

Beverley Community Working Group

Community Working Group meeting notes

Wednesday 19 January 2016, Maltese Cultural Centre, 6 Jeanes Street, Beverley

Attendees

Name	Representation	Name	Representation
Dale McGill	EPA	Cate Moore	Resident
Danielle Torresan	EPA	Tina Meakin	Resident
Tim Saul	EPA	Kevin Meakin	Resident
Mitch Talbot	EPA	Jayne Willcocks	Resident
Heidi Hessling	EPA	Doug Scotney	Resident
Mark Hassam	EPA	Tony Kyriacou	Flinders Park Residents Association
Susan Ovenden	Resident	Adam Filipi	City of Charles Sturt
Mat Way	Resident		

Welcome and introductions

Tim Saul welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the members of the EPA and the Community Working Group (CWG). Tim discussed the new employment opportunity that he has accepted outside of the EPA and the subsequent transition to the new contacts within the EPA for the ongoing work of the Beverley project. This includes both Dale McGill, Danielle Torresan and Mitch Talbot. Tim then invited Dale and Danielle to discuss their role in the group and project work, prior to presenting the upcoming environmental assessment work for the assessment area.

Some of the key questions and answers arising from the presentation and discussions were:

Comment: Discussion was held regarding the approach to consultant engagement where sampling results or computer modelling trigger the need for accelerated action. Tim discussed the re-engagement of Golder Associates to undertake the validation assessment work, which involves the modelling predictions resulting from further soil vapour assessment within the Beverley investigation area that was also undertaken by Golder Associates.

- **Does the EPA have any suspicions regarding persons or companies responsible for causing the contamination?**

Through the works undertaken, the EPA has identified several key areas for the investigation of potential sources.

- **TCE is still available to purchase online. Does the EPA hold any data for the current use of TCE in the area?**

The existing data indicates that the contamination is historical rather than the result of new TCE sources. The EPA does not currently identify any licenced storage or use of TCE in the area.

- * Also privately discussed the current disposal methods for TCE (different from historical disposal instructions to pour onto ground) and the potential for regulatory action, including prosecution if inappropriate disposal is identified.

- **Can the EPA confirm that there will be no identification of individual properties in the publicly available reports?**

Yes, where results are documented in a report, the property will be allocated a number. Each individual property owner will receive a letter providing them with the number allocated to their property that corresponds with the results within the report.

- **There are several new, real-time continuous data logging technologies available and their use has been documented overseas. Is there a reason why EPA is not using this technology to achieve faster results?**

The EPA is aware of and has investigated the use of other technologies. The above mentioned technology can produce results consistent with those already collected through more conventional active and passive methods (Summa Cannisters and Radiellos). The use of a consistent data collection method provides comparable results. Additionally, the current methods enable data to be collected over a period of time that is suitable to incorporate seasonal variations, in a controlled manner with minimal disturbance to residents.

- **We use our house differently during the summer than we do in winter. Won't that affect the results?**

This is one of the reasons why the EPA is requesting permission to undertake validation testing during the warmer months. We know that the vapour can behave differently during summer and that some people like to ventilate their houses more in the summer and some like to close it up with the air conditioner on. This is valuable information in addition to the understanding the construction of a home.

- **What would be involved with "intervention" in the event that a result identified a concentration of TCE >200 µg/m³?**

To reduce exposure, temporary accommodation will be arranged for the residents of that property while Government is consulted on the next steps.

- **What is the reason for expanding the existing extent of the investigation area?**

Some of the samples collected from groundwater wells and soil vapour bores at the investigation area boundaries identified that the contamination extended beyond the existing boundary. As such, the boundary of the investigation area was extended to enable the extent of the contamination to be delineated.

- **What is the rate of groundwater migration and the future prognosis?**

Groundwater migration is relatively slow due to the presence of heavy clay. Likewise, the contamination moves slowly too. The future outcome for the wider area is that the management of the groundwater contamination will occur through the implementation of a Groundwater Prohibition Area.

- **Is it possible to increase the frequency of updates regarding the assessment progression and the review of results?**

- * Working group suggested monthly updates.

Absolutely.

- **Will Dr Sim Ooi be reviewing the HHRA dated October 15 and the proposed scope of works?**

Yes, Dr Sim Ooi has reviewed the scope of works. Due to the size, value and complexity of the proposed works the selection of a consultant for the project stages will be and have been determined through the tender process in accordance with government requirements.

- **Will Dr Sim Ooi be documenting his review of the HHRA in a report?**

Yes, Dr Sim Ooi will prepare a report on his review of the previous risk assessment work completed by Golder Associates. This includes both the preliminary vapour intrusion and preliminary human health risk assessment.

- **Where is Dr Sim Ooi coming from?**

Dr Sim Ooi will be coming from Melbourne and is expected to be in Adelaide during the week beginning Monday 22 February 2016. It is intended that Dr Ooi will present at the next CWG meeting that is proposed for Wednesday 24 February 2016.

Actions

- Tim Saul to email a copy of the Human Health Risk Assessment reports to the CWG members.
- A copy of the presentation provided and draft meeting notes summarising key questions will be sent to CWG members. The final notes will be uploaded on to the website.

Next meeting

- Email updates will be provided to the group on a monthly basis regarding the progress of assessment work.
- The next CWG meeting is proposed for Wednesday 24 February 2016.

More information

Community Information line 1800 729 175

Email EPASiteContam@epa.sa.gov.au

Website www.epa.sa.gov.au

For any questions specific to health, or to follow up on the health responses provided above, please contact the Scientific Services Branch of SA Health.

Phone 08 8226 7100

Email public.health@health.sa.gov.au