that exists today, and they can process as much as they choose.

Colin Maybury: Regain came to our place.

Michael Ulph: When you say 'our place' Col?

Colin Maybury: Our house. Three of them turned up there, three executives of Regain.

Richard Brown: I hope they didn't tell you much, cause they'd get in trouble.

Colin Maybury: I'd love to see you try to sue them. They told us they were being paid \$500 per tonne to process the material, which I thought was excessive, and then sold it for 50 dollars per tonne. So there's your economics.

CRG member: Whoever is selling the stuff in the first place, that's where they make the money.

Colin Maybury: When I went down to Tomago and had a look at the plant there, we were told they are getting 200 dollars/ per tonne. Obviously they get subsidised by the smelter and they should. The smelter will sell land around here for at least 200 million dollars. To dig the hole I would think would cost less than five million dollars, so obviously putting the material in the ground is far superior economically then trying to treat it.

Alan Gray: What we are talking about is putting in a clay base, but there is still room to negotiate with your stored pot lining whether it goes through processing or not.

Richard Brown: This is still subject to approval, it's early days. Absolutely. We've proposed what we believe is the best option, and have what we believe are valid reasons for that.

Michael Ulph: This process of talking to this community reference group and the media has shown Hydro they need a very good job explaining

Richard to look at Hydro's Financial Report 2012 regarding Rockwool.



Notes	Action
<p>about the containment cell, and what needs to be considered and to provide confidence to the community and others. So the community consultative process has started already even though they haven't got the SEARS yet, and one of the most important things they need to do is provide information about the cell.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: So it is also about economic decision?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: It is one of the factors, we've said that. Clearly any company has economic considerations; I wouldn't be doing my job if I wasn't considering economic factors, and in fact I can go to jail for not doing that. I have shareholders that I'm responsible to. Equally other companies involved in potentially processing material have these considerations; they are not doing it for altruistic reasons they also do it for profit.</p>	
<p>CRG member: Can I ask a question? I believe Tiwai Point is gone?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: No, I don't think so.</p>	
<p>Michael Ulph: Where was that? Is that an aluminium smelter?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: A New Zealand aluminium smelter which is doing it tough.</p>	

Questions and Answers

Rod: There have been comments in the community that we shouldn't be selling the property because it was given to us in the first place, not bought. My understanding is that some land was maybe given to the smelter in the 1960s, and it would have made over the 40 years it would have made lot of money for the community. I also believe that the land in the buffer zone was purchased by the company.

Kerry McNaughton: That's entirely correct Rod, and continues to be the case. Land within the buffer zone, the smelter is required to offer purchase for land as it becomes available on the market. We then instruct our valuer to disregard the presence of the smelter and assess the land value based on its merits, such as amenities and proximity to Kurri Kurri. We've certainly purchased our properties all along the way. Back in 1982-83, the Wangarra property which is 980 hectares, cost Alcan a couple of million dollars. It's worth a lot more in today's market but certainly there wasn't a free ride given to anybody. The land since I've been here in 1980, was purchased by the various owners of the smelter, Alcan, Capral, VAW and Hydro.

Colin Maybury: They claim in newspapers like Crikey that the smelter has been subsidised to the extent of \$75,000 per employee per year. So the land cost is insignificant compared to the amount they got in cheaper electricity over the 40 something years. We the tax payer have a high stake in the plant, and I worry this is going back to Norway while we in Kurri will be left with this toxic material.

Alan Gray: You're right in what you say, and I did mention capitalism earlier. But the mighty dollar is what has ruined this country at the moment with the privatisation of the coal mines and power stations. That's all in the past, we've got a problem to deal with here now, and I want to move forward. You've bought up the question about the hospital. One thing I've been in talks about is the possibly of having the Lower Hunter Hospital on a site near here, instead of at the army camp at Greta. The piece of land we looked at (haven't got it) is west of the Hunter Expressway, back to Sawyers Gully Road which has two access points. And we get the argument often



HYDRO

Notes

Action

“but what about the pollution”? From what I can see the pollution is all to the east of that block, so I don't see any problem in there. It's taken 20 years to get the expressway, and I've been working 20 years on this hospital now. It would appear if the hospital goes ahead at Metford, it will replace Maitland hospital. So we get one and lose one. What we've been told by the Board of Hunter New England Health is that they won't fund two hospitals in Maitland. That's my focus, I'm interested in that land.

