

**Adbri Community Liaison Group Meeting**  
**Held on Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2024**  
**City of Port Adelaide Enfield Council Town Hall 6 pm**

## **1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

We acknowledge and pay respect to the Traditional Owners of the land on which we meet. We pay respect to Elders past and present. We respect their spiritual beliefs and connections to land which are of continuing importance to the living Kurna people of today.

## **2. OPENING**

Meeting opened at 6:05 pm with a welcome and acknowledgement of country and the facilitator outlining the rules of engagement and the purpose of the meeting:

- allow for clarifying questions to develop understanding of the EIP process and document development
- update on EPO process
- provide feedback on EIP
- provide input to the 2<sup>nd</sup> September CLG meeting agenda

Round of introductions conducted as there were a number of people new to the CLG.

## **3. ATTENDANCE RECORD**

Community members, Brett Peterson, Alison Derry, Tony Bazeley (PAREPG), Cr Peter McGregor (PAE), Deb Stoeckel, Celia Braum, Donna Hilton.

Bradley Prosser (PAE)

Adbri members, Johan Revalk, Peter Baker, Peta Wingrove, Craig McKenzie.

Barbara Chappell (Independent Facilitator), Brenton Chappell (Independent note taker).

## **4. APOLOGIES**

Shane Stoeckel, Michael Williams, David Vaughan, Andrew Pruszinski, Gwyn Pickard.

## **5. MEETING PROCEEDINGS**

Adbri Manager Birkenhead Operations Peter Baker provided an overview of what has been happening since he took on his role six weeks ago. He indicated there are daily collections of dust around the area to measure emissions. He has been meeting with residents to find out when and how the dust has been landing on properties; and asking if when they experience a dust event, to call Adbri and they will come straight out to investigate.

Peter acknowledged the clinker shed event. He advised that the repair work on the shed is now complete, however they continue to see dust around the environment.

Work is continuing on the EIP to fix the dust issues once and for all. It is important to define how the dust continues to escape so the actions put in the EIP and money spent is used effectively and not wasted. Adbri is not certain that they have all the necessary information needed at this point in time.

Peter asked the CLG members if they were aware of any patterns for the spread of dust; is it on certain days or continuous? Do residents in the area notice patterns in the spread of dust? Recognising patterns may help with development of solutions.

Brett Peterson indicated the times he notices the dust is on still, cool nights. The stuff that comes out sticks to everything. It's normally around the April to May period is when it is noticed the most. Cr McGregor asked if Adbri was looking to gather data and assess before deciding on where the money would be spent? The response was "yes".

Peter Baker presented information on the process used to make concrete. This is information the CLG members are aware of. Their interest for this meeting was to provide input to the EIP before it is resubmitted to the EPA.

Alison Derry asked if the CLG could have a copy of the draft EIP and could not understand why it was not being made available at the meeting since the purpose of the meeting was to review the EIP and provide feedback. She asked if it was going to be made available at the consultation drop-in sessions being held in September? At this point, the Adbri staff asked to continue with the PP presentation.

Tony Bazeley indicated that the CLG had asked to do an evaluation of the previous EIP to see if it had been effective and this has not happened to date.

Peter Baker sought to confirm if the CLG had been expecting to see the draft EIP at the meeting and go through it. The community members indicated they had expected to go through the EIP during the meeting and give feedback as part of the consultation process.

CLG members asked if information on the EIP consultation could be extended beyond the immediate areas surrounding the Adbri site.

Cr McGregor asked if the process for informing Elected Members of Adbri information could be improved? Johan Revalk indicated he would be happy to work with Council to improve the process.

Deb Stoeckel asked what was going to happen after the consultation? Johan Revalk indicated the drop-in sessions were being made as available as possible.

A further enquiry was made about the availability of the EIP in time for people to be able to read it before the drop-in sessions on the 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> September, along with a question about the period of time for the consultation. Johan Revalk indicated this information would be made available.

The end of October is the deadline for submission of the EIP to the EPA.

At this point, presentation of the PP slides recommenced. Samples of clinker, cement and limestone were distributed. The discussion then centered on how cement is made from the raw materials provided for the CLG members to view. It was acknowledged that the process does create a lot of dust, however this should be contained on the site.

Clarification was made regarding cement and concrete, cement being the product produced. Clinker is produced at high temperatures and then milled into the cement mills and then gypsum is added and processed to the bagging stage. These processes can spread dust if not controlled properly. Attention in the presentation was drawn to storage areas (see Slide 14).

