

# Remediation, Operation & Monitoring, Community Working Group

## Meeting Minutes – Meeting 4

### 11 October 2022



<b>Project</b>	Remediation, operation and monitoring, Community Working Group (CWG)	<b>Date</b>	11 October 2022
<b>Venue</b>	Ampol Fuel Terminal, 2 Solander Street, Kurnell Training Facility – SOB meeting room 7	<b>Time</b>	6.30pm-8.30pm
<b>Purpose</b>	Meeting 4 CWG: Odour (part 1) continued - Sitewide Study		
<b>Attendees</b>	<i>Isabelle Moss, Chair (WSP)</i> <i>Robyn Heagney, resident</i> <i>Brett Lobwein, resident</i> <i>Sarah-Jo Lobwein, resident</i> <i>Joanne Oldfield, resident</i> <i>Rob Stanley-Jones, resident &amp; President, Kurnell Progress and Precinct Residents' Association</i> <i>David Zaharija, resident</i> <i>David Peninton, National Operations Manager, Ampol</i> <i>Damien Davidson, Remediation Specialist, Ampol</i> <i>Helen Stanley, Community Relations, Ampol</i> <i>Beatrice Hobson, CWG Secretariat (WSP)</i>	<b>Apologies</b>	<i>Cr Leanne Farmer, Sutherland Shire Council</i> <i>Ella Burgess, CWG secretariat (WSP)</i>
	<p>-----</p> <p><i>Subject Matter Experts</i></p> <p><i>James Farhart, Project Manager, Ampol</i></p> <p><i>Dr Nivari Jayasinghe, Principal Environmental Scientist, Contaminated Land Management (WSP)</i></p> <p><i>Michael Assal, Operations Manager, The Odour Unit</i></p> <p><i>Isaac Farrugia, Consultant Engineer, The Odour Unit</i></p> <p>-----</p> <p><i>Observer</i></p> <p><i>Daniel Scully, Community Relations, Ampol Kurnell</i></p> <p><i>Stakeholders to receive minutes/agenda:</i></p> <p><i>Leanne Mariani, Sutherland Shire Council</i></p>		

**Pre-meeting material:** remediation meetings summary

Item	Notes/actions
<p>Welcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The meeting commenced at 6:47pm.</li> <li>- The Chair welcomed all and gave an Acknowledgement of Country.</li> <li>- The Chair noted apologies from Leanne Farmer and Ella Burgess.</li> <li>- The Chair introduced Beatrice Hobson who will be taking notes in place of Ella Burgess.</li> <li>- The Chair outlined the agenda for the meeting: hear from community members on their views and questions from previous meetings and any questions from the pre-reading material, undertake a practical exercise, go through highlights from the odour study and answer any remaining questions.</li> <li>- The Chair noted that there would be no new material covered in the meeting. The aim of the meeting was to seek member's views and any outstanding questions from members.</li> <li>- The Chair explained each CWG member will have the opportunity to share their thoughts, views and questions on the remediation meetings we have had so far.</li> </ul>	

