



MEETING MINUTES



MEETING **Community Meeting - Stockton RSL - Marstel**
DATE 27 March 2007
TIME 6:00pm
MEETING # 1

PRESENT Pat Keating (PK) (Stockton Residents Group), Fran Callaghan (Stockton Residents Group), Paul Bender (PB) (RLMC), Anne Frizell (AF) (Mayfield Residents Group), Jeff Hibbert (JH) (Marstel), Renae Gifford (HLA), Alison Dodds (HLA), Anne Catley (Marstel), Tim Gunning (TG) (Marstel)

APOLOGIES Peggy Svoda

CC

CHAIR/TEAM LEADER Jeff Hibbert (Marstel)

MINUTES Renae Gifford

PERSON	COMMENTS
PK	- Pat expressed that she would like a copy of the EA report when the document was completed - PK stated that Marstel was likely to understand what was required running such a facility due to their experience at Coode Island.
PK	- Would the trucks that would be used on site be the same trucks as presented in the presentation?
JH	- Yes – bottom filling trucks will be used
AF	- What is the Design life of the facility?
JH	- 100 years would be the design life of the facility.
PK	- Where would you obtain your Water Supply? Is there a possibility that you could water share with the other industries?
JH	- No, not really, not a great user of water.
JH	- Marstel have had preliminary discussions with DEC – there may be a possibility to store a small amount of stormwater for landscaping / trees, but as rainfall is not a predictable event, we would design the facility to dewater the compounds via a discharge licence to the river. - In terms of fire water Marstel will use best practice. - The facility will use Freshwater – salt water has maintenance problems. - Fire water storage requirements would be met by 2 x 500m3 tanks
AF	- How many employees will be employed at the facility? - JH replied: 2-3 employees (not including shipping) 5 x 8hr shifts – 3-4 people per shift when unloading via ship.
AF	- Would the trucks be owned by Marstel or would they be Contractors? - The owner of the product would engage their own contractors.
JH	- Fire system will be tested weekly on the terminal site - More information will be available after fire safety study for the facility has been completed.
PK	- Where does ethanol come from to the facility?

PERSON	COMMENTS
TG	- There are two main sources of ethanol suppliers currently with new plants to be constructed in future terminalling companies - Manildra at Nowra, CSR in Mackay - Distribution will be important - It is important to understand that Marstel is an independent, therefore they do not own the fuel stored on site and are purely a storage facility. -
AF	- Where do you get the fuel?
TG	- Sourcing of the fuel is up to customers
PK	- Biodiesel manufacturer is a good thing as it has lower emissions - Pat requested that we keep her informed on the project. - Also requested that any spills be reported to residents group as soon as they occur. It is a positive to work with the community in these matters.
JH	- In Melbourne, Marstel have a community consultative committee which meets quarterly.
PK	- Stockton Residents Group have arrangements with Orica that they ring on the day of the incident – it would be requested Marstel to do the same. Incitec – Pat supported in a judgement in the Land and Environment Court.
JH	- Marstel, will develop emergency response procedures to alert neighboring industry and residents of onsite incidents
PK	- Pat indicated that she has not heard as much about the proposal as she might have expected - She would like to remain informed, and also help stop any phone calls!
AF	- Have there been any major incidences at Marstels other plants?
TG	- No there haven't been – Marstel have experience in dealing with very difficult products e.g. Coode Island
AF	- What is the issue in the presentation of having combustibles near the public land area?
JH	- Legally there needs to be 25m to boundary fence for combustibles. - This will be looked at during the environmental assessment and hazard analysis. - Flammables need to be 50m from public area.
PK	- There maybe community concern regarding the proximity of the Orica plant to the proposed Marstel facility
JH	- Orica has a very good record and so do we - Bunding ensures all is sealed - Many features to ensure safety are to be included in the design
PK	- Leaks are more likely to occur than a big spill
JH	- Marstel are proposing to install a bentonite layer under the entire area. - The design will meet the DEC criteria for permeability to prevent possible fuel spills reaching the water table. - Bentonite comes in rolls and you lay them out on the ground and up the sides of the bunding and tank foundations where they are sealed to contain any liquids. - Have undertaken a preliminary contamination assessment with additional ground water samples planned for the site.
AC	- Has there been a community inspection? - No, not to date. There is accessibility by road to the site