Storage areas and the storage facilities were shown. A site review has been conducted to look for potential dust areas, seeking to pinpoint the main source of the problem. This is where Adbri is looking to spend money. Slide 7 is a map of material storage.

An overview of RDF was provided to the meeting identifying that RDF is tested every day for content. Plastic makes up 10%, n.b. 20% is allowed, and remainder is mainly wood from construction. Adbri indicated they have been commended for keeping plastics so low in the RDF.

Cr Mc Gregor asked for data on plastic content percentages. Peter Baker undertook to provide a response.

One of the advantages of RDF is it keeps materials from going to land fill and reduces the reliance on natural gas for the kiln.

Tony Bazeley asked for a presentation on how the quality process works and data measurements?

Adbri undertook to provide this.

Peter Baker provided information on CRH who have taken ownership of Adbri. CRH has a wealth of global experience around the use of alternative fuels. CRH has 40 plants around the world and some are in cities, and in residential areas.

Peter Baker advised that CRH is prepared to invest in the plant to improve the function of the plant, be it alternative fuels, processes, or maintenance. They are seeking advice on how to address this. There are two new managers from the USA with 30 years' experience in the cement business and knowledge of best practice around the world.

The current draft EIP will not have input from global experiences, this will be included in the next EIP.

Peta Wingrove (Adbri) continued with the PP presentation.

She indicated the Environmental Improvement Plan was submitted to the EPA, but now needs to be revised and resubmitted. Historically, the content of the EIP was based on modelling, taking into account the stacks, truck movements, items we have line of sight on (including noise). Modelling is used to determine what has to happen. Adbri will need to take into account all aspects of the process to bring together the revision of the EIP.

In developing the refreshed EIP and taking into account the dust event, discussions with the CLG, the expert advice and EPA expectations, the key is community input.

As part of tonight is important to have a general discussion to make sure Adbri has identified potential hot spots to make sure the CLG are across these areas as EIPs are iterative. The objective is for improvement for the community and dust reduction. Since May we need to have a refreshed way of thinking about how we address the dust area for the community. We need to look at how we change culture, looking at organisational factors getting it into the DNA. Adbri is committed to making Birkenhead a flagship site.

Noise studies, dust collector studies, 3 internal workshops, and CLG meetings have all been undertaken. A variety of dusts emerge from the site that can be identified. Samples taken from cars are clinker and limestone dust.

Need to take a holistic approach to see how we are measuring success. The options project forms part of this. The Barbara Chappell (facilitator) asked Peta Wingrove if she was talking about projects as part of the EIP because newer members of the CLG would not understand this.

Peta Wingrove continued with the presentation. She talked about how data plays an important role in the EIP process, e.g. if dust containment is successful then less cars should need to be cleaned. This was acknowledged as a reactive model, but also one of the ways to improve the process.

Cr McGregor showed maps on eView that showed the extent of dust movement on the Adbri site and outlined his concerns about storage issues of raw materials to Adbri and the EPA.

Adbri is focused on developing better early warning systems and dust containment.

Tony Bazeley commented that there was too much reliance on complaints from residents, citing the canary in the coal mine analogy.

Peta Wingrove continued with the PP presentation. The rationale is used to select projects for the EIP based on a quantifiable model, capex costs, maintenance costs and implementation. Adbri will make changes to have more community responses in the rationale. There needs to be a logic to the rationale in the EIP that will be acceptable to the community.

Alison Derry asked if people can see an earlier EIP so they had some sense of what is in an EIP. Craig McKenzie advised it is on the Adbri website and on the EPA Engage web page.

Slide 14 outlined the monitoring network. Eleven sites were identified on the maps.

Peter Baker acknowledged the expectation around a draft EIP being available. Adbri is seeking to cover off every area where they think there could be potential dust emissions. They will provide one page summaries of the options for dust management.

The dust event has forced Adbri to look beyond the modelling. There will be processes they retain, and consideration given to what needs to be add to the EIP projects?

Brett Peterson commented that the modelling has not been correct although it was thought that it was. Change is now necessary. Dust containment has been better in recent years but still needs work. This has gone on for 25 years.

There have been baselines events and then ad hoc events described as excursions. Adbri is looking at how to capture and record these events.

A CLG member asked if the PP slides shown this evening were going to be shown at the drop-in sessions? The community needs to know what Adbri is doing and what is in the EIP. Other information the CLG members asked to be included in the drop-in session information was:

Where are the monitors located?

What is the cleaning that is going on?

Where is the notification of a dust event happening?

What is Adbri doing to notify the public that things are happening?

CLG members commented they had not seen any of the above information presented at the meeting this evening.

