

Appendix D

Working Group Meeting Reports

The following tables provide the details of the Working Group meetings that occurred prior to the submission of the ERMP. The *Issues*, *Outcomes* and *Actions* are transcribed directly from the meeting reports. Please note that *Process Outcomes* that provided details of observers, apologies handouts and other process points were also recorded. The full meeting reports are located on the Alcoa website at www.alcoa.com/wagerup3

Emissions & Health Working Group

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
1, 18 Oct 2004	Background to consultation	ERMP public consultation, statutory processes and timeline Refinery Process Overview Document Glossary of Abbreviations & Terms Emissions and Health Open Forum outcomes Open Forum Report			Documents relating to the emissions and health components of the ERMP will be sent to all members prior to the next meeting.
1	Outline of Working Groups		A question was raised as to whether this group has the expertise to address technical emissions information, despite being well-intentioned and generally well-informed individuals. After a lengthy	We acknowledged that Jodie Read, Community Relations Officer, Alcoa and Tim McAuliffe, Environmental Consultant for Alcoa, will be observers at every meeting. We noted and accepted that an observer is an onlooker who may be	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
			discussion, we agreed this is a relevant, important issue to be considered.	called upon at any time to provide input, or might also offer input where they think they can help us resolve an issue or reach an outcome.	
1	Selection of Working Group members			<p>We decided who the members of the final working group would be through a process of self-nomination and discussion.</p> <p>We agreed that having community representation from each locality is imperative, and that government representation from both environment and health departments is also essential.</p> <p>The members of Emissions and Health Working Group are: Barry Bowden – Waroona John Bromham – Harvey Kingsley Dyson – Cookernup Les Egerton – Waroona Lindsay Gillam – Department of Health David Puzey – Harvey Tony Hall – Coolup Robin Myers – Waroona Jon Schupp – Waroona David Hanham – Alcoa Colin Scrimshaw – Department of Environment</p> <p>Tony Hall has expressed an interest in joining the group, but was unable to attend tonight. Bradley Chenoweth will confirm his availability for the next meeting.</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
1	Terms of Reference	Draft Terms of Reference		<p>In discussing our draft terms of reference, we clarified that 'confidentiality' refers to the way we relate to each other and how we represent this group as individuals.</p> <p>This conversation led to queries about who will speak on behalf of the working group and our relationship with the media.</p> <p>We agreed that no individual member can make a comment to the media on behalf of the working group.</p> <p>If contacted by the media, the facilitators may confirm that particular topics were discussed, but will not provide details of the meeting.</p> <p>The draft terms of reference were agreed to by the Group.</p>	
1	Reporting to other WGs and CCN	<p>Wagerup Unit Three Consultation - CCN charter</p> <p>Wagerup CCN relationship to Working Groups (diagram)</p>	<p>We heard that there is a perception by some members of the community that the CCN is not impartial or representative of the community.</p> <p>We also heard that the CCN is not controlled by Alcoa, and that membership of the CCN is not restricted to particular members of the community but is open to anybody.</p>	We agreed that Barry Bowden will be the first working group representative to attend the next CCN meeting on Thursday 28 October 2004.	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
1	Independent expert review panel	Independent expert review process Criteria for expert reviewers			
1	Working Group discussions: topics for next four meetings	Draft sequence of discussion points for meetings			
1	Communication process				
2, 28 Oct 2004	Scope of ERMP	Handout 2.1 - Emissions & Health Working Group ERMP Scope Handout 2.2 - What is the quantitative Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to be included in the Unit 3 ERMP? Pinjarra Efficiency Upgrade Environmental Protection Statement (EPS) document (L)	As a Group, we need to establish confidence in the base case or baseline data before moving forward and being able to make informed decisions.	We reviewed the ERMP scope for emissions and health and agreed on the key issues to be addressed by this Working Group.	Provide Working Group (WG) members with reports of the Bunbury Port Consultative Group meetings. Determine when we can examine "potential for dust generation during construction".
2	Wagerup refinery emissions - current state of knowledge	Powerpoint Presentation by Patrick Coffey, 'Wagerup refinery emissions - current state of knowledge'	We discussed how and whether the emissions and health impacts on employees are covered in the ERMP process. We noted that these issues need to be addressed and we need to decide where and when these can be addressed. We recognised that the occupational health and		Distribute copy of Patrick Coffey's presentation to the WG.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
			<p>safety of workers (as they impact on plant design) should be addressed in greater detail should this group continue past the ERMP requirements, but the conversation can continue within this Group.</p> <p>We identified that the ERMP process covers environmental impacts outside the refinery boundary. Emissions and health inside the refinery boundary is interpreted as being the jurisdiction of the Department of Mines and the relevant occupational health and safety bodies.</p> <p>We identified that the design of the plant must have sufficient redundancy built-in so that full maintenance can be carried out.</p>		
2	Independent expert review of key reports	Handout - Independent Expert Reviewer biographies - Emissions			<p>Make available the Roger Drew report on HRA upgrade for Pinjarra.</p> <p>Make available the Expert Review on the Roger Drew report.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
2	Working Group			We accepted that a place on the Working Group will be reserved for John Sabourne, to replace John Bromham as Harvey Shire representative, subject to his participation.	
2	Working Group report				Remove "and sign off" from Section 4 of WG report to CCN, so it becomes a participant register.
3, 11 Nov 2004	Wagerup Unit 3 air emissions modelling overview	<p>Handout 3.1 What is Air Emission Modelling?</p> <p>Handout 3.2 Wagerup 3 Air Emissions Modelling PowerPoint presentation</p> <p>Handout 3.3 Wagerup Unit 3 Modelling Sequence (residue and cooling lake and additional refinery emission monitoring)</p>	<p>A concern was raised that the meteorological data used as input to TAPM (The Air Pollution Model) is not based on worst case scenario (i.e. Not in winter).</p> <p>There was also a concern that the effects of vegetation and topography on air movement have not been factored in TAPM accurately, particularly with regard to the impacts of odour on residents.</p> <p>There was a concern about using VOCs as an indicator of odour, and similarly, the use and definition of 'Odour Unit' as a measurement.</p>	<p>We acknowledge that the draft Refinery baseline modelling and draft RDA/Cooling Pond baseline modelling reports expected at this meeting has not been received, and is due to be completed, and will therefore be made available to the Working Group at the first opportunity.</p> <p>As a follow on, this may therefore require additional meetings in January.</p>	<p>Find out the possibility of a feasibility study about removing vegetable matter prior to coming into contact with caustic, in order to reduce emissions.</p> <p>Distribute & explain the database of 261 compound emissions at Wagerup and the World Health Organisation standards for exposure levels to these compounds.</p> <p>Feedback to CSIRO with regards to the Air Emissions Modelling (presentation):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was DOLA information used for Wagerup-specific land use information for TAPM? How recent is the DOLA database? • Inclusion of Yarloop and Waroona as 'urban areas'. • The use of language and meaning of 'urban areas' is

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
					<p>confusing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does 'PDF' stand for? • What impact does over-prediction of winds have on dilution factors? <p>Find out what technology will be applied to control emissions.</p>
3	Wagerup Action Plan (WAP)	Wagerup Action Plan			<p>Circulate the Wagerup Action Plan (WAP) for discussion at the next meeting.</p> <p>Map WAP recommendations and any actions taken to address them, with regard to data inputs to the model (TAPM).</p>
3	Parliamentary Inquiry				Make available the Parliamentary Inquiry findings relevant to this Working Group.
3	Design redundancy for VOC emissions	Design Redundancy for VOC emissions Air Quality Guarantee: Wagerup 3 (presented Robin Myers, Waroona resident)			Distribute Robin Myers discussion paper to all Working Group members.
3	Pinjarra Efficiency Upgrade	<p>Health Risk & Toxicological Assessment of Emissions from Upgraded Alcoa Pinjarra Alumina Refinery (Executive Summary)</p> <p>Pinjarra Refinery Efficiency Upgrade Review of Draft Health Risk and Toxicological Assessment Report (L)</p>	We discussed the scope of the expert review and how this can influence the outcome of the review.		

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
3	Working Group				Make the Names of Working Group members available to the public through the Harvey Reporter.
3	ERMP issues			We drafted a register of issues that we want overtly addressed in the ERMP, which will be used to establish confidence in the process and outcomes of the consultation.	
4, 9 Dec 2004	Meteorological and dispersion modelling using The Air Pollution Model (TAPM) for Wagerup (Part one)	<p>Meteorological and Dispersion Modelling Using TAPM for Wagerup - CSIRO Summary Presentation</p> <p>Meteorological and Dispersion Modelling Using TAPM for Wagerup - Phase 1: Meteorology (draft report)</p>	<p>We added the following issues to our ERMP/ongoing issues register:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technology that will be used to control emissions 2. Are 27 of the 261 compounds appropriate to test? 3. 'Synergistic' impact of 'cocktail' of chemicals (cumulative impact). 	<p>Ian Galbally and Ashok Luhar, from CSIRO Atmospheric Research, presented a summary of the meteorological and dispersion modelling using The Air Pollution Model (TAPM) for Wagerup, which also generated questions and discussion about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location of weather stations in the Refinery 2. Use of other air pollution models in USA 3. Data inputs into TAPM (supplied by Alcoa). 4. Establishing confidence in the model inputs and outputs. <p>In response to this presentation and reading material we received before the meeting, we raised a number of questions about the use of TAPM, in relation to both the inputs to the model and the outputs. We agreed to compile these outside of this meeting so that our questions are accurately captured, and circulate among the Group and to CSIRO for further discussion at the next meeting on</p>	Forward questions relating to TAPM to Michelle McManus, for circulation among the Group and to CSIRO to continue the discussion at the next meeting.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				Monday 20 December, 12:30pm.	
4	Compound emissions at Wagerup	Handout 4.2 - Wagerup Emissions Summary: Systematic list of compounds detected in gaseous emissions (from Wagerup Air Quality Review, CSIRO, 2004) Handout 4.3 - Health Protective Guidelines (for emissions monitoring)			Email and post Working Group members about speciation of metals (relevant to the Bayer process) and interpretation of guideline values shown in Handout 4.3. Ensure that the list of carcinogens is current in the table in Handout 4.3 (e.g. formaldehyde not shown as a carcinogen in Handout 4.3).
4	Wagerup Action Plan	Handout 4.5 - CSIRO Wagerup Air Quality Review (Wagerup Action Plan recommendations) Wagerup Action Plan - Linkages to the Wagerup Unit 3 ERMP			
4	Independent expert review of key reports	Handout 4.4 - Independent expert reviewer statement of work and biographies of independent expert reviewers - health			Examine scope and CVs of expert reviewers for emissions and health and select preferences for each (including a process used to make this decision).
4	Removal of organics from bauxite	Removal of organics from bauxite (summary)		We received a summary of information about the processes for removing organic matter from bauxite prior to contact with caustic soda, as a follow-up from an Action at meeting 3. We agreed we need to continue discussing this matter.	Provide Alcoa's (full) research studies on bauxite ore treatment to Jon Schupp and a copy for the Library