PERSON	COMMENTS
PK	- Pat supports the proposal – economic development of the Port
AC	- Have Marstel considered the affects of sea level change?
JH	- No, this has not been considered at this point, but we will check the site levels relative to Stockton and report at a future meeting.
Close	Approx 8:00pm

**Minutes of the Community Consultative Meeting held 3rd July 2007, 6.00pm Stockton RSL,
Newcastle**

Attendees:

Marstel Terminals

Jeff Hibbert
Tim Gunning
Brent Metson

HLA

Renae Gifford

Community Representatives

Pat Keating (CAKA)
Anne Frizell (Mayfield residents)
Peggy Svoda
Pat Callaghan

Jeff opened the meeting, thanked the representatives for attending and briefly re-capped the project development to date.

Slides 1, 2, 3. Jeff explained the content of the presentation and overview of the planning process background.

Renee explained to the group the “new” integrated planning system process (NSW DoP part 3A) as opposed to the older part 4 system that the attendees may be more familiar with.

Pat Keating requested a copy (in CD form) of the EA for her group and its technical associates to review. It was agreed to provide a copy to Pat.

Slides 4 & 5. Jeff explained how the site had been screened to determine the appropriate type of risk study to be included in the EA, and it had been determined to use a semi/partially quantitative analysis using the approach detailed in HIPAP No. 6 “Hazard Analysis Guidelines” , despite the development risk screening indicating that only a qualitative approach was required.

Slide 6. Jeff explained the safeguards that had been developed from the risk study as needing to be in place to mitigate the risks identified.

- Foam monitor at wharf in a suitable staging area
- Wheeled dry powder extinguisher
- Wharf emergency plan
- Buried pipeline indicators
- Procedures developed in accordance with ISGOTT (International Safety Guideline for Oil Tankers & Terminals)

The study concluded that the risks from the facility do not exceed the recommended allowable risk levels for the land use zone the site is situated in.

Slide 7. Jeff explained the on-site fire-fighting systems.

Anne asked “what is the pipeline diameter?”. Jeff explained it is 350mm diameter and explained further the materials and construction/testing method. There followed some discussion by the group on the pipeline features and operating methods. Also explained what was a “pig”.

Slide 9. Storm-water. Jeff explained the system features and operating controls and testing. The question was asked “how often is it cleared?”. Jeff explained that is managed on a day-to-day basis. Bunds were then discussed, as was the treatment of minor spills.

Slide 11. Renee detailed the extent of the groundwater testing and results.

Slide 12 & 13. Jeff showed photos of a typical clay bund liner and how it is installed and maintained.

Slide 14. Renee explained how the air quality study was modelled and what the modelled impacts would be (negligible). Jeff talked about the tank features to suppress vapour generation and the operation of the VRU (Vapour recovery unit). There was also discussion around bio-fuels and the handling and blending of bio-fuels.

Slide 15. Noise. Renee detailed the noise study and modelling – including the only likely exceedence of noise criteria for a short period during construction (pile driving for 4-6 weeks, during daylight hours. The terminals hours of operation were discussed and typical noise levels (minor) during normal operations.

Slide 16. Traffic. Renee detailed the traffic impact study and concluded there was a low impact to local traffic and road network. Tanker movements equate to one truck every half-hour

Slide 16, 17, 18. Visual Impact. Mock-ups of the terminal were shown and the size was discussed in the context of the surrounding facilities.

Slide 20. Other issues. Renee listed the other issues considered for the EA. The group raised the issue of site security and there was some discussion regarding security features. Jeff agreed to provide further detail on security as the project was progressed.

Slide 21. Where to from here? Renee explained the process the EA follows from submission including adequacy review and public display process.

General discussion on ship movements and size of ships that Marstel will bring to the Port. No specific tide will be needed.

The invitation for further questions was made and Pat Keating asked of the construction timing. Jeff responded with the likely timing of construction during 2008 for operation in 2009. Anne raised the question of flooding. Evidence of how the Island performed during the recent floods was discussed and it was agreed the risks of serious damage to the facility and consequent environmental harm were minor. Jeff committed to investigating the site levels relative to the Stockton area for Anne.

Meeting Closed at 8pm