- A CWG member commented that the key feedback from the community is that there has been no communication from Ampol to the broader community.
- A CWG member added that the minutes should be made more accessible and not just available on the website.
- A CWG member commented that the meetings should have clear objectives for what is trying to be achieved, including what Ampol is seeking from the CWG and as an extension the wider community.
- A CWG member noted that the only value they derive from the meetings is receiving information. They remarked that the wharf drain is contentious amongst the Kurnell community, and the view from the community is that Ampol has not actioned any changes.
- The Chair summarised there is a need for better communication.
- A CWG member commented that they are unsure how to make a fair call and assessment about what can be shared with the community.
- Another CWG member stated they wanted accountability and transparency: what has been done, when they will hear from Ampol and when the study will be complete. They added that when they call the 24/7 hotline regarding odour, there are different responses which are confusing.
- A CWG member remarked that information should be distributed through existing channels as opposed to searching the Ampol website. Members want to receive communications proactively rather than having to seek the information out.
- Helen asked whether sharing the link would meet the communication needs.
- A CWG member commented that there are multiple communication channels that could be used such as the Kurnell Resolution Group, Kurnell Resident's Association, Kurnell Facebook page.
- Helen responded that to ensure one source of truth, the minutes will remain on the Ampol website, however a link to the minutes can be provided to be shared on the different channels.
- A CWG member asked if community newsletter updates were still being provided.
- Helen confirmed that the community newsletter box drops are still ongoing but have moved to a monthly occurrence.
- A CWG member commented they were waiting for the Ampol reports to be able to update the Kurnell resident group.
- Damien advised that the Wharf Drain Study (*being completed by WSP for the EPA*) was still active so conclusions were not yet available.
- A CWG member asked if the Wharf Drain Study would be ready by December.
- The Chair advised that we do not have that information and took on notice the need to inform the CWG of the study/report timelines.
- A CWG member stated that they are waiting for the reports before they make a judgement. They would like to see: a timeline of when the report will be available, a follow-up discussion on why the drain has odour and a simple guide about what has been happening.
- The CWG member also commented they had not realised there was a naturally forming sheen from the rock formation in Yena (*picnic area*) and Voodoo (*pathway*) which resembles a petrol spill to the ordinary person. Signage or better communication for the community would address the misconception that this comes from Ampol.

- A CWG member stated that as they felt constrained by what information they could share, there needs to be two communication issues addressed: direct communication with the community and provide specific information (as opposed to “things are being done”).
  - The Chair summarised the key points raised by community members. The Chair recognised that it may be frustrating waiting for answers, as the studies do take time.
  - A CWG member requested an estimated timeline for the studies.
  - The Chair responded that this will be taken on notice. The Chair thanked the members for their feedback.
- 

#### Practical exercise in identifying odours

- The Chair outlined that the exercise involved smelling and identifying 8 odour samples.
  - The Chair noted that the exercise was voluntary, anonymous and involves everyday smells. If the CWG thought this was a worthwhile exercise, this could be offered more broadly to the community.
  - A CWG member asked what the objective of the exercise was.
  - The Chair explained that the exercise is about identifying an individual’s level of ability to detect and identify odours. This practical experience will provide CWG members with a common point of reference to complete the odour report.
  - A CWG member remarked that Ampol had previously advised that community feedback was not an effective mechanism to report odour. The member asked whether Ampol has changed strategy and now wanted community feedback.
  - The Chair responded that the intent was for CWG members to use the odour report template to inform the study. Whereas the broader community can continue to use the 24/7 hotline to report odour.
  - The Chair explained the steps involved in the odour exercise. The meeting attendees then moved to the adjoining training room to take part in the exercise. Michael, Isaac and Damien each had a number of odour samples at their respective stations. CWG members then proceeded to move through the different stations to smell the samples and complete the questionnaire.
- 

#### Plenary discussion on odour exercise

- The Chair asked the CWG members how they found the exercise.
  - A CWG member noted that smells such as petrol and diesel were hard to differentiate.
  - A CWG member found it was an interesting experience.
  - Michael then proceeded to share what the samples actually were:
    - o Sample 1: petrol (Isaac’s station)
    - o Sample 7: fresh air (Isaac’s station)
    - o Sample 8: mulch (Isaac’s station)
    - o Sample 3: rotten egg (Damien’s station)
    - o Sample 6: earthy cabbage, decay foliage (Damien’s station)
    - o Sample 2: diesel fumes (Michael’s station)
    - o Sample 4: rendering animal by-products, (Michael’s station)
-

- Sample 5: shiraz (Michael's station)
  - The Chair asked whether the experience was worthwhile enough to run a similar exercise for other community members.
  - CWG members noted that it was an interesting exercise, however there was not enough value to broaden this to the community.
  - A CWG member asked about health issues related to smelling odours of certain concentration levels and whether headaches can be linked to odours.
  - Michael replied that odour health is a complex subject because many odours people are exposed to are below safe limits. Tying odour to health is challenging because everyone has a different physiological response.
  - A CWG member asked what a healthy level of odour concentration is.
  - Michael explained that there are six thresholds to detect odour, the samples presented were generally a three or four. The concentration alone will not trigger a physiological human response, it is the combined factors of odour frequency, odour duration and odour intensity that may trigger a response.
  - A CWG member asked if air had a threshold of one.
  - Michael replied that air does not exist on the threshold. It is non-detectable. He explained that most people can identify shiraz however distinguishing between petrol and diesel requires a bit more training because people are less familiar with these odour characters.
- 