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>The main discussion topics were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of organics from bauxite because of its potential impact on emissions. 2. Wagerup Action Plan recommendations from the Wagerup Working Group and the linkages to Wagerup Unit 3 ERMP (i.e. how the recommendations will be addressed in the ERMP). 3. Overview of list of compounds (261) that have been detected (at some point) at Wagerup, and their cumulative impact. 4. The health protective guidelines (national and international). 	
4	ERMP Issues Register			<p>We added the following issues to our ERMP/ongoing issues register:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technology that will be used to control emissions 2. Are 27 of the 261 compounds appropriate to test? 3. 'Synergistic' impact of 'cocktail' of chemicals (cumulative impact). 	
4	Parliamentary Inquiry into Wagerup Refinery	Handout 4.1 Legislative Council Inquiry Report into Wagerup Refinery			Compile and distribute to Working Group members the findings relevant to this Working Group from the Standing Committee report.
5, 20 Dec 2004	Meteorological and dispersion modelling using The Air Pollution	Meteorological and Dispersion Modelling Using TAPM for Wagerup - CSIRO Summary Presentation	A question was raised as to whether change in design of the existing operations at Wagerup is possible, to	Ian Galbely and Askok Luhar from CSIRO Atmospheric Research continued their presentation of the meteorological and dispersion	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
	Model (TAPM) for Wagerup (Part two)	<p>Meteorological and Dispersion Modelling Using TAPM for Wagerup - Phase 2: Meteorology (draft report)</p> <p>Phase 3A: HRA (Health Risk Assessment) Concentration Modelling - Current Emission Scenario INTERIM REPORT</p> <p>Handout 5.1 – Wagerup Refinery Air Emissions – Stack Properties for Dispersion Modelling.</p>	incorporate the emissions-reductions technology that will be used for the expanded scenario to ensure that some emissions are not increased (as is the target for Wagerup 3).	<p>modelling using The Air Pollution Model (TAPM) for Wagerup, which generated discussion about the following topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of wind data assimilation 2. Use of Yarloop as a receptor point for the modelling purely as an example 3. Comparison of odour modelling to complaint data 4. Model pathways for pollutants from the Refinery to the surrounding Region 5. Nature and speciation of metals 6. Use of plume enhanced rise for 100m stack and 65m stack <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We heard that a more definitive resolution about this for Wagerup is needed will be produced between now and the middle of January. 7. Concentrated modelling for the Health Risk Assessment 8. Relationship between stack height, plume concentration and therefore the potential distribution of pollutants downwind 9. Stack diameters and implications for TAPM modelling. <p>We discussed the importance of understanding and clarifying the nature of metal or metallic compound that is included in the Health Risk Assessment (HRA), and that in order to do an accurate HRA on certain metals (e.g. cadmium, arsenic and</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				mercury) we also need to know something about the speciation of metals and, where possible, in what quantities they are emitted. We called for the text in the HRA to clearly state this information, and heard that this will indeed be the case.	
5	Resolution of outstanding community issues with the current Refinery operations and production.	Health Impact Proposal (presented by Jon Schupp, Waroona resident)	A member of this Group stated that the Wagerup expansion should not proceed until the current outstanding emissions and health issues associated with Wagerup currently are resolved and we decided that this will be discussed further at the next meeting.	A question was raised as to whether the consultation process this Working Group is currently engaged in is addressing the concerns and questions of all participants, and if the balance of information received meets our various needs. We agreed to give this some thought over the break and make this the first order of business at our next meeting, particularly ways it can improve.	Distribute copy of Jon Schupp's Health Impact Proposal tabled for general business.
5	Expert reviewer preference and selection criteria.				Approach John Bisby as the first preference for expert reviewer for Health and Dr Christine Killop for emissions, to check their availability.
5	Action follow-up				Provide Alcoa's research studies on bauxite ore treatment to Jon Schupp and a copy for the Library
6, 11 Jan 2005	Consultation process review			Review of our Working Group consultation process.	
6	Proposed emissions control for Wagerup 3	Wagerup 3 expansion - engineering design and emissions control presentation (David Hanham and Chris		David Hanham and Chris Phillips (Senior Chemical Engineer, Alcoa) presented the proposed emissions control for the expanded scenario,	Provide a table quantifying the percentage reductions from the emissions control measures and equipment or process

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		Phillips, Senior Chemical Engineer, Alcoa)		<p>which also served to put into context the TAPM (The Air Pollution Model) predictions presented by Ian Galbely from CSIRO Atmospheric Research (meetings 4 & 5, December 2004).</p> <p>The presentation covered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background on environmental controls 2. Ambient air environment and the TAPM (The Air Pollution Model) modelling 3. Wagerup 3 engineering design and emissions control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upgrades and improvements to existing equipment and processes, as well as installation of new equipment 4. Alcoa's commitment of not increasing noise, dust, odour or short and long term emissions impacts on residents, as a result of the proposed Wagerup refinery expansion. 	<p>improvements.</p> <p>Bring copy of Pinjarra Works Approval for the Library.</p> <p>Provide the inputs to TAPM (for the final phase, the expanded scenario) prior to the final report being distributed.</p>
6	Expert review (TAPM and HRA)			Confirmation of our expert reviewers (for both health and emissions)	
6	WG meetings	Potential topics for future Emissions and Health Working Group meetings			
6	ERMP Process			Process for Alcoa's submission of the Environmental Review and Management Plan (ERMP) to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) and how our Working Group deliberations are included in the ERMP	
6	Bauxite Ore Treatment				Provide Alcoa's research studies on bauxite ore treatment to Jon Schupp and a

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
					copy for the Library.
6	Meeting with all WGs				
7, 27 Jan 2005	Health Risk Assessment	<p>Health Risk Assessment overview – presentation by Peter Di Marco, Benchmark Toxicology Services</p> <p>Engaging Stakeholders, Risk Communication and Community Consultation – presentation by Peter Di Marco</p>		<p>Peter Di Marco, the consultant engaged to undertake the Health Risk Assessment (HRA), presented an overview of the HRA process, which covered in particular:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aims of the HRA; 2. Key principles of HRA; 3. Process for undertaking a HRA; 4. Chemicals included in the HRA and how they are selected 5. The 27 chemicals (on the basis of their toxicity and the quantities they are emitted) were identified for inclusion in the HRA from three main sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1. Source emissions from Pinjarra Refinery; 5.2. Monitoring of emissions at Wagerup Refinery; 5.3. National Pollutant Inventory reporting estimates. 6. Understanding how risk is determined; 7. Hazard identification; and 8. Acknowledging the distinction between hazard and risk <p>We heard today that the synergistic effects of compounds are not included in the Health Risk Assessment (HRA).</p> <p>The HRA is just one part of a larger assessment process with regards to health, which includes further work</p>	Provide more specific information about what we would like comment on in the Health Risk Assessment, for Michelle McManus to pass on to Peter Di Marco-HRA consultant.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>such as analysing the link between ambient conditions to weather conditions and complaints data, and using the CSIRO modelling to determine what conditions are likely to cause short-term impacts.</p> <p>We requested that Peter Di Marco make comment specifically on the issue of Multiple Chemical Sensitivity (MCS) and the synergistic effects of chemical compounds in the Health Risk Assessment (HRA).</p>	
				<p>We acknowledge that Peter can give an opinion in terms of expertise and the information that is available to him, and that this would not be part of the assessment itself.</p> <p>We requested that Lindsay Gillam from the Department of Health and David Hanham from Alcoa bring back to this Group some more detailed information which seeks to find resolution to the following issues of particular concern to this Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantifying health impacts within the community, including Multiple Chemical Sensitivity; 2. Determining how many people are affected; and 3. Determining how much of the impact can be attributed to Wagerup Refinery. <p>In addition, we also gave permission</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				for the independent facilitators to write a letter about this to the Department of Health and to Alcoa on the Group's behalf.	
7	Removal of organics from bauxite	Yarloop 'Miasmas' – diagram accompanying presentation and proposal for further research by Jon Schupp, WG member		One of the committee members raised the possibility that there are other external contaminants, due to geological formations of the surrounding environment, that are causing health problems within the community and we believe this should be explored further by government.	Bring the Department of Health's position on providing a diagnostic surgeon in Yarloop to help determine health impacts in the community. Report back after meeting with the Department of Environment about external contaminants. Provide the Government's response to Medical Practitioners Forum recommendations.
7	Emissions control for Wagerup 3			Following up from a discussion at meeting 6 about the systematic list of compounds detected in gaseous emissions (received by the Group at meeting 5), we heard that more than half of the 261 compounds listed in the CSIRO Review were detected at such low levels that they could not be quantified, and many were "tentatively identified", which means that their actual presence is uncertain. It is not standard practice to include trace and tentative identifications in emissions reporting, as they have no real significance, however they are included in the table in the interests of openness and completeness.	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				The number of species that could be quantified with reasonable certainty was 109, of which only 47 had emission rates of greater than 0.1kg/day according to the 2002 Emissions Inventory.	
7	Expert reviewers report	Expert review of CSIRO modelling (Christine Killip);			Provide any additional comments or questions about the expert review of the CSIRO modelling to Michelle McManus, to be provided directly to CSIRO through David Hanham. (Working Group Members) Investigate whether all Working Group members' questions regarding the CSIRO modelling have been answered.
8, 10 Feb 2005	Expert review of TAPM			We requested that we receive a 'lay language' summary of the expert review, to help us understand the significance of the technical review findings. We also suggested that this occur for subsequent reviews and for expert reviews for other Working Groups.	Request the expert reviewer to provide a more 'lay-person friendly' summary of the expert review and subsequent work.
8	Understanding health impacts in the community	Draft letter to Department of Health and to Alcoa		We accepted the draft letter to Alcoa and the Department of Health regarding health concerns in the community, and the individual community members present at today's meeting signed the letter and were happy for the facilitators to send on our behalf.	Bring the Department of Health's position on providing a diagnostic surgeon in Yarloop to help determine health impacts in the community Report back after meeting with the Department of Environment