That's where we are at, and we need to clean up this site. What we've heard today and last month is that the [containment] cell sounds the best way to get rid of Mount Alcan. And the spent potlining in the pots and the sheds, we look to recycle or maybe we store it.

Michael Ulph: Thanks Alan, no questions in there. Around the room, have you heard something on the street, or has something spurred your interest? We will go around the table to give each of you an opportunity to raise a question or comment.

Lesley Morris: The feedback and comments I've heard from general public is a lack of understanding, and it comes back to what you were saying before about the need to explain to the general community the difference between stock pile and the [containment cell]. Because people hear containing material on site, and waste will remain on site which generates fear. People don't want to read lots of paper; it needs to be explained in as short a way as possible, because it's just fear mongering otherwise that will capture people's attention, other than facts.

Debra Ford: Regarding the hospital hopefully in the general area. As you know I'm in real estate and I'm hopeful there will be growth in the area. A lot of people are talking to me about the possibility of a hospital, and there is an understanding that Hydro is taking on board in getting rid of waste as best they can. Keep the messages short and simple for the community.

Morgan Campbell: I was pretty up front in not supporting the idea of the containment cell. I wanted to be up front and as such provided a notice of motion to Council and sent an email to Michael and Richard explaining it. I didn't want to start a media circus, I'm not about slagging off the company; it's just a difference of opinion. There is a lot of concern out there, and I want to make an informed decision as much as you do. I have no interest in stopping what hydro wants to do, or in distorting the truth, nor does anyone else. We all have a responsibility as members of the committee to deal in facts, to get the information out there, and let people make up their own minds, and ultimately the decision will be up to government.

Colin Maybury: It worries me that you're going ahead blithely with this. After one meeting we are told this is a fiat accompli. There is a lot of disquiet in the community and I urge you to look at that complaint [from Mrs McGee] and the questions asked in there from a local. We are worried about your honesty as far as the money is concerned, and how much money is going to be made and where it is going to and what it will be spent on. We are worried about the example we had at Weston, where at Kline street it took you two years to get back the smelter waste that was there, and from what I'm told there is still more there. Is that true Kerry?

Kerry McNaughton: There is still smelter waste there yes. Col you must remember, again, that it is not a smelter issue as such, it's a goodwill gesture by the smelter to take the material back. It is a privately owned



Notes	Action
<p>property and there was no legal obligation to take the material back whatsoever.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: I'm sorry the smelter put it there.</p>	
<p>Debra Ford: A contractor put it there.</p>	
<p>Michael Ulph: Look we did discuss this last month, and that discussion is in the minutes, we've heard your opinion on that and we've heard Hydro's opinion on that, so rather than go over old ground, but please if you have something else.</p>	
<p>Allan Gray: That's the first thing I brought up tonight, whether is that site or if there are others.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: There are others. The auditor that did that, I understand is the auditor that you used to oversee, your, DLA?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: No, they are not the auditor. They are the remediation consultant; they are just managing the job. The actual site auditor is an EPA accredited person, a completely different person involved.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: In 2012 AEMR environmental report, it says that DLA were the auditors of that.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: That's not a SITE auditor, that's a different function. As I understand, at the Kline street site, the property owner engaged DL A to manage the remediation action plan and oversee the remedial action works. On top of that they've engaged a Site Auditor to validate that the work is being done in accordance with the remedial action plan, and that that land is then suitable for future use, that's the function of a site auditor. In terms of the AEMRs, they are then independently audited by another environmental consultancy, so that's not a site auditor as such.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: According to that, it says they inspected the whole lot and had grave concerns about the amount of leachate that was outside the fence and he wanted that looked at in relation to cleaning up the site.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: Absolutely, and we agree with him.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: In fact when they went to Western he wrote a remediation action plan but didn't follow it; there was no discourse with the community, no records as far as I can see, and it's taken well over two years.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: I can't comment on that.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: Well you've got to get it back one way or another.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: And we've agreed to do that.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: The bloke is going broke as far as I can see.</p>	
<p>Colin Maybury: I've asked you to assess the comment by Dr Brett Turner, and would you accept the questions of the affected Weston resident. And would you ratify the AEMR for 2012.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: It's Hydro's AEMR – it's a public record document.</p>	
<p>Kerry McNaughton: Just a comment, I'm regularly stopped in the street regarding the future. I take them through my opinion of what's occurring and so forth. This committee has different views, and I'll reiterate that if the containment cell is not environmentally sound, and an acceptable</p>	



HYDRO

Notes

Action

environmental procedure it won't get approved and proceed. People also ask about the land use, three components – the residential, commercial and most importantly too, the five important endangered ecological communities we have on site will be preserved as offset land, so that's a bonus for everybody. The other question is when are we restarting, that's never going to happen. There is still a lack of knowledge in the community, and that's our job as a group; there are different views and questions to be answered.