The question was posed from Adbri to the CLG if they thought there was anything glaringly missing from the material provided on the PowerPoint. The response was the importance of community engagement in the process was not clear.

The facilitator asked what the fundamental purpose of an EIP was? To deliver improvements to the community was a suggested answer.

Peta Wingrove was asked to explain her use of the term "projects". She indicated she was talking about projects in the EIP. This is something people may not understand if the only thing covered in PP slides is a reference to projects and there is no explanation that they form part of an EIP. Examples of projects were, changing process paths, or covering surfaces.

Peter Baker was keen to get to the root cause of the issues. Adbri needs to get out more and speak with people, particularly those close to the plant.

Donna Hilton commented that culture change is needed and has been needed for a long time. She would not want to see Adbri go, but it needs to be a good neighbour.

Deb Stoeckel has offered her property as a monitor site because it is a fairly new build and has been waiting follow up. Peter Baker offer to follow up with Deb.

At this point the facilitator reminded the CLG that the next meeting is on September 2nd and is a public meeting. There were two sheets of questions submitted from the previous meeting. These questions need to be answered.

Tony Bazeley indicated there were a number of items he raised at a CLG meeting he was awaiting responses to.

A CLG member indicated they understood this meeting was meant to cover the EIP, however it has not been provided. It would have been good to see some suggested deliverables for discussion. We thought we were your testers (of the data) for an opinion.

Johan Revalk indicated we need to discuss the EIP with the broader community as well. So this was really a pre-planning session. The whole community has a right to contribute to the EIP. There will be a draft EIP for the community as well as the CLG

The facilitator asked when the EIP would be available? Adbri's aim was for Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> September. This indicated that the expectation for input to the EIP by the CLG was not met and it would have to happen on Monday September 2nd.

Johan Revalk commented that we have to give people who are not core CLG members an opportunity to comment on the EIP. The meeting on September 2nd should provide an opportunity for everyone to provide feedback as well.

The CLG asked for a draft EIP for this meeting, however they were told at the meeting that it would not be available until the 2nd of September. There may be 100 people at the 2<sup>nd</sup> September meeting who have not seen the EIP until that day. People cannot be expected to provide comment on an EIP with a considerable number of pages, if they do not receive the information in a timely manner.

With no indication as to whether the draft EIP would be made available before the 2<sup>nd</sup> September, the meeting the facilitator indicated she may not be able to continue with the process under these conditions. She was not prepared to breach the Code of Conduct that she works to, and she would be breaching it if she did not raise these issues.

A suggestion was made for the CLG to have thoughts on the projects, and particularly on the existing knowledge they had on the EIP and any ideas around it. Open discussion for preliminary ideas to be thought through based on the earlier EIP. However, the CLG had no information to base this discussion on.

The facilitator moved the discussion to the agenda for the 2<sup>nd</sup> September CLG meeting. Donna Hilton suggested we defer the CLG meeting until after the EIP consultation. The decision was made to go ahead with the meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> September and for the CLG to meet after the community consultation to have input to the EIP.

Agenda items proposed included:

- SA Health session update
- Q&As from the July meeting.
- Follow up from the May event from Adbri.
- EIP consultation information session from Adbri

Peta Wingrove sought to qualify that the draft EIP presented would not look like a current EIP. More likely a PP presentation with cutouts (screenshots) on the key areas would be presented, along with an overview of the EIP process including options projects. It would not be a report e.g. if we are talking about clinker sheds, it will be a one pager on that topic.

The notice that has gone out to the public indicates the draft EIP will be available. What Adbri meant by that is the EIP Projects list with some information will be provided.

The draft EIP is due to the EPA at the end of October. The document will be more in line with the options assessment (of projects).

The drop-in sessions will be round table discussions with table topic information, meeting with people individually and going through the information in detail. As this would take a lot of time, there was a suggestion that the PP slides could be on a rolling presentation. It needs to be made clear to the community that when Adbri talks about projects they are referring to the EIP.

Cr McGregor indicated it would be good to see what changes have been made to the rejected EIP to see the differences. Tony Bazeley indicated quarterly reports used to provide an update on the EIP and asked where this is at.

The EIP Options Assessment is due at the end of September including the Community Engagement undertaken and the changes that have been made. Strong recommendation from tonight is for the community input to be at the front of the EIP.

The draft report is due around middle of September for CLG to look at. Feedback can be provided by the CLG to Adbri up until around 20th September. CLG may need to meet again to decide on their feedback. A summary table at the back of the EIP document would be a useful way of working through the projects.

## **9. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2024 at 6:00 pm in the PAE Town Hall.

Meeting closed at 8.00pm