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				We recognise that in the ERMP, the Wagerup emissions are the primary focus of investigation. However we believe that a comprehensive environmental health investigation needs to be undertaken.	about external contaminants. Provide the Government's response to Medical Practitioners Forum recommendations
8	WG scope and future	Letter from John Clark, member of the Social and Economic Working Group to the Minister of Environment about the scoping of the ERMP, and her response.	We suggested that we need a closer association with the Shires of Waroona and Harvey.	<p>After a lengthy discussion about our purpose, focus and future as a Working Group, we recognised that we are primarily engaged in a process that was set up to look at the Wagerup expansion proposal and understand the potential impacts if the expansion occurs.</p> <p>We noted that the unavoidable delays in information have frustrated the process. However, we acknowledge that there is also a continuing, long-term role for this Group about broader community concerns and contributors to health impacts in the community.</p> <p>We appreciate Alcoa's commitment to continue supporting the Working Groups after the ERMP-specific work has been completed. The structure and process for all Groups should be discussed when all the Working Groups and the CCN come together.</p>	
8	Questions about TAPM modelling	CSIRO responses to community questions about the Wagerup 3 Modelling			
8	Power cogeneration	Handout on power cogeneration as part of Wagerup Unit 3 Project			

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
8	Emissions sources and substances				Provide further information, where possible, about key emission sources and key substances to understand where the increases will occur and where others will be offset.
8	Emissions control for Wagerup 3				Invite Fabien Syants, from the Department of Environment to the next meeting to quantify emissions reductions from engineering solutions.
9, 24 Feb 2005	Emissions reductions at Wagerup - previous engineering works	Fabien Styants, DoE, presentation on emissions reductions		<p>Fabien Styants, from the Department of Environment, presented the Department's perspective on emissions reductions that have been achieved from previous engineering works undertaken at the Refinery (1996 – 2002), based on information obtained from the Report of the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs in Relation to the Alcoa Refinery at Wagerup Inquiry.</p> <p>Fabien indicated that the Department of Environment submitted that “significant reductions in noise and odour emissions had been achieved (in 2002)”.</p> <p>The key discussion points that arose from this presentation were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The independent verification of the input data supplied by Alcoa for emissions reduction modelling (undertaken by CSIRO, AWN etc); 2. Clarification of the meaning of 	Seek update from engineers about any changes or additions to engineering solutions already proposed.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>Alcoa's commitment that there will be 'no increase in noise, odour and dust impacts as a result of the expansion', and that doubling production does not mean doubling emissions; and</p> <p>3. Engineering design and works can reduce emissions to meet this commitment for the expanded scenario.</p> <p>We requested that a written update on the engineering works be provided to this Group.</p>	
9	Letter to Wayne Osborn re community health	<p>Copy of letter to Wayne Osborn from Working Group</p> <p>Copy of the letter response from Wayne Osborn, Alcoa</p>		<p>In response to our letter seeking information about health impacts in the community, we received a letter from Mr. Wayne Osborn, Managing Director, Alcoa.</p> <p>We were informed that Alcoa and the Department of Health are currently engaged in discussions as to how a community health survey could best be undertaken in the area surrounding the Wagerup Refinery.</p> <p>His letter stated "The investigations being undertaken as part of the Wagerup Unit Three ERMP include several important studies designed specifically to assess the potential for refinery emissions to affect community health, both in the current situation and if the proposed expansion was to proceed."</p> <p>The letter indicated that details of this</p>	<p>Invite Professor D'Arcy Holman to present at the next meeting or present our questions for a written response through correspondence, whichever he is most available</p> <p>Bring a copy of the Kwinana Health Survey recently completed by the Department of Health to all Working Group members</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>are still to be worked out. We were pleased to hear that the scope of the survey will be included in the ERMP, making it available for community comment during the 10 week public review period.</p> <p>Mr. Osborn said "This would ensure that, should the Wagerup Unit 3 project proceed, information would be available for the current situation prior to commissioning Alcoa hopes that community confidence would be further assisted by ongoing emissions and ambient monitoring and a follow up health survey once Unit Three was in operation."</p> <p>Overall, we support the undertaking of a survey and look forward to hearing more about this as the details emerge.</p>	
9	Future meeting agenda items	<p>Upgraded Sprinkler System Assessment – Approach</p> <p>Review of compound selection for the Health Risk Assessment for the proposed expansion</p> <p>Presentation summary to accompany and explain the Draft CSIRO Final Report (Phase 3B: health Risk Assessment Concentration Modelling – Expanded Refinery Scenario)</p>		<p>The following additional information was also tabled for our review outside the meeting and further discussion at the next meeting if necessary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Upgraded sprinkler system assessment – approach 2. Review of compound selection for the Health Risk Assessment for the proposed expansion 3. Presentation summary to accompany and explain the Draft CSIRO Final Report (Phase 3B: health Risk Assessment Concentration Modelling – Expanded Refinery Scenario) <p>We heard that the CSIRO report has also been sent off for expert review.</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>The next meeting is scheduled for: Thursday 10 March 2005, 8am, Waroona Senior Citizens Centre</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Substances identified for assessment in HRA 2. Combined Wagerup (refinery + diffuse source) modelling 3. Draft Air Management Plan <p>Thursday 31 March 2005, 8am, Waroona Senior Citizens Centre</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draft Quantitative Health Risk Assessment report 2. Expert review of HRA 	
9	Expert review of TAPM	Expert review of CSIRO modelling, phase 1 and 2 (Christine Killip) (distributed meeting 7);			<p>Request the expert reviewer to provide a more 'lay-person friendly' summary of the expert review and subsequent work.</p> <p>Seek a letter response to this Group from the expert reviewer about the concerns raised in her report and how they were addressed.</p> <p>Provide the AWN report and subsequent letter to all Working Group members.</p> <p>Conversion of input of emissions values data in CSIRO Final Report.</p>
9	Environmental monitoring and health impact linkages	Draft Report: Wagerup Alumina Refinery – Environmental Monitoring and Health Impact linkages			Find out the size of the power generation unit for the proposal.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		<p>Wagerup Community Working Group meeting minutes, 25 September 2003</p> <p>Wagerup Environmental Review and Management Plan extracts from 1978</p> <p>Registry of Toxic Effects of Chemical Substances: Aluminium oxide, November 2004 updated.</p>			
10, 10 Mar 2005	Final outcomes from the WG	AWN Report and covering letter		We commenced drafting our final outcomes and issues to go into the Environmental Review and Management Plan (ERMP).	
10	Health Risk Assessment			We request that Alcoa quantify the amount of aluminium oxide released through the stacks from Refinery processes and provide this information to the Health Risk Assessment consultant.	
10	Future meeting dates and agenda items			<p>Future meeting details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thursday 31 March 2005, 8am, Waroona Community Centre: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expert reviewer's final report (of TAPM) 2. Preliminary final outcomes Thursday 7 April 2005, 8am, venue to be advised <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health Risk Assessment (HRA) outcomes 2. Preliminary final outcomes. 	<p>Follow-up on Alcoa's responses to the questions put to CSIRO from this Working Group.</p> <p>Send expert reviewer's final report prior to meeting 11 is possible.</p> <p>Find out how much of the increased production resulting from the expansion will go</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
					<p>through the existing calciners.</p> <p>Find out why the cooling towers were not included in the TAPM modelling for methalyne chloride as well as the liquor burner.</p> <p>Ask Peter Di Marco to look at the one-hour variations, as detailed in the CSIRO 3B report (p 129 [30], point 8).</p>
11, 30 Mar 2005	Dr. Paul Van Buyder Presentation on the Department of Health's overall approach to the decision making authority in Wagerup expansion proposal.	Dr. Paul Van Buyder (DoH) Presentation		Dr. Paul Van Buynder, Principal Medical Consultant, Department of Health attended a meeting to present information about the Department of Health's overall approach and role as a decision making authority in assessing expansion projects, and how this approach applies to the Wagerup expansion proposal.	
11	TAPM Model			We request that CSIRO and the expert reviewer of the TAPM model comment on the effect and usefulness of the near-completed weather station on the Scarp on the air emissions modelling.	
11	Expert Review			We would like the details of what requests the expert reviewer made to CSIRO and the responses from CSIRO.	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
11	Group Discussion				<p>Feedback to the Group about further discussions about the omission of the cooling towers was not included in the TAPM modelling for methalyne chloride as well as the liquor burner.</p> <p>Send draft reply of letter response from the Group to Glen Turner</p>
12, 31 Mar 2005	Air Emissions Expert Review			<p>We refer the air emissions expert review to Alcoa and request that all the matters raised by Christine Killop be fully addressed, with particular focus on the following two recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Strongly recommends the maximum exposed location outside Alcoa lease boundary is also presented and the change in impacts for the expansion assessed at this location". 2. "For the current operation of the refinery impacts in Yarloop, the modelling may have underestimated both short and long term maximum impacts, as data assimilation is not included. We recommend that such modelling be done with data assimilation". <p>We note that the expert reviewer indicates that the question previous posed in the draft report 'is the model</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>predicting the right answer for the right reason?' remains unanswered, suggesting that further verification of the model is required.</p>	
12	Interim Health Risk Assessment (HRA) Outcomes - Peter Di Marco	Peter Di Marco Presentation		<p>Peter Di Marco presented the interim Health Risk Assessment outcomes covering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acute Hazard Index 2. Chronic Hazard Index 3. Incremental Carcinogenic Risk <p>For the current refinery, the expanded scenario with cogeneration and the expanded scenario with boilers.</p> <p>We noted that the assessment is based on a conservative approach, tending to overestimate rather than underestimate the health risks.</p> <p>Peter Di Marco indicated that emissions from current operations and proposed operations are unlikely to pose a health risk.</p> <p>A member of the Group raised a question about speciation of metals, given that many metals occur in a variety of form naturally and in the mining refining process (i.e. what form of metals are assessed?) is taken into account for the HRA.</p> <p>Peter indicated that the screening</p>	Send Summary of HRA to all Working Group members