Andrew Walker: Hydro is now starting to talk to companies about the detailed design of the containment cell. We have a conceptual design from our environmental consultant Environ but we now need to get into detailed design and also talk to companies who could potentially build the cell as we want to pick the best designer and contractor so we end up with the best result. We need to look at quality control practices, and what sort of non-destructive testing can be done, so that when they join the liner to make sure that it doesn't leak, things like that. That's the sort of work that I'm involved with at the moment. We want to do this job well, because it does have to last.

Michael Ulph: I'd suggest that over time we get people in to talk more specifically about the technical aspects of this proposal, how things are evolving over time, and how waste and hazardous material is managed. Waste management, even domestic waste management, has changed over the years and no doubt this has as well. Are tenders for demolition works likely to be open to people around here?

Andrew Walker: Yes. We are looking at early works which would involve dismantling the pots; however there would be no demolition of buildings until approval from the Department of Planning. But you're right; works would be open to local contractors. We have also started some work with some local companies. We've started to take the switch plates off the pots, taking off the anode stem rods (11,000 of them) which is being done by a local contractor over a 40 week period.

Debra Ford: It is good to keep it local as much as you can.

Andrew Walker: And where we can, we will.

Michael Ulph: Is there much planned around the site over the next month?

Richard Brown: There's going to be little bits and pieces. We are looking to engage people to do some of the peripheral site remediation that we've talked about. So when we mentioned last [month] the mine subsidence void filling that was done, we are looking to remediate that site and also reclaim the refractory bricks from the clay borrow pits, so that a bit of work that we'll hopefully be in a position to engage over the next few weeks.

Michael Ulph: Okay, we've been around the room as part of the Q and A session. Is there anything else to add?

Richard Brown: I have made a few comments to the media about this but wanted to share it with the CRG. I think these concerns that people have got are very understandable, and in fact helpful for us; we have to have these concerns raised so we know what the community are thinking and we know what these issues are, so that we can be challenged that we are doing the right thing, and that if we are comfortable in what we are doing that we can hopefully take people on that journey as well.

I'll like you to understand how we got to this position, that it's complex and



Notes	Action
<p>difficult to simplify but we will do our best to explain it and keep it simple. I really appreciate the input that everybody has here, and the people you represent as well. We have a way ahead of us, no doubt about it, but ultimately we'll deliver this site a future for the community.</p>	
<hr/> General business	
<p>Michael Ulph: We've discussed the possibility of a site tour previously, and said we'd wait for it to be lighter in the evening. Next month we might have the right light. If we say 5pm for a site tour an hour before the meeting, does that work for people?</p>	
<p><i>General consensus.</i></p>	
<p>Debra Ford: If we are going to have the site tour, are we allowed to bring our partners if they are interested? My husband would be interested to have a look where his father used to work, before everything starts being dismantled.</p>	
<p>Michael Ulph: If we did that for one, we'd have to do the same for all. Would it be feasible for each member to bring one person with them?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: We can do one person each. We're mindful of the numbers of people that we've got to control. That opportunity will go away quite quickly as the site becomes less stable. I'm happy to do that.</p>	
<p>Michael Ulph: So you can bring UP TO one extra person. Let us know who that person is as we will need to issue the required PPE.</p>	
<p>CRG member: Is that PPE clothing?</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: Yes we need to know numbers because we'll have to have the right amount of required safety gear, hard hats, vests and the like.</p>	
<p>Michael Ulph: I will put an invitation out and ask that you come back to me. We would like to confirm that 5pm is okay. If it's going to be a problem we can make it 5.15pm.</p>	
<p>Rod Doherty: If we are talking about allaying fears it mightn't hurt to have an open day? If it's controlled. I've had some ex-employees children approach me, whose Dad worked here – they would like to see plant before it's demolished.</p>	
<p>Richard Brown: We are certainly considering something, in terms of the demolition, how we document that process. And we will see whether we can have real time documentation for that as well.</p>	
<p>Michael Ulph: Thank you for your attendance. I will close the meeting at 7.29pm.</p>	
<p>We ratified the terms of reference last month, and I've printed hard copies which are here. I also printed copies of the last meeting minutes. Contact me any time if you are looking for these. The terms of reference are on website as well as the minutes.</p>	

Next meeting: Thursday 16 October from 5pm.

