

Port Augusta Community Reference Working Group Meeting Notes

Meeting Number	8
Date	Thursday 1 March 2018 at 5:00pm, the power station site.
Attendees	Brad Williams (Flinders Power), Brett Prentis, Sophie Martin (EPA), John Miller, Tracy Freeman (Dan's office), Dan van Holst Pelican (State MP for Stuart), Michelle Coles, Peter Georgaris (CEO, Flinders Power), Travis Dymmott (EPA)
Facilitator/Executive support	Steve Dangerfield (communicate), Henry Rasheed (communicate)
Apologies	John Banks (Port Augusta City Council), Andrew Manson (DPC), Brian Reichelt, Chris Kennett, Robin Sharp

1. Site tour

The group boarded a minibus and were taken on a tour of the site, with Brad and Peter speaking on different topics and answering questions as they arose. The bus stopped at various site locations to give the group an opportunity to have a look and assess different aspects of the site including the ash storage area, the former coal stockpile site and the power station demolition site.

2. Meeting room debrief

Once the tour finished, the group gathered in a meeting room on the site and were given the opportunity to raise any questions.

Q. Is there any information that Flinders Power could share with the broader community as to the long term future of the site once remediated?

A. Peter said that there has been a high level of interest in the site, due to its ability to serve as a site suitable for power generation. Peter advised that Flinders Power has an Environmental licence and the existing environmental management and remediation obligations continue until the land is sold and the outstanding and ongoing obligations need to be assumed by a new landowner as part of any sale. It was considered that this would be an important piece of information to communicate to the community. It was agreed that a summary of any potential future sale process and transfer of any obligations would be included in the soon to be released newsletter.

Q. Have there been any further developments in retaining any significant structures, to address the historical legacy aspects of the closure for the community.

A. Peter said that Flinders Power had been approached about retaining some items of historical significance. John Moss (Flinders Power) noted that Flinders Power had already provided Wadlata with multiple historical items and artefacts via the Flinders Power 'Hunters and Collectors' club).

Q. Does the stack actually need to be demolished, as it carries emotional and historical significance?

A. Peter said the demolition of the stack was a requirement under the lease obligations for site closure, so if the community felt that they wanted it retained it would need substantial discussion with State Government. In addition, the structural integrity of the stack and ongoing management and maintenance would be necessary and this would fall to any new owner. Concern was expressed regarding the retention of the stack and the risk of future deterioration and the remaining obligation to demolish it by the then land owner, be it Flinders or another.

Q. Does Flinders Power pay rates to the Council?

A. Peter said that Flinders does pay rates but the amount has reduced since generation at the Power Station had ceased.

Q. Why is the covering of the ash storage area not in line with the EPA's guidelines for landfill sites. Attention was drawn to the rehabilitation plans for former Ash Storage Areas in NSW and Victoria and why South Australia wasn't remediating to the same standard.

A. It was stated that the site is not considered a landfill site in the context of the guidelines. A specific plan suitable for this site has been developed under the guidance of an independent auditor with the actual remediation works to be signed off as being acceptable under the plan.

It was stated that the very nature of the ash is a major factor in the current fill solution and is considered inert. The profile of the site, the type of ash and the location and topography are very different to other ash storage areas in NSW and Victoria and therefore the remediation approach differs. Brad said that he had been to the Hazelwood Power Station ash storage area and confirmed that the ash is very different to what Flinders Power is dealing with in South Australia. Following further discussion, Steve advised that without a full understanding of the other sites being referenced, it was impossible to make direct comparisons. It was agreed that further work would be done with the EPA to have further dialogue with the relevant members of the group with regard to this issue prior to the next meeting.

Q. A Greenpeace report was referred to which stated that the Hazelwood Power Station site has a budget 5 times larger than the Flinders Power budget. Does this mean that the level of remediation being undertaken by Flinders Power is inadequate or that Flinders Power may run out of money and be unable to complete the remediation to the required standard?

A. Peter stated that all sites are different and that Flinders Power has been through a process with the South Australian Government. Flinders Power has a robust plan in place specific to this site which has been, agreed to by an independent auditor, and costed and agreed to by independent consultants. Peter also pointed out that the Greenpeace paper is an opinion piece where various statements have been made that are factually incorrect and should in no way be relied upon as a way of determining the adequacy of the remediation process being undertaken by Flinders Power. Greenpeace had not visited the site in preparation of their report. Peter made it clear that Flinders Power do not

see a need to respond or answer to the article which Greenpeace has published. Flinders Power is reporting to the State Government on a monthly basis, the EPA frequently and the independent site auditor, and will continue to do so to ensure the execution of the remediation strategy meets the defined criteria.

Steve summarised the points made by stating that Flinders Power has publically committed to remediating the site under the specific requirements set by the State Government and the EPA and will meet these agreed standards.

The EPA is committed to addressing some of these questions with the relevant member(s) of the group prior to the next meeting. The EPA further committed to circulating the information researched to the group via Steve.

It was stated by a member of the group that it was important to point out that the questions and criticisms were in no way a reflection on the workers and the job they are doing. It was acknowledged that the management and their respective teams are committed to undertaking the best job they can and that the work is difficult, complex and challenging. The teams should be recognised for their efforts and their commitment to the task. The issues and questions raised were focusing on whether the approach being taken to site remediation is the right one for the long-term future sustainability of the site and the benefit of Port Augusta residents.

3. Close

Steve thanked the group, suggested April 12th or 19th as a date for the next meeting and closed the meeting at 8.15pm.

Actions

Item	Action	Who	When
1.	EPA to research other interstate ash storage area remediation approaches and provide further detailed responses to key questions including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why the preferred approach? • Why the difference with interstate models? • Is the remediation strategy adequate? 	Sophie Martin	Next meeting