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>assessment, given the conservative approach, showed that there was no appreciable risk associated with metals and therefore this refinement was considered unnecessary.</p> <p>We request confirmation that an assessment of the predicted vs. measured ground level concentrations of an indicative species has been undertaken.</p> <p>We would like to receive a copy of the HRA for our review and consideration, and then decide whether to come together as a Group and have Peter Di Marco present for a full discussion.</p> <p>Peter also offered to be a point of contact for the Group outside the meetings. We are aware that the expert review of the HRA may not be available for this Group to consider before the ERMP is submitted.</p>	
<p>13, 07 Apr 2005</p>	<p>ERMP Outcomes</p>			<p>Some members noted their disappointment that the imposed timeframe to contribute our final outcomes to the ERMP, has not enabled us to consider all the important information we need to assess, in particular the full HRA report and expert review of the HRA.</p>	
<p>13</p>	<p>Working Group Meeting -Post ERMP</p>			<p>We decided to meet again after the ERMP is submitted, but before its public release, to review these key documents.</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>We request to receive hard copies and electronic copies of the relevant documents one week prior to our next meeting.</p> <p>We understand that any new outcomes generated by these discussions may be lodged to the EPA as a public submission by the Group during the 10-week public comment period.</p>	
13	Final Working Group Outcomes			<p>We completed and signed off our final Working Group outcomes for submission to Alcoa for inclusion in the ERMP.</p> <p>Note: The group was informed that David Puzey had resigned.</p> <p>Tony Hall was an apology for the meeting.</p>	

Land Management Working Group

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
<p>1, 26 Oct 2004 Note: The Land Management Working Group met twice before adopting the independently facilitated process and associated reporting process.</p>	Working Group consultation framework and background	<p>ERMP public consultation, statutory processes and timeline</p> <p>Land Management Open Forum outcomes</p> <p>Open Forum Report</p> <p>Process Overview Document</p>		<p>We agreed to adopt the process of independent facilitation that the other W3 Working Groups are using.</p> <p>A question was raised as to whether this group is safeguarded against litigation.</p> <p>We clarified that as we are engaged in a community consultation process, and we are not offering a professional opinion, we are not liable for litigation.</p>	Glossary of terms and acronyms of ERMP specific terms
<p>1</p>	Selection of Working Group members			<p>We decided to form the group from the people who attended tonight's meeting & who were identified as representatives at the Open Space Forum.</p> <p>We agreed the members of the Land Management Working Group are: Glen Turner Rob Romeo Karen Liddiard Brian Doy Jean Branchi Angela O'Brien Helen Alexander Gail Wickham Geoff Cattach Merv McDonald Dave McKittrick</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				We decided that no State government representative will be on this Working Group, unless we request their participation (i.e. they are invited as observers).	
1	Terms of Reference	Draft Terms of Reference			
1	Reporting to other WGs and CCN	Wagerup Unit Three Consultation - CCN charter Wagerup CCN relationship to Working Groups (diagram)		We clarified that the CCN's role in the Working Group process is to ensure the independent facilitation process is open, fair & transparent, and is responsible for communicating the information to the wider community. They do not change or edit the content, but they may raise questions or suggest additional topics for discussion.	
1	Alcoa's land management policy in Area B			The group's proposal was accepted by Giulio Casello, with some changes. The key points of the proposal are set out below, and an acceptance letter will be provided with these meeting notes. Alcoa will agree to purchase the defined properties for: 1. The life of the property owner, or their surviving spouse or partner still living in the residence; or 2. The life of the Wagerup refinery (whichever comes first).	Follow up with Giulio to get his commitment that 'Alcoa will walk away from Wagerup stage 3 if they have to move the town of Yarloop' in writing

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>Alcoa proposes to do this by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Immediately extending the period during which Alcoa will purchase at any time from 31 December 2006 to 31 December 2011 (in accordance with the Wagerup Land Management Revised Proposal, January 2002). 2. Agreeing to purchase after 2001 if the owner has first marketed the property for six months but has been unable to find a buyer at fair market value. <p>The group heard that Alcoa has a long-term commitment to Yarloop & Hamel, and have a commitment to see these towns prosper.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">2, 9 Nov 2004</p>	<p>Working Group discussions</p>			<p>We clarified that this Working Group acts as an advisory group and is in no position to make decisions or commitments on behalf of the broader community, without the endorsement of the community.</p> <p>We agreed that the following issues will be addressed by this Working Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Terms of Agreement 2. Area A 3. Area B between individual land owners and Alcoa. 4. B Area – flesh out detail 5. A Area – letter confirming offer clearly 6. Valuations process – A, B [plus outside A and B] 7. Capital gains 	<p>Follow up with Giulio Casello's written statement, as per Meeting One Action, by the next meeting.</p> <p>Confirm any ERMP-related land management issues to be addressed by this Group.</p> <p>Refer the issue of bank loan difficulties for people in Areas A and B, and also people outside these areas, to the Social and Economic (S & E) Working Group.</p> <p>Seek legal advice in writing on what needs to be disclosed by landowners selling their properties to third parties, with</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>8. Stamp duty</p> <p>9. What happens to people outside Area A and B?</p> <p>10. What about people who bought post (Land Management Plan) 2001, December?</p> <p>11. Open Forum weekend – land management issues</p> <p>12. Any ERMP issues?</p>	regards to Alcoa and perceived impacts.
2	Other groups addressing land management issues			The Group was informed out of courtesy that a letter from the Community Alliance for Positive Solutions (CAPS), that addresses land management issues, will be presented to the CCN (but not on behalf of this Group).	
3, 23 Nov 2004	Alcoa's commitment to the local area	Letter from Giulio Casello re Alcoa's commitment to Yarloop and Hamel	<p>We commenced discussion of the issues around the valuation process for Area A & B.</p> <p>This is a work in progress that will inform a significant part of the recommendations and outcomes from this Working Group.</p>	<p>We strongly feel that there is overlap between this Working Group and the Emissions and Health Working Group. We therefore decided to refer the following questions, in reference to the letter received at this meeting from Giulio Casello, relating to emissions and health to that Working Group, and would like explicit acknowledgement of the receipt of these questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How will the 'no increase in odour, noise or dust impacts' be measured? 2. What safeguards will the community have if impacts do increase? <p>Although the letter said there would be no increase in odour, noise or dust impacts, we noted with concern that it did not say there would be no increase</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>in emissions. The group heard that it was not possible to expand the refinery without an increase in some emissions, such as greenhouse gases. We refer this to the Emissions & Health Group also.</p> <p>We indicated a concern that emissions are affecting land values.</p>	
3	Valuation methods in Area B			<p>With regards to Action 4 from the previous meeting, we heard that for legal and ethical reasons, Alcoa is unable to provide advice on disclosure for landowners selling their property, so members of the Group undertook to do their own research and report back to the next meeting (refer to Actions).</p>	<p>Research what disclosure information land buyers receive when they purchase in the area.</p> <p>Copy of what Alcoa supplies to purchasers as relevant documents</p> <p>Provide two draft Terms of Agreements – one for Area A and one for Area B.</p> <p>Ask a representative from the Citizens Advice Bureau or the REIWA to explain disclosure requirements.</p>
3	Working Group discussions & confidentiality			<p>A concern was raised that some people in the community are unsure about what they are able to say about the Working Group process outside the Working Group meetings.</p> <p>The Group wanted an opportunity for all the Working Groups to get together and there is a desire to promote genuine dialogue between the Groups.</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				We suggested that the facilitators may need to re-clarify the confidentiality process across the Working Groups.	
4, 14 Dec 2004	Disclosure to property buyers and Wagerup Land Management Proposal			<p>With regards to what landowners are required to disclose when an individual sells a property, Helen Alexander reported back to the group that she received limited advice from a real estate agent about this matter, which was broadly that it is up to individual owners to make disclosures, but it was suggested that individuals should seek advice from a lawyer for more information.</p> <p>We received the Annexure to the contract of sale that Alcoa provides, and which property buyers sign upon reading the Wagerup Land Management Proposal (for Area B).</p> <p>We will continue discussing disclosure requirements when we receive information that Angela O'Brien has agreed to research and when we hear from representatives from the Citizens Advice Bureau</p>	
4	Area B agreement	Draft Letter of Agreement (Area B) Informal Land Management	<p>We may choose in the future to go the public with our recommendations before we make any final decisions</p> <p>The group aims to finalise their recommendations by</p>		Distribute a copy of Annexure to the Wagerup Land Management Revised Proposal (January 2002) that people who buy properties from Alcoa sign and receive when upon their purchase. Provide feedback to Brian on