Janita Klein

GHD – Stakeholder Engagement and Social Sustainability

Response to the written statement by Mr Colin Maybury of Kurri Kurri Landcare at the August meeting of the Hydro Community Reference Group (CRG).

Background:

Mr Maybury, a CRG Member, requested and was given a fifteen minute period in the agenda of the above meeting in which to ask questions. Mr Maybury read a statement containing many questions, statements and assertions. Due to the lateness of the meeting and the complexity of the statement, the Chair asked Hydro to examine the document and associated photographs and respond as soon as was practical to each issue raised.

This document is that response, to be circulated to CRG members and included in the minutes of the September 2014 meeting.

Mt Alcan a multi-hundred thousand tonne pile of spent potlinings.

While the capped waste stockpile contains spent potlinings, it is comprised of a wide range of waste materials generated at the smelter over decades. Hydro estimates that spent potlining makes up around half of the material, and it is mixed with anodes, bath, general waste, alumina, and so on. Please see the picture in the August minutes.

The engineer in charge sealing the bottom of the pile with neoprene, I seem to remember, complained to me that they were having trouble gluing the sheets together.

The capped waste stockpile does not have any material at its base. It was created by piling material up without any preparation of the site.

Dumping of smelter waste in Weston, Neath, Aberdare South (Siberia) down that deep shaft and Hebburn No2 mine shaft. In the East Greta No1 mine void.

While the actual disposal of waste and alleged dumping occurred well before Hydro took ownership of the site in 2002, Hydro has assisted the remediation of a site at Kline St Weston, being undertaken by the land developer, and following a remediation action plan developed by DLA and approved by the Environmental Protection Authority, by receiving the waste material back onto the smelter site.

Hydro is aware of only one other off-site location where smelter material has been placed. During the 1980s and early 1990s certified inert refractories were taken underground at Bloomfield colliery.

Hydro understands that the old mines were sealed at the end of production making access to the mine shafts impossible. For example, the East Greta No.1 mine was closed and sealed in 1963, six years before the smelter construction commenced. Any factual evidence to the contrary is welcomed.

Around 2010 GHD removed a huge waste dump at Clark and Rawson Sts Weston. Was that smelter waste?

Hydro has no knowledge of this case.

In 2012 the 1400 tonnes was dug up and some removed by the developer and the smelter ... it was not removed for 2 years and 3 windy seasons ...

All removal of material from the Kline St. site has been the responsibility of the land developer under the guidance of their remediation consultants. Hydro has simply agreed to receive the material that had its origins from the smelter. The received waste is currently stored on the smelter site. Hydro has no control over the activities of the developer, land owner or remediation consultants for the Kline St site.

400 tonnes or 30% as I was told by the developer, remained on site. The smelter has since removed the remaining 400 tonnes.

Hydro has not had any responsibility for the activities on this site, but has agreed to receive smelter derived materials back at the smelter.

The developer has said he was wanting to sue the smelter.

Hydro has had discussions with the developer and their remediation consultant on numerous occasions to arrange receipt of the smelter waste. This has not been raised. Hydro has no knowledge of this potential action.

For over 40 years smelter pollution particularly fluoride, a very dangerous poisonous waste, was spreading over the land. "The Buffer Zone."

It is acknowledged that the manufacture of aluminium, as with many manufacturing industries, does create waste products including 'pollutants', some of which are classed as hazardous waste. The smelter has been licensed for its entire operation by the New South Wales Government's Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) which guides the operation of the plant and measurement of pollutant levels.

This is described in some detail in the minutes of the August meeting. The Environmental Protection Licence (EPL) that Hydro Kurri Kurri operates under is a freely available document hosted on the EPA web site.

Upon request from Kurri Landcare the smelter invested approximately \$60,000 in an attempt to reduce water ingress into mine workings on Wangara that then presented as reported acidic drainage on adjoining properties. For reference leachate from spent potlining and smelter waste would be high pH (ie alkaline, not acidic).

Your photo shows a serious bright red weed infestation over the swamps. What is it?