#### How CWG can inform the study:

- Damien explained it is important to get quality data so Ampol can make decisions and apply appropriate controls. Ampol are required to have a 24/7 hotline to receive community complaints, including odour issues. Bringing in a new mechanism, the odour report form, will assist Ampol to get accurate information in a timely manner and respond.
  - A CWG member asked if they can report odour through the Ampol community email because they experienced difficulty with the 24/7 hotline.
  - Damien replied that yes, they can use the email address. We have also realised the 24/7 hotline is not working as expected and are reviewing this service.
  - A CWG member stated that they have used the Ampol community email and there was a fast response with people turning up soon afterwards. They asked if there was an agreed template for what information to include regarding odour.
  - Damien stated that Ampol does have a template which was displayed on the projector. He then proceeded to step through the columns and drop-down boxes of the template with what information was required.
  - Damien stated that it is important to use the template and ensure the information is reported as quickly as possible. The information needed is the date and time the odour was noticed, the location and the odour character. Damien asked for feedback on the odour report form.
  - A CWG member suggested that a more general term be used instead of petrol or diesel so people do not misidentify the odour.
  - A CWG member suggested the use of the word fuel instead.
  - Damien responded that this suggestion would be included.
-

- Damien noted that key information, such as the location and time of the odour, was missing from some community complaints. There is currently a review of the 24/7 hotline and the script that is used to improve the information needed from the caller.
  - A CWG member commented that the location might need to be more specific.
  - Damien acknowledged they would need to consider how to better identify the location.
  - The Chair summarised the 24/7 hotline will be reviewed and the odour report template will be shared once the changes are made.
- 

#### Sitewide odour investigation in Kurnell

- The Chair stated that this next section will cover highlights on what has been found to date with the sitewide odour study. The Chair noted the pre-reading materials provided an overview of the methodology.
  - Damien noted three key points:
    - o This is a scientific study;
    - o It takes time, 3-6 months is required to complete; and
    - o The study is currently active.
  - Studies like these are normally completed, then the results are communicated. Unlike this situation where the information is shared while the study is underway. Conclusions can be made once the whole data set is understood, not on a partial set of data.
  - Studies take time as sufficient data needs to be collected over different weather conditions. For example, wet weather can trigger certain odours. For this reason the study is still active. There have been wet weather samples taken recently after the rain.
  - It is anticipated the sampling will be finished in November, followed by analysis of the data with a report finalised in early 2023.
  - A CWG member asked if the report will identify areas where odour has been detected.
  - Damien responded that there is a diagram identifying likely sources which will be shared in this meeting.
  - A CWG member asked whether the sources include the community or Ampol Kurnell fuel terminal only.
  - Damien replied that both areas are considered.
  - A CWG member asked whether the two areas of concern, separators and landfarm are being investigated.
  - Damien stated that The Odour Unit investigation included areas based on reports from community members, including areas of concern.
  - A CWG member asked whether the area was tested on the weekend when the weather event happened.
  - It was explained that the odour testing has to follow a wet weather event which means the testing was done on Tuesday.
  - A CWG member commented that there was a high odour at the wharf on the weekend and asked whether this was included in the odour sampling.
  - Damien replied that a separate study, the Wharf Drain Study, included monitoring over the weekend.
-