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
			June 2005.		<p>the draft letter of agreement and the Informal Land Management document.</p> <p>Provide more detailed information about comparison of market value vs. replacement value: · Definition around the terms 'unaffected market value' and 'fair market value' · Property sales data · Percentage differences between market valuation and replacements valuation (based on information from Area A).</p> <p>Bring draft letter about the Terms of Agreements for Area A, for us to decide whether to pursue concurrently or after we have looked at the Area B Terms of Agreement.</p> <p>Bring feedback to Brian on the draft letter of agreement and the Informal Land management document.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
5, 18 Jan 2005	Alcoa's presence in the community			<p>A member of this Group expressed the view that if Alcoa were not here then the concerns raised within this and other Working Groups would be redundant.</p> <p>An observer also stated that he does not want to be represented by negative statements and opinions from Working Group members.</p> <p>We agreed, and reiterated that we are here as individuals on the Working Group, and do not claim to represent the wider community.</p> <p>We acknowledge that this Working Group is make up of different people seeking different outcomes, and we are not going to be able to address all the individual issues (of the members and other individuals in the community) because we don't have all the information and there are diverse concerns and needs.</p>	
5	Working Group process			<p>After a lengthy discussion about our purpose and our progress so far, we agreed on the following meeting principles to assist us in moving forward as a Group:</p> <p>1. An agenda for each meeting is developed and Working Group members wishing to add items to the agenda should contact the facilitators prior to the meeting and their item may be addressed at the end of the</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>meeting or with the relevant topic. 2. We agreed to the agenda that we set in meeting 2, 9 November 2004. 3. Participation within this Working Group is based on the understanding that Alcoa will not support moving the town of Yarloop or Hamel and doesn't support making the whole of Yarloop or whole of Hamel a buffer zone (i.e. removing the zones A and B). We acknowledge however that community members have other avenues for this to be explored. This principle will be reviewed at the end of this Working Group process.</p>	
5	Letter of agreement for Area B			We accepted the second draft letter of agreement for Area B, which incorporated our suggestions forwarded to Brian Doy between meetings.	
5	Valuations process for Area B			<p>After discussing the issue of choosing valuers and determining unaffected market value at length, we were unable to reach a conclusion and agreed that we need to invite a member of the Baseline Study Committee to provide some feedback and that all Working Group members are better informed of valuation issues.</p>	<p>Find out when the Baseline Study Committee is going to meet next and when a presentation can be made to this Group.</p> <p>Find any reports from valuers that resulted from previous land management discussions (from other townsites) that talk about valuation processes and unaffected market values.</p> <p>Distribute guidelines for valuers from the Australian Property Institute.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
5	Fostering community support for WG outcomes			<p>A question was raised by an observer as to what processes are in place to ensure that decisions made in this Group have broad community support and how can community members provide feedback to the Group on its proposals to Alcoa.</p> <p>We confirmed that the meeting outcomes are published in the Harvey Reporter, the meeting report is published in full on Alcoa's website and all community members are invited to attend and interact at any meeting.</p> <p>Further, when a decision point is reached, an opportunity for comment will be made to the public.</p>	
5	Letter of agreement for Area A				Bring draft letter about the Terms of Agreements for Area A, for us to decide whether to pursue concurrently or after we have looked at the Area B Terms of Agreement.
6, 8 Feb 2005	Draft letter of agreement Area A	Draft letter of agreement Area A		We have viewed the draft letter of agreement for Area A; we believe that the letter formally acknowledges the offer made to landowners in Area A.	Provide comments on Draft Letter of Agreement, Area A to Brian Doy.
6	Draft letter of agreement, Townships of Yarloop and Hamel	Draft letter of agreement, Townships of Yarloop and Hamel		<p>We also reviewed the draft letter of agreement for the townships of Yarloop and Hamel.</p> <p>We believe that it formally acknowledges the offer made by Alcoa to Area B residents, and acknowledge</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>that it does not bind individuals to sell their properties to Alcoa. We agreed that the letter to those people affected in Area B should be distributed as soon as possible.</p> <p>The discussions about determining unaffected market value and fair market value continue to be topic of discussion through the Land Management Working Group and Alcoa is committed to finishing this process.</p>	
6	Baseline Study report			<p>We were advised that the Baseline Study has been completed, although the purpose of the Study has been superseded by Alcoa's decision to extend the offer to purchase in Area B.</p> <p>We have invited Jenny LeFleur, a member of the Baseline Study Committee, to the next meeting to help us better understand the study and valuation processes, and help us decide whether to continue compiling the relevant statistical data.</p> <p>We agreed to forward the following questions to Jenny for her to address at the next meeting.</p> <p>We hope to be able to use this information to become better informed to recommend a process for determining unaffected market value. As a process point, we will also</p>	<p>Provide copies of the Executive Summary (stand-alone) and the full Baseline Study Reports to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yarloop Community Centre; • Yarloop Library; and • Waroona Telecentre <p>Prepare some additional contextual background to the Baseline Study (in addition to the consultants brief) to provide alongside the reports.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>address these questions in the outcomes of the meeting report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the guidelines that valuers work to? 2. What is expected of them? 3. What should their reports look like? 4. What are the factors they need to consider? 5. Why can there be such a discrepancy with such values? 6. Do valuers use a costing per square metre to help them determine the value? 7. How does the way it is built or the quality of construction and fittings impact on the value? How are they taken into consideration? 8. Should we have a panel of valuers, how do we select them and how often do we change them? 9. Does or should the valuer consult the owner? 10. Definition of fair market value? 11. What happens when a property cannot be compared to another in the area? 12. How do you take into account over-capitalisation? 13. How do you think the Baseline Study went? Was it done in a fair manner and unbiased? 14. Does the Baseline Study provide any useful data or a useful process to help in determining unaffected market value? 	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				15. Will it be useful to include in any future statistical analysis sales outside of Area A and the townships of Yarloop and Hamel?	
6	Land Management in the ERMP	Informal Land Management section of the ERMP		We accepted the revised section titled 'Informal land management' for inclusion in the Environmental Review Management Plan (ERMP) document.	
7, 23 Feb 2005	Valuations process for Area B	Presentation by Jenny LeFevre, based on questions recorded at previous meeting	Should the information from Jenny be unavailable at the next meeting, we will postpone the meeting until this information is available.	<p>Jenny LeFevre, a licensed valuer and member of the licensed valuer's board, attended the meeting to answer our questions (raised in the previous meeting) about the valuations process and about the Baseline Study for Yarloop, Hamel and Benchmark Towns.</p> <p>We sought advice from Jenny on a number of matters which we want to explore further, particularly developing a panel of valuers and development of proforma instructions for valuers.</p> <p>To assist us in moving forward, we requested that Jenny draft some points for proforma instructions and a sample valuers report.</p>	<p>Provide copies of the Executive Summary (stand-alone) and the full Baseline Study Reports to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yarloop Community Centre; • Yarloop Library; and • Waroona Telecentre <p>Prepare some additional contextual background to the Baseline Study (in addition to the consultants brief) to provide alongside the reports.</p>
8, 29 Mar 2005	Baseline Study Report			<p>Further to her presentation at the previous meeting, we heard that Jenny LeFevre has been contracted by Alcoa to assist this Working Group in the valuations process for Alcoa purchases in Yarloop and Hamel.</p> <p>We reviewed and accepted the scope of work set out for her.</p>	<p>Distribute Area A letter to residents</p> <p>Send re-drafted informal land management section of the ERMP.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>We received a first draft of written instructions and guidelines for licensed valuers asked to value properties at the “unaffected market value” (in the form of a letter from residents – the instructing party), prepared by Jenny LeFevre.</p> <p>We are awaiting more detailed assessment guidelines and suggested reporting styles from Jenny, at which time we will examine more comprehensively and provide feedback.</p> <p>In the meantime, we have offered to be a point of reference for Jenny to consider including specific factors in the guidelines (i.e. that are unique to this area).</p> <p>We heard that the Baseline Study Committee is currently considering future of the study outcomes and requested some direction from this Working Group as to the value in continuing the study.</p> <p>We agreed that the Study can provide a useful benchmark for towns in the area and, overall, it would therefore be useful to continue.</p> <p>In particular, gathering more statistical data on repeat sales would be useful and should be broadened to include</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>broad acre and small farms, as well as townships.</p> <p>A community member raised a question concerning land owners beyond area A and B and asked "when is their situation going to be discussed and addressed". We heard that Alcoa continues to negotiate with individual landholders outside Area A and B on a one-on-one, case by case basis.</p> <p>We will examine this as a future agenda item for this Group when we have completed current discussions regarding Area B.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the situation in these areas is more complex, requiring more focus on individual circumstances and therefore overarching guidelines may be difficult to produce.</p> <p>We emphasised the importance for Alcoa to continue liaising with impacted landholders beyond areas A and B.</p>	
8	ERMP Final Outcomes			<p>We generated our final outcomes that will go to the ERMP.</p> <p>Note: The following Working Group members were not present at this meeting. Karen Liddiard</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				Angela O'Brien Helen Alexander Geoff Cattach	

Noise & Transport Working Group

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
1, 19 Oct 2004	Background to consultation	<p>ERMP public consultation, statutory processes and timeline</p> <p>ERMP public consultation, statutory processes and timeline</p> <p>Refinery Process Overview Document</p> <p>Glossary of Abbreviations & Terms</p> <p>Transport and Noise Open Forum Outcomes</p> <p>Open Forum Full report</p>			Report to the group the scope and details of the ERMP sections relevant to transport and noise.
1	Outline of Working Groups				
1	Selection of Working Group members			<p>Given the smaller group numbers, everyone present agreed to stay on as permanent members of the Working Group.</p> <p>We also agreed to the conditions of observers, and the option for individuals to send a replacement as an observer, should an individual be unable to attend.</p> <p>The members of the Transport and Noise Working Group are: Ray Suarez – Cookernup John Oliver – Alcoa Transportation</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>and Logistics Manager David Kemp – Binningup David South – Australind Anita Logiudice – Alcoa Environmental Scientist Garry Oliver – Waroona Eric Walmsley – Wagerup Graeme Baesjou – Collie</p> <p>The last 3 people listed above were unable to attend tonight, but are willing to be involved and their membership was accepted by those present.</p> <p>During the membership discussion, the question was raised as to whether a relevant rail service provider was invited to be part of this Working Group.</p> <p>It was suggested that the group invite a representative as an observer when the need arises.</p> <p>Any member of the Working Group is free to invite someone at any time, but we also agreed that John Oliver, who managed rail contracts for Alcoa, could be a contact person to organise this component.</p> <p>Also during our membership discussion, we clarified that David South's involvement as an interested community member is not compromised by his role as an Alcoa employee and he was welcomed by</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				the group.	
1	Terms of Reference	Draft Terms of Reference		The draft terms of reference were agreed to by the group	
1	Reporting to other WGs and CCN	Wagerup Unit Three Consultation - CCN charter Wagerup CCN relationship to Working Groups (diagram)		We agreed that Anita Logiudice will be our first reporter to the CCN and from here on we will rotate this responsibility among members.	
1	Independent expert review panel	Independent expert review process Criteria for expert reviews			
1	Working Group discussions: topics for next four meetings	Draft sequence of discussion points for meetings	<p>The question was raised as to exactly how we direct the questions or issues raised by this Working Group to the relevant Alcoa representatives and further, when we will be able to get a response.</p> <p>We confirmed that the purpose of having Alcoa representatives with relevant knowledge and expertise in transport (John) and noise (Anita) is to act as an interface between Alcoa and the Working Group.</p> <p>We also acknowledged that for the transport aspect, commitment to a time frame for Alcoa reporting back to the group may be difficult to predict, given that the</p>		Clarify when noise and train options studies can be made available prior to next meeting