Hydro expects that Colin is referring to Marsh Club-Rush (*Bolboschoenus fluviatilis*) which is common most of the time. During periods of severe drought the area is impacted by berry saltbush (*Einadia hastata*), which is a native species rather than a weed, common in slightly brackish soils during drought.

Hydro operates a Property Management Plan as a condition of consent. This plan includes the monitoring and control of noxious plants (land and aquatic). So successful have been the results of

the property management that the regulator has suggested changing from an annual report to a 5 yearly reporting period.

The dangers of airborne fluoride and cyanide in the water are suitably chronicled.

This is absolutely correct, and is why the smelter operates under an Environmental Protection Licence.

E.g. [cattle owner]'s cattle were visibly affected 4-5 kms from the smelter. Kerry McNaughton took photographs for many many years of her cattle's twisted and distorted teeth and misshapen bodies as well as fluoride measurements of soil, water and foliage.

Fluoride levels in tailbone biopsies at Wangara and the Sawyers Gully property owned by the late Eve Giles have never been considered excessive by the smelter or the EPA. Historic reports support this.

Kerry McNaughton's role is Environment Officer / Buffer Zone Supervisor. Part of his role was to take photographs and fluoride measurements to ensure compliance with the EPL. Cattle did not develop misshapen bodies or distorted teeth.

At Wangara downwind of the smelter a herd of cattle were kept to monitor their tail bone fluoride.

The testing vet owned the cattle, it is claimed and did his own testing before selling the cattle into the food market. A conflict of interest? Surely?

But worse was claimed. He bought the cattle from fluoride free areas in calf.

This is correct. At Wangara 2- 3 year old cattle were monitored by a consultant veterinarian who also owned the cattle being monitored. The purpose of a beef cattle producing property is to produce meat for consumption. As with all Australian beef, Wangara cattle meet the stringent *Microbiological Testing for Process Monitoring in the Meat Industry Guidelines*. Hydro is aware that many cattle have been born on the property.

The soils and foliage of the Wangara area are probably heavily polluted.

Extensive monitoring of air, vegetation, water and cattle has never found excessive fluoride levels on Wangara.

Hydro has identified limited areas of soil contaminated with smelter materials (the filled mine subsidence areas) and this was presented at the August CRG meeting. The planned remediation of the site includes remediation of contaminated soils.

In 1995-6-7 we locals were involved in a protest court case in the Land and Environment Court against a proposed fluoride producing Dross Plant in Kurri Kurri. The smelter owned many houses in the Buffer Zone and did not tell the tenants.

Hydro took ownership of the smelter in 2002.

A little 3-4 years old boy in a smelter house in Bowditch Rd Loxford was affected badly, headbanging etc. by the air borne pollution from the uncovered stockpile of SPL.

His mother applied for help saying the smelter had ignored her. After Garvan Institute testing suggested moving and the family did. The little boy improved within 6 weeks and the house was immediately demolished.

Hydro expects this is a reference to 10 Bowditch Avenue Loxford. The residence was infested with termites and as a result management requested Sternbecks Real Estate to ask the tenant to vacate. After the tenant vacated the house, it was demolished. At no stage did the tenant raise any health concerns.

If the inference here is that the health issue was caused by ambient fluoride levels, the data shows that such levels were well below ANZECC guidelines.

The TAFE grape vines part of the Viticulture Course immediately south of the boy's house were badly affected by windblown pollutants from the plant and Mount Alcan and it was necessary to dilute the grape juice by fluoride free grape juice 50/50.

Fluoride is not absorbed by grape juice. High concentrations of gaseous and particulate fluorides can impact leaf development and interfere with photosynthesis. This can impact the quantity and quality of the grape juice produced. The mixing of fluoride impacted grape juice with fluoride free grape juice is factually incorrect.

It is common for winemakers to mix grape juice concentrate during the winemaking process to assist with balancing the sugars during and/or after fermentation. Winemakers also blend different wine types or varieties.

The Mt Alcan pile of SPL was covered with soil around this time and vents were installed to relieve the gas pressure inside. Pumps were installed east of the pile outside the fence to suck up the leachate. The toxic leachate was pumped back into the smelter ponds.

It is still there awaiting treatment.

This comment dates others above and close by at around 1995.

As mentioned and illustrated in the presentation to the August CRG meeting, the waste stockpile was capped with 900mm of clay (not soil) to reduce water ingress. A shallow layer (150mm) of soil was placed on top to allow vegetation to grow, which aids in the removal of moisture.