- Damien provided an overview of the results so far. Odours have been found both onsite and offsite. Seven field surveys have been done to the end of last week and one this week. Off-site testing identified fuel odours including light hydrocarbons (petrol) and heavy hydrocarbons (diesel). These were mostly very weak to weak and of short duration.
- A CWG resident asked if Ampol still has sulphur lines.
- Damien confirmed that they are all gone and off-site sulphurous odours have been found relating to the natural environment, these include National Park, creeks and wetlands.
- Damien presented that 7 likely odour sources have been investigated in Kurnell so far:
  - o Separator Vents have been identified as a potential source. Ampol has taken action to clean the Separators and is investigating long term options for odour mitigation.
  - o Land Farm waste material has also been identified as odorous. The data suggests that drying the material and mounding significantly reduces odour. They have seen a 10 fold reduction in odour following drying. The Land Farm waste material is temporary and is in the process of being removed.
  - o The areas still under investigation are the Wharf Stormwater Outlet, a Stormwater Pit (leading to Gate 5) and Gate 5 Separators. These form part of the Wharf Drain Study which is an EPA driven study.
  - o Areas that have been eliminated as they have no significant odour, are the Stormwater Basin and Aeration Tank.
- A CWG member asked if the Separators are cleaned regularly.
- James Farhart replied yes.
- A CWG member commented that once the cleaning is done, there might still be odour. The member asked if there was a plan to address this.
- Damien stated that the odour sampling will provide more information.
- A CWG member asked if there is any technology that can be upgraded to remove the odour.
- Damien replied that they are already considering technology.
- A CWG member commented they had read Ampol acknowledged odour events and asked whether Ampol's license stipulates they cannot produce odour.
- Damien stated that the EPA decides if organisations are in breach of licence and Ampol have not been notified of a breach. Measures have been taken to reduce odour coming from the separators though in doing so, by lifting the separators lid, this does create odour temporarily.
- Helen clarified that what Ampol acknowledged was that Ampol did not communicate with the community before the start of the cleaning of the separators. The license allows Ampol to take action to mitigate future odours, such as cleaning the separators. When mitigating actions to reduce odour are planned, Ampol will communicate with the community beforehand.
- A CWG member commented the odour was the main concern for the community and queried whether the technology to clean the separators was appropriate.
- Damien explained that there are covers on the separators to reduce odour, though when the covers are lifted for cleaning purposes, some odour is unavoidable. This is unlikely to be a technology issue, however Ampol will review this.
- A CWG member requested a simple guide which explains what is creating odour and how Ampol is addressing this.

- Another CWG member commented that we are unlikely to be completely odour free and questioned what level is acceptable for the community.
- A CWG member asked if the maintenance schedule has changed with the cleaning being more frequent.
- James stated that the separators have been cleaned on an annual basis for the last 7 or 8 years.
- A CWG member asked whether cleaning the separators more regularly would have meant the materials that ended up in the community would have been different.
- James responded that the materials would not have been different. Jim explained that the product that went into the community was diesel which sits on top of the separators. The material at the bottom of the separators did not go out into the community.

---

Close: actions and next meeting – date/time

- The Chair outlined the tentative dates for the following meetings.
- Some CWG members indicated that they are unavailable for the next two meetings and would prefer to reschedule.
- A CWG member asked whether the results from the Wharf Drain Study will be presented at the proposed meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of November.
- Nivari advised that the results of the Wharf Drain Study would not be available at the proposed meeting date. This is an active study with reporting to the EPA due by the end of January.
- There was consensus from the CWG members to reschedule the meetings when the studies are complete.
- The Chair confirmed the next meetings will be rescheduled and will update the CWG members. The Chair summarised the Validation Report meeting and the Tour Site will occur this year however the Wharf Drain Study and the Ecological Study meetings will be in February.
- A CWG member requested an earlier update on the wharf drain due to concern about swimming in the area and asked whether there should be signs not to swim in the water.
- David commented that his understanding of the current results is that the water is no different from a normal drain that gets rid of stormwater and presents no risk to human health. There were previously council signs on the beach about potentially contaminated water which were unrelated to the drain. These have been removed as a result of testing results.
- David thanked everyone for their open and honest feedback, acknowledged that Ampol want to resolve this.
- The meeting closed at 8:49pm.

ACTION: Ampol to revise schedule and CWG secretariat to send an update.