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
			<p>railway providers are somewhat separate to this process.</p> <p>We acknowledged that the complex nature of the ownership and operation of the trains/train line will need to be considered at future meetings, under various discussion points. This particularly relates to who owns the trains and leases infrastructure.</p>		
1	WG Communication process				
1	Parallel community consultation processes (ERMP)			Consultation with Bunbury Port, as part of the overall consultation, was acknowledged and noted by the group.	
2, 28 Oct 2004	Scope of ERMP	Handout 2.1 - ERMP Scope Refinery Operation Noise Components and draft working group meeting priorities	<p>We noted that the rail line and rail carriage services are contracted by Alcoa, and therefore outside their control, and also partly outside the scope of the ERMP.</p> <p>This raises an issue about Alcoa's ability to influence another party, and the community's ability to influence another party. We suggested tabling this for consideration past the</p>	We agreed to the key transport and refinery operation noise components that will be covered by this Working Group for the ERMP.	Amendment to 5th ERMP scoping issue to include "and potential opportunities.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
			<p>ERMP- related meetings. This can also be suggested as an issue for inclusion in the ERMP.</p> <p>We noted that a similar community consultation process is currently underway in Fremantle to address the increase in freight trains (in that area).</p> <p>It was suggested we contact the relevant Government representative in the future to discuss their process.</p>		
2	Wagerup refinery noise variation application (Regulation 17)	Wagerup Refinery Regulation 17 Variation Application Update (presentation, Anita Logiudice)	<p>There was a concern about what happens if there is a noise increase from the expanded scenario and if Alcoa can apply for another Regulation 17 Variation.</p> <p>We suggested that a representative from the Department of Environment should be invited to a future meeting to clarify the regulatory possibilities.</p> <p>A question was raised about how enforceable Ministerial Conditions are, and what would happen if Alcoa does not comply with them.</p>		

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
2	Noise model overview	Handout 2.2 Noise Model fact Sheet			<p>Invite SVT representative to next meeting to present base case, explain checking process for noise model</p> <p>Find out if data from Noise Monitoring Stations is available past 2001.</p>
2	Typical Wagerup road and rail movements (current)	Handout 2.4 Wagerup Refinery - Current typical Transport Profile			<p>Find out current train load, details of all trains that use the line and the times they are used. Invite rail representative to attend meeting 4</p> <p>Source data from the rail company for explaining the measured noise from all existing rail traffic.</p> <p>Invite representative from the rail company to attend meeting 4.</p>
2	Working Group discussions: topics for next four meetings		<p>Eric Walmsley declared that he is an Alcoa employee at Wagerup, but clarified that he is here representing himself and his family as residents of Wagerup.</p> <p>We noted that this means there are 4 people on this Group that work for Alcoa.</p>		
2	Independent expert review of noise model	Handout 2.5 Independent Expert Review (Noise) biographies	A concern was raised about the accuracy of the Noise Model.		

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
3, 10 Nov 2004	Reg 17 and ERMP Scope			<p>We will address the Regulation 17 issues & ERMP issues as separate items when examining noise-related components for the ERMP.</p> <p>We commenced logging transport and noise issues that we would like overtly addressed in the ERMP.</p> <p>We noted that this is a working document that will be progressed at each meeting and will form a significant part of the outcomes of this consultation process.</p>	Try to produce a flow chart illustrating ERMP and Reg 17 as they stand alone
3	Noise modelling overview	Alcoa Wagerup Historical Refinery Noise Levels (Worst Case) at Boundary Road Logger 3 Location			Find out how long it will take to extend the noise level data past 2001.
3	Rail noise			<p>We suggested that Alcoa's noise consultant liaise with ARG (the rail service provider) to measure train noise from a sample representative of all trains (i.e. not just Alcoa's) as they pass through Yarloop. We developed some guidelines for scoping the work to be undertaken, subject to further suggestions from the noise consultant.</p>	<p>Prepare and seek advice for the scope for the rail noise consultant to undertake noise sampling.</p> <p>Feedback on the rail noise scope to Jodie Read.</p> <p>Flag issues or questions that could be specifically addressed by ARG representatives at the next meeting.</p>
3	Rail traffic on the South West main line (current)	<p>Handout 3.1 Train Services SW Main (for one week)</p> <p>Handout 3.2 Train Services SW Main (Sunday) Handout 3.2</p>			Clarify responsibility for train movement within Refinery and how it contributes to REG 17 processes and ERMP process as it relates to noise

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
3	Road and rail planning for Wagerup Three	Handout 3.3 Rail Capacity Planning Options for Wagerup 3			
4, 25 Nov 2004	Noise variation application (Regulation 17) and ERMP processes	Handout 4.1 Flowchart showing Alcoa's approach to noise in Wagerup Unit 3 and Reg 17	<p>The issues (relevant to this topic) that were added to our working document – the ERMP transport and noise issues register are:</p> <p>If it costs \$21m to avoid need for Regulation 17 application then is it reasonable or practicable to spend that amount?</p>		Circulate email of confirmation from the Department of Environment about how issues are dealt with in the Wagerup ERMP process
4	Rail noise (presentation by Australian Railroad Group)	<p>Historical Refinery Noise Levels (worst case) at Boundary Logger Road Logger 3 location (Graph)</p> <p>Presentation by Tim Ryan, General Manager of WestNet Rail</p>	<p>The issues (relevant to this topic) that were added to our working document – the ERMP transport and noise issues register are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise Vs Nuisance (refer to outcome) 2. Options for reducing noise levels on trains or acoustic treatment of trains? 	<p>We expressed our thanks for the attendance of Peter Satie, Australian Railroad Group Regional Transportation Manager, and the presentation from Tim Ryan, General Manager of WestNet Rail, which was based largely on questions about rail noise that were raised at previous meetings and fell under the following key headings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sources of railway noise 2. Control of railway noise <p>Further to the question about rail noise controls that was formally asked at the CCN meeting last night, we also heard today that there is shared responsibility between Alcoa and the rail service providers to address the issue.</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>1. Typical levels of noise 2. Noise sources between Brunswick and Pinjarra 3. Community Issues.</p> <p>Following up Action from last meeting, we heard that rail noise is exempt from the specific environmental protection noise regulations, but noise from the loading point and associated equipment at the Refinery is included under the Regulations.</p> <p>It was questioned whether the levels of compliance with the regulations adequately deal with nuisance noise experienced by some nearby residents, and we added this to our ERMP issues register.</p> <p>At the CCN meeting, our reporter was asked why this Group is addressing rail noise when it is outside Alcoa's control.</p> <p>ARG advised that railway noise is exempt from the specific noise regulations from the EPA, however because rail noise is of concern to the community, this Group will continue to investigate this issue.</p>	
4	Rail noise study	Sound pressure level data for trains on line between Wagerup and Bunbury (results of data samples collected by Herring Storer Acoustics on 22 & 23 November 2004 as a			Invite Lynton, the consultant who conducted the train noise sampling, to the next meeting to present his findings in full.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		follow-up to an outcome from meeting 3).			
4	Road Transport	Road Transport for Wagerup Unit Three - General freight movements	The issues (relevant to this topic) that were added to our working document – the ERMP transport and noise issues register are: 1. Upgrade of South West Highway to cope with increased traffic 2. Rail vs. road and other road options (other than SW Highway) should be examined (DPI study – draft report looking at transport numbers provided by John Oliver and possible ask for DPI briefing after that).		Provide more detailed road traffic numbers about current & projected vehicle movements from the Alcoa mine site and the Refinery.
4	Hydrate transport from the Refinery		Further discussion needed on the transport of hydrate from the Refinery.	We referred the following question to the Tripartite Group, as it relates to the Refinery licence which this Group addresses: How does hydrate trucking from Wagerup relate to the production limit in the licence?	Refer the hydrate issue to the Tripartite Group (refer to outcomes) for them to answer.
5, 15 Dec 2004	Noise Model			The outputs from the noise model for the expanded refinery scenario will be presented at the next meeting on Wednesday 12 January.	
5	Road Transport for Wagerup Three	Road transport for Wagerup Unit Three		As mining is not included in the ERMP, data about truck movements out of the minesite has not been specifically identified in the data reviewed by the group. We identified this is an important issue	Write a letter to the MMPLG requesting that they consider truck movement data from the minesite in their mining consultation process (and provide copy of this letter to the Working Group).

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>to refer to the Mining Management Program Liaison Group (MMPLG), and suggest that they examine this data in their consultation process.</p> <p>We noted the ERMP deals with expansion-related increases in traffic, but there is a broader safety issue of truck movements that should be referred to in another appropriate forum.</p> <p>We heard that the Department for Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) has completed a draft study about transitioning existing road freight to rail, and we would like to invite a DPI representative to a future meeting to present this draft report.</p>	<p>Contact DPI to ask for a briefing on the transport study at the next meeting and a briefing of the Fremantle community consultation process to address the increase in freight trains currently underway (follow up to issue from meeting 2).</p> <p>Investigate whether main roads has additional data for traffic movement on the South West Highway south of the Refinery, to help further understand the percentage changes in traffic if Wagerup 3 goes ahead.</p>
5	Train Noise	Yarloop Train Noise Study results by Herring Storer Acoustics (December 2004).			Send additional questions about the Yarloop Noise Train Study to Anita to forward to Lynton, in preparation for his full presentation of the results.
5	Rail crossing noise			<p>In response to a question about rail crossing noise (i.e. the 'clickety-clack' created by the signalling device), raised at previous meetings, ARG responded that extensive research has been undertaken on this topic, but no current practical application or alternative being used in Australia or elsewhere.</p> <p>We also heard that ARG aim to trial a</p>	Distribute copy of ARG's response to question about rail crossing noise (see outcomes).