Leachate interception systems have been installed under the recommendation of the EPA. The systems are designed to reduce vegetation impact from any perched leachate impacted groundwater. Any captured leachate is currently stored in evapo-transpiration dams along with all of the storm water collected from the smelter site. If dam levels become too high due to excessive rainfall, then some diluted liquid is irrigated under licence in and around the smelter site and in a defined area on Wangara. Water quality is monitored constantly to ensure that the fluoride levels are within the requirements for irrigation. Soils around the site have been tested and those that require it will be remediated. Soils around these dams do not require remediation.

3 or more houses on Bowditch Road Loxford were removed, see the pre expressway map.

Hydro is only aware of one house being removed, 10 Bowditch Avenue.

There were no vents at the Weston illegal dumps to relieve the pressure and toxic gases.

The Weston site is not and has never been under Hydro's control.

It is claimed that 5,000 tonnes of Spent Pot Lining was included in the pavement of the Hunter Expressway. ARRB road making consultants on the HE project claim they used recycled pot lining from smelters.

Hydro has had no involvement in this activity. One of the issues in having spent potlining re-processed by other companies is that Hydro loses control of the material. That said Hydro has no reason to believe that any unprocessed material has been used in this way. It is possible that a local re-processor has on-sold or given this material to the above company after it has been processed, and also possible that material could have come from any one of the Australian smelters.

If so we have no reason to believe that there is an issue.

Photographs of pre-Hunter Expressway open air SPL sorting piles.

The material described is not spent potlining. It is in fact anode butt (referred to as AOS – ahead of schedule). Large quantities of AOS are being prepared to be exported to Europe for reuse. This material is classified as a “green” (non-hazardous) waste under the Basel convention (which governs the trans-boundary movements of wastes).

It was common knowledge that the smelter did not acknowledge compensation claims and pay outs. The amounts awarded were subject to a contracted silence. I spoke to a ring furnace operator dying from lung disease awarded \$80,000 and silenced by contract.

We assume that this reference is to an historical event that took place prior to Hydro's purchase of the smelter. We would comment that financial dealings with employees are generally provided with a level of privacy and confidentiality, but cannot comment on prior practices.

Comment relating to a death from mature aged asthma.

Even though this statement is dated around five to six years prior to the Hydro purchase of the site, this woman was known to current Hydro staff who worked with the previous owners. The lady in question moved to the area with severe emphysema and 28% lung capacity. She survived for five years after moving to the area. She did not have mature onset asthma.

Smelter fined in 1997.

Hydro purchased the site in 2002 and has no comment on this issue.

The smelter has been subsidised with cheap electricity.

Details of our power contracts are highly confidential. However, it is fair to say the whenever products or commodities are purchased in bulk there is a tendency to pay a lower per unit cost than for a one-off purchase. The Kurri Smelter, like all aluminium smelters, certainly consumed enormous amounts of electricity.

The land Hydro wants to sell was in large part gifted to the smelter.

Hydro is not aware of the purchase price of land during the development of the smelter site, but understands that the Wangara property was purchased at market value in 1983 when the smelter was obliged to purchase adjoining land as a condition of consent for capacity expansion.

Large areas of land have undergone significant and costly improvements over many years.

The Federal Minister for the Environment introduced by the local Federal member Joel Fitzgibbon opened a Spent Potlining treatment plant on behalf of Regain, a company that claims to treat SPL and sell it as feedstock to cement plants for \$50 per tonne.

Hydro believes this to be the case. Hydro is not privy to the business dealings of Regain with its customers so is not able to comment on their sales figures.

They claim they are paid \$500 per tonne by the smelter to process SPL.

Hydro will not discuss the commercial arrangements they have in place with Regain. The contract is commercial in-confidence.

Norsk Hydro Norway claim they have a profitable way of making SPL into feedstock for Rockwool International. Why are they not using it on the 45 year old stockpile here?

The capped waste stockpile is not a stockpile of spent potlining. It is mixed waste. While it contains approximately 50% spent potlining as described in the presentation to the August CGR meeting, this material is mixed with a range of others and cannot be processed in this way.

Joel Fitzgibbon MP on YouTube

Mr Fitzgibbon has acknowledged that his statements in Parliament, viewable on YouTube and in the Hansard, were not correct.

Hydro has hired “spin doctors” to give their message to the press etc.

Hydro has indeed appointed communications professionals, along with a range of other consultants for this phase in the life of the smelter and site.

Hydro staff on site are managing the day to day care and maintenance and overseeing and managing the remediation and redevelopment of the site. The staff numbers are appropriately low due to the current nature of the business.

Hydro will continue to hire in specialists as required.

Our CRG “facilitator” from GHD claimed to be a facilitator for AGL.

This is not a claim, it is fact. Michael Ulph is the chair of the Gloucester Gas Project Community Consultative Committee (CCC). He has held this role for around four years. Minutes of these meetings are publicly available on the AGL website www.agl.com.au/gloucester, under “community”.

The locals (at Gloucester) are strongly opposed.

Both opposing and supporting groups, council staff and officers, and others, are represented on the Gloucester Gas CCC. They view draft minutes and have the opportunity to challenge them, and vote on the ratification of the minutes in the same way that the Hydro CRG does.

a former Mayor of Gloucester claimed “Our big mistake was in allowing Michael to take the only minutes. We should have taken our own.”

The former Mayor of Gloucester, now a vocal opponent of the gas project and heavily involved in “Groundswell Gloucester”, has never met Michael and has never been a member of the CCC.

Membership of the CCC is listed on the AGL web site.

Spent Potlining in Wikipedia

Hydro acknowledges that spent potlining is a hazardous material and has provided a breakdown of its properties in the presentation and minutes of the August meeting.

Page – Joel Fitzgibbon MP, Member for Hunter

This statement has been commented upon above. Mr Fitzgibbon has acknowledged that his statement was incorrect. Hydro is not aware of the source of this misinformation.

Discussion of Rockwool on Joel Fitzgibbon’s Facebook page.

This has been commented upon above.

Complaint to Kerry McNaughton of Hydra (sic) over AGL “Illegal?” donations to the Liberal party.

While Hydro finds this link to be tenuous at best, an email was issued to the Gloucester Gas CCC by the Gloucester Gas Community Liaison Manager following the publishing of this article. It is presented below.

Dated 11 August 2014.

“Good afternoon

An article in today’s Sydney Morning Herald about AGL’s political donations requires clarification:

- The Gloucester Gas Project determination was made by the independent Planning Assessment Commission. This distinction has also been made in the online version of the Herald, which adjusted their article, saying:
 - “Clarification: An earlier version of this article stated the Planning Department had approved AGL’s Gloucester project. The Director General of the department recommended to the Planning Assessment Commission that the project proceed.”
- The donations, referred to in the article as ‘secret’, were disclosed to the NSW Election Funding Authority and are publicly available.

- Donations to the Millennium Forum were paid to the NSW Liberal Party, however it is part of their federal fundraising and goes to their federal account, and therefore is not subject to NSW state donation laws. When AGL disclosed the Millennium Forum donations we disclosed more than is required by legislation.

Best regards,

Karyn”

-- Ends --

Included at the bottom of the email are comments by Colin to Kerry that are not correct.

Colin states “I have already written to Michael asking for information but have received no reply.”

Colin at no time wrote to Michael about the AGL issue. He did put many questions in two emails regarding contamination and remediation, and mentioning the red weed.

Michael did not answer the questions, but did reply on both occasions. The following is a copy of the second email response from Michael to Colin.

Dated 4 August 2014.

“Hi Col,

You have many questions. Most if not all seem to relate to contamination and remediation.

As per my previous email, I think it is a good idea to wait (just a couple of weeks) until the next CRG meeting, so that your questions can be asked in front of the rest of the group, and they can then learn of issues and through Hydro’s answers.

In this way the CRG members can then answer those same questions if asked by other community members, and also they will be in the minutes.

I would ask you to keep your questions as concise as possible at the meeting so that they can be properly put and answered, and recorded in the minutes. I will bring these two emails from you with me so we can check them off either on the day or later if time gets the better of us, or if some answers take some research.

Kind regards,

Michael

-- Ends --

Post script

The minutes of the August CRG meeting were distributed in their draft form to the CRG for review, as per the agreed process, on 11 September 2014.

On 12 September 2014, Colin Maybury sent the following email to Hydro Kurri Kurri Managing Director Richard Brown, copying in Michael Ulph and Kerry McNaughton.

“Richard, Kerry, Michael, I hereby withdraw my comments and reports from residents and apologise for any angst I may have caused. Col.”

-- Ends --