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				GPS-related solution in 5 years time, with a final solution in 10 years.	
5	Train horn noise			We had a discussion about the variability in horn volumes in different trains and the group agreed to seek clarification from ARG about this matter.	Ask ARG about train horn comparisons between the Australind and other locomotives, such as S-Class.
5	ERMP issues register			We recognised that having an Alcoa representative on the group has been useful, from a process perspective, for accessing the relevant information. On occasion, some would have liked more detailed information, and we therefore resolved to ask for more specific information when we need it to reach a decision or recommendation.	
5	Independent expert review of noise model.	Handout 5.1 – Independent Expert Review Statement of Work		We selected our expert reviewer for the noise model, and we decided to provide them with additional information that we believe that may be relevant to the 'desktop' review.	Ask expert reviewers if they will come to the meeting to present their review or telephone conference.
5	Construction Noise				Information about management of construction noise.
5	Wagerup refinery noise variation application (Regulation 17)				Invite representative from the Department of Environment to talk about the enforceability of ministerial conditions Regulation 17 Variation (follow up to issue from meeting 2).
6, 12 Jan 2005	Parallel ERMP community consultation process			In response to an action from meeting 5 (15 December 2004), Tim McAuliffe, Environmental Consultant to Alcoa, presented a draft letter to the Mining Management Program Liaison Group	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>(MMPLG) requesting them to consider truck movement data from the minesite.</p> <p>We accepted the letter and agreed that Tim will forward it to the MMPLG on our behalf.</p>	
6	Noise model	Noise Modelling of Proposed Wagerup Expansion (presentation by Jim McLoughlin, SVT Engineering Consultants)		<p>Jim McLoughlin, from SVT Engineering Consultants, presented an update of the noise modelling of the proposed Wagerup expansion, which covered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of noise sources for the Proposal 2. Predicted noise emission levels from the proposed expansion 3. Noise controls that can be applied 4. Project noise management <p>We recognise that the preliminary noise modelling that has been developed by SVT indicates that if the proposed noise controls are applied, the refinery expansion could occur without increased noise impacts.</p> <p>We also believe that where it is reasonable and practicable, Alcoa should attempt to reduce noise levels further and not just maintain existing noise levels, as specified in Alcoa's commitment of 'no increase in noise impacts' for the proposed expansion.</p>	
6	Expert review of the noise model				Forward to Michelle McManus additional information (relevant to the scope of the expert review, as outlined in Handout

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
					<p>5.1) for the expert reviewer's consideration during the desktop review of the noise model.</p> <p>Confirm that the expert reviews report will be available before the 16 February.</p>
6	Train noise			<p>Lynton Storer, noise consultant from Herring Storer Acoustics, presented in full the outputs of the Yarloop Train Noise Study, which was undertaken as a result of the deliberations of this Working Group to understand the current noise impact associated with all trains traversing the Yarloop section of the South West rail line.</p> <p>We believe that train noise is an ongoing significant community issue, and that the work to satisfy the scope of the Environmental Review and Management Plan (ERMP) has been completed, namely through this Train Noise Study. We will make the Department of Environment aware of the various issues associated with rail noise impact through our input to the ERMP.</p>	
6	ERMP issues			<p>A number of rail noise issues that were raised in the Open Space Forum have been deliberated in this group, and the relevant representatives from the Australian Railroad Group have been invited to meetings to discuss the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocating the rail line, 	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lay by areas, • Rail crossing noise ('clickety clack'), • Rail gradient, • Train horn noise, • Train scheduling opportunities to minimise impacts, • Having longer trains not more trains, • Choice of locomotives (selection of old vs. new locomotives), • Bigger wagons or changing wagons and • Maintenance issues. <p>While this group has considered these issues, there is potential for further investigation.</p>	
6	Road and rail transport				<p>Investigate whether main roads has additional data for traffic movement on the South West Highway south of the Refinery, to help further understand the percentage changes in traffic if Wagerup 3 goes ahead.</p> <p>Invite DPI representative to ask for a briefing on the transport study at the next meeting and a briefing of the Fremantle community consultation process to address the increase in freight trains currently underway (follow up to issue from</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
					meeting 2).
6	Regulation 17 application				Invite representative from the Department of Environment to talk about the enforceability of ministerial conditions for Regulation 17 Variation.
7, 19 Jan 2005	Final issues review - transport			We commenced working on preparing our final transport outcomes and issues for input to the ERMP.	
7	Construction noise management	Construction Noise Management Requirements: Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997			Distribute Pinjarra Noise Management Plan to Working Group members Receive the draft Wagerup Noise Management Plan in its form by meeting 9, Wednesday 16 February 2005.
7	Expert reviewers report				Receive expert reviewers report and decide whether we want her to attend and present her report or communicate via telephone hook up.
7	Traffic on Southwest Highway				Invite Department for Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) representative to present transport study to meeting 9, 16 February. Find out about providing the Group with data about traffic currently entering the Refinery from the Highway. Provide further information on

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
					the High Wide Load Corridor study.
8, 9 Feb 2005	High Wide Load Corridors	Background information and proposal from Graeme Baesjou (prior to meeting)		We were informed that the state Government has allocated funding for the provision of high wide load corridors along the South West Highway and we support this decision.	Circulate updated information about the funding for high wide load corridors.
8	Response from MMPLG to questions raised by WGs about Willowdale Mining Operations			<p>In response to the letter received from the Mining Management Program Liaison Group (MMPLG) a member reported that there is still concern, from both minesite neighbours and the broader community, about blasting from the minesite.</p> <p>We refer this matter back to the MMPLG to be investigated in that consultation process.</p> <p>A member of the Group raised particular concerns about whether Alcoa's current blasting management practices are adequate to minimise the impacts on surrounding residents.</p>	
8	Ministerial Conditions	Ministerial Conditions: an Overview – presentation by Filipe Dos Santos		<p>Filipe Dos Santos, from the Department of Environment (Audits) presented an overview of the process and enforceability of Ministerial Conditions.</p> <p>We understand there is an assessment process that allows Ministerial Conditions to be reviewed and potentially changed and that they will not necessarily be changed because the proponent is in non-compliance.</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				We also heard that there are a variety of statutory consequences for failing to comply with the conditions, including fines, directions or environmental remediation.	
8	Transitioning products from road to rail	Analysis of the Western Australian Freight Task - presentation by Paul Hamersley		<p>Paul Hamersley from the Department for Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) overviewed a study undertaken by DPI to look at both current and future opportunities for shifting freight from road to rail (south of Geraldton), and possible impediments.</p> <p>We heard that there are 6 key potential infrastructure projects identified in the study, including upgrading the terminal infrastructure for the Bunbury Port.</p> <p>We heard that the Wagerup expansion proposal is not impacted by the key priorities identified in the study.</p>	
8	Increased traffic projections			We request Alcoa to ensure that the estimated increased traffic projections are as accurate as possible and that the assumptions behind these numbers and the categories they relate to are clearly presented in the ERMP to enable the potential impacts to be determined and understood.	Find out about providing the Group with data about traffic currently entering the Refinery from the Highway.
8	Construction noise management	Noise Management Plan – Pinjarra Efficiency Upgrade, 2 April 2004 Alinta Pinjarra Cogeneration			Provide initial comments on the Pinjarra Noise Management Plan and Alinta Pinjarra Cogeneration Environmental Management

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		Project: Construction Environmental Management Plan - Noise Management Plan section			Plan as input into the draft Noise Management Plan for Wagerup. Receive the draft Wagerup Noise Management Plan in its form by meeting 9, Wednesday 16 February 2005.
9, 16 Feb 2005	Traffic monitoring			<p>We heard that Alcoa is currently looking into the possibility of placing a traffic monitor on the access road into the Refinery.</p> <p>We suggest that it is important to obtain traffic data before, during and after construction, then assess the significance of these numbers (in particular of heavy loads) and compare these to the estimates that are included in the ERMP. This information should then be brought back to the appropriate forum to then build into the Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>We also noted that the traffic numbers should be passed on to the relevant local authorities, particularly the local police and the Shires.</p>	Circulate updated information about the funding for high wide load corridors.
9	Draft expert review - Noise Management Proposal			We worked through the draft expert review of the Environmental Noise Management Proposal for the expansion, which reviewed the process and the methodology used by SVT Consulting to develop the noise model. Overall, the reviewer deemed that this was undertaken in an appropriate manner.	Anita will follow up with the expert reviewer about her suggestion on p4 of the draft report: "It would be useful to have an intermediate figure which shows noise contours for the expansion but without the noise reductions for the existing sources"

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>We understand that comments in the expert reviewer's final report will be addressed by Alcoa in the relevant section of the ERMP, and also passed on SVT Consulting for consideration in their final report on the noise modelling.</p> <p>Further, we request that the expert reviewer be provided with a summary (by Herring Storer Acoustics) of the process used to validate the model, for her to comment on the approach, and that Alcoa provide any additional information requested by the reviewer.</p>	
9	Overview of the process used by Herring Storer Acoustics to validate the Wagerup Refinery Acoustic (noise) model.				Provide SVTs review of the validation of the model (2002) and the Herring Storer summary validation.
9	Future meeting agenda items			<p>The next meeting is on Wednesday 9 March, 1pm, at the Waroona Community Centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expert review on the validation of the noise model • Draft Construction Noise Management Plan • Generation of ERMP outcomes. 	
9	ERMP public review process	Fact sheet: Preparing submissions on the ERMP			

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
9	Noise Management Plan			We received the draft Noise Management Plan, which details the noise control and management methods that will be employed (from design through to commissioning) to achieve the noise objectives for Wagerup expansion project, should it proceed.	
9	Noise Outcomes for ERMP			We continued work on drafting our final noise outcomes and issues for input to the ERMP.	
10, 09 Mar 2005	Noise Management Plan	Draft Noise Management Plan – proposed Wagerup Refinery expansion		We received the draft Noise Management Plan, which details the noise control and management methods that will be employed (from design through to commissioning) to achieve the noise objectives for Wagerup expansion project, should it proceed.	
10	Noise Outcomes for ERMP			We continued work on drafting our final noise outcomes and issues for input to the ERMP.	
10	Overview of the process used by Herring Storer Acoustics to validate the Wagerup Refinery Acoustic (noise) model.	Summary of Wagerup Noise Propagation Model Validation Process (Herring Storer Acoustics)		<p>The other key discussion topic from today's meeting was:</p> <p>Overview of the process used by Herring Storer Acoustics to validate the Wagerup Refinery Acoustic (noise) model.</p> <p>We heard that the expert review of the Noise Model will be available in early April. To this end, we have scheduled another meeting in the first week of April.</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
<p style="text-align: center;">11, 06 Apr 2005</p>	<p>Environmental Noise Management Proposal</p>	<p>Expert Review of the Environmental Noise Management Proposal for Wagerup Unit Three Expansion, Part 2 Ore Transport System and Bunbury Port.</p>		<p>We received and discussed the expert review of the Environmental Noise Management Proposal for Wagerup Unit Three Expansion, Part 2 Ore Transport System and Bunbury Port.</p> <p>We recognise that the initial modelling has been undertaken early in the design phase and this has been advantageous as it set a framework for detailed design.</p> <p>The modelling and peer review process has given us confidence that this initial work regarding noise management for the Wagerup 3 expansion is reasonable.</p> <p>We understand that the noise model will be reviewed as detailed design progresses. We believe this is important.</p> <p>In our deliberations we've queried the accuracy and limitations of the existing Wagerup noise model. We sent information on the model set up and the model validation process undertaken to date to an acoustics expert for peer-review.</p> <p>Advice from the expert reviewer has concluded "it would appear that the noise model is appropriate and the validation of the model appears to support this."</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
11	Working Group Outcomes			<p>We completed and signed off our final Working Group outcomes for submission to Alcoa for inclusion in the ERMP.</p> <p>Note: David South and Garry Oliver were not present at this meeting.</p>	

Social & Economic Working Group

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
<p>1, 21 Oct 2004</p>	<p>Consultation framework and background</p>	<p>ERMP public consultation, statutory processes and timeline</p> <p>Social and Economic Open Forum outcomes</p> <p>Briefing note - social and economic components of ERMP</p>			<p>Provide members with the relevant information for the socio-economic components in the ERMP.</p>
<p>1</p>	<p>Outline of Working Groups</p>			<p>We recognised and accepted that the main purpose for convening this Working Group is to collaboratively examine and develop opportunities, initiatives and strategies that relate to the socio-economic outcomes of the ERMP.</p> <p>We also noted that social and economic factors do not feature heavily in the ERMP, but we acknowledged there is potential for this Group to continue past the ERMP process (beyond January).</p> <p>We recognised and accepted that the main purpose for convening this Working Group is to collaboratively examine and develop opportunities, initiatives and strategies that relate to the socio-economic outcomes of the ERMP.</p> <p>We also noted that social and economic factors do not feature heavily</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				in the ERMP, but we acknowledged there is potential for this Group to continue past the ERMP process (beyond January).	
1	Selection of Working Group members			<p>We elected members to the Working Group by sharing our affiliation to this process by filling in a matrix, which looked at our community of location, community activity and skill register (skills include local knowledge).</p> <p>After a lengthy discussion, we agreed that thee members of the Social & Economic Working Group are: John Clark Guy Mansell Warren East Kylie Ashenbrenner (Alcoa) Owen Hunt Audrey Smith Carol Dyson Evelyn Dyer John Gillingham Helen Alexander (unable to attend tonight, but keen to be involved) Brian Wood (Department of Industry and Resources – unable to attend tonight but keen to be involved)</p>	
1	Terms of Reference	Draft Terms of Reference	During our discussion about 'Code of Conduct', we noted that the large number and diversity of the Group may make it difficult to keep concise in presenting views. Whilst	We agreed to the Draft Terms of Reference for the Working Group, and clarified that under 'Confidentiality', this relates to how we treat each other and that no individual member can speak on behalf of the Working Group.	Amend the draft Terms of Reference (TOR) under 'membership' – number of community residents from 7 to 9, which makes 11 Working Group members in total.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
			the facilitators will commit to managing this process, we noted that this is something we need to be aware of at future meetings.	We also agreed that the Terms of Reference can have addendums/add-ons at a later stage.	Amend the draft TOR under 'membership' – first dot point – add "and surrounding areas". Amend the draft TOR under 'Confidentiality' to read more clearly.
1	Reporting to other WGs and CCN			We clarified the role of the CCN in this Working Group process. We recognised that the CCN is perceived within some sectors of the community as not representative of the community at large. We accepted that the CCN is not going to edit the content or outcomes of these meetings, but they are here to ensure the process is open to everyone, fair and transparent. We also noted that after the CCN looks at the meeting reports, they will be communicated to the public and remain the ownership of the Working Group. We agreed that Evelyn will present the report from this meeting at the next CCN meeting.	
1	Working Group discussions	Draft sequence of discussion points for working group meetings	We would like to see or develop some specific goals for the Working Group process.		Information will be sent to participants one week prior to the meeting, which will cover the background to social & economic data for the region. Provide members with the relevant information for the socio-economic components in the ERMP

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
1	Independent Expert Review Panel				Update of where negotiations are at for the plans to build an industrial park in the Shire of Waroona.
2, 1 Nov 2004	Scope of ERMP for the social & economic working group			<p>We agreed on the order and timeframes for the ERMP material on social and economic data for the region, and the socio-economic topics concurrent to the ERMP process. We also noted that this list is not exhaustive, and is open to change.</p> <p>We acknowledged that factors other than Alcoa's operations impact on individuals and communities in the region, for instance, the de-regulation of the dairy industry and its associated impacts.</p>	
2	Agenda items for future meetings		<p>We noted that identifying long term income streams from government and industry is important for this Working Group to discuss.</p> <p>We noted that hospital and emergency care in the region has been in decline and needs to be addressed.</p> <p>We noted that this Working Group is in a position to address the issue of local people that are hurting and burnt out. We recognised an urgency to help people who are in</p>		<p>Provide Working Group members with the scope of the Holthouse Study</p> <p>Source public statement about the current status of the Yarloop Hospital</p> <p>Source information about the Port Hedland Enhancement Scheme.</p> <p>Invite the relevant people to help us understand social context and processes to the next meeting: Maribelle Thomas ECU researchers Invite Daniela Stehlik as an</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
			<p>crisis now and presently need one-on-one attention.</p> <p>We also heard that there are services currently available to provide this assistance, but that not everyone in the community may be aware such services exist and therefore people may not have been referred to them</p>		<p>observer at the next meeting, then a presenter at the following meeting</p>
2	Working Group objectives			<p>We set the following objectives for this Working Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide a process to bring people together to foster community pride and participation. To give local people hope through priority in employment and training opportunities. To provide a process to identify and implement facilities and service delivery in our communities to meet current and future needs. To identify the need and put forward ideas and options for improved social outcomes, including for residents who are impacted by Alcoa's operations. To increase participation, especially by the youth and aged, in identifying social and economic options for the region. To promote economic activities for long-term sustainability that are not reliant on Alcoa. To identify and promote skill-building opportunities for the region (community, 	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				industry and government). To identify needs & options, & develop a strategy for improved education opportunities in the region, with Wagerup Three as a possible catalyst.	
2	Social and economic summary of the Peel and Upper South West	Draft Social and Economic Summary of the Peel and Upper South West			Provide Working Group members with the following reports: "Peel Away the Mask" –PDC report. Landholdings study – Ted Rowling ECU reports, including those on social impacts and tourism studies Waroona Family and Youth Support Service information Regional population projections – PDC or WA Planning Commission (which includes Shire projections)
3, 15 Nov 2004	Action follow-ups from previous meeting	Pinjarra Brunswick Sustainability Study: 1. Identification of issues & audit of plans/strategies, Kevin Martin (January 2004) 2. Request for local stakeholder participation document			

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		<p>Executive Summary – Peel Sustainable Development Strategy 2020</p> <p>An Overview of the Peel Region – Where are we now?', Peel Development Commission presentation</p> <p>Media Statement – Port Hedland Enhancement Scheme</p> <p>Local Government Area Population Trends and Projections [by Planning Regions], WA Planning Commission</p> <p>Parliamentary Question – Harvey and Yarloop Hospitals</p> <p>Agricultural Landholdings and Farmlands Business, Alcoa</p>			
3	Social and economic summary of the Peel and Upper South West				<p>Include further information or clarification on the following items from the Social & Economic Summary:</p> <p>Noting what information is publicly available about the status of the Yarloop Hospital</p> <p>Under Item 1.2 (p2) – what trees will be used for tree farming?</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
3	Visual Amenity Plan	Wagerup Unit 3 Proposal - Visual Amenity Approach		We decided not to examine the visual amenity plan for the ERMP in detail, given the extensive agenda we have already set, and that Alcoa generally has a good record regarding visual screening, so this is being adequately addressed by the Company.	Circulate the methodology for the Public Safety components of the ERMP, so the Group can decide whether to examine this further.
3	Social and economic issues	Regional projects – sustainability framework, Alcoa Sustainability Principles Rule, Alcoa	We began drafting the following issues that need to be further addressed and clarified at these Working Group meetings: Continued pressure on health, education services. Audit government services (every government service). Community Clinic – is this an option? Is it possible to view Refinery from the scarp for tourism potential? Closure of recreation areas due to mine expansion. Industrial land availability - Alcoa correspond with Waroona Shire re land availability and conditions. School of Mines Skills shortage and capacity – how will this be addressed? Will W3 short operation W4?	We began capturing issues that arise from our discussions of various agenda items, but that we may not be able to resolve at this meeting or without further information. Rather than have these issues lost, we agreed they will become a working document and will form a significant part of the outcomes from this Working Group process. We noted that there is potential for this Working Group to continue past the ERMP process, and is particularly suited to this Group given that we are dealing with long-term, sustainability issues. Further, we agreed to have an additional meeting on 20 December 2004.	Invite Dr Ken Robinson and Anne Jennings to present the ECU research at the next meeting. Check obligations regarding current & projected provision for government Services in the Alumina Refinery State Agreement Act.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
3	Alcoa's local community content and procurement policies	Overview of Alcoa's Local Community Supplier Procurement Policy and PEU Results	<p>Following David Lunn's presentation about the Pinjarra Efficiency Upgrade (PEU), we discussed some of the procurement and employment issues that will need to be considered further for Wagerup:</p> <p>Contracts longer than 12 months for local businesses to help them grow.</p> <p>Pinjarra has a good light industrial area, but Waroona does not.</p> <p>Can Waroona service the Wagerup Refinery in the longer term the way Pinjarra can service the Pinjarra Refinery?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People currently looking for land in Waroona Shire. - Alcoa lobbying for access to industrial land (abattoirs, for instance). <p>Yarloop Community House – could be a recognised place to try and source labour (i.e. in a similar way to Murray House was used for the Pinjarra Efficiency Upgrade)?</p> <p>Enhancing and facilitating access to apprenticeship schemes is vital, particularly preferential treatment towards young</p>	<p>We endorse Alcoa's Local Content and Local Procurement Policy, and encourage Alcoa and interested stakeholders to expand this across the Peel and South West regions.</p> <p>We also noted that the anticipated shortage of skills/capacity and labour (for Wagerup) needs to be addressed by this Policy.</p>	Find out Alcoa's age limits for employment and clarify whether there is a mature age apprentice policy as well

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
			<p>people. - Connections between Alcoa and learning institutions are important (and are already underway to some extent). Great potential for a school of mines as part of the objective to 'promote long term economic sustainability', servicing this area and Australia. We must take into account the factors that are different for Wagerup (compared to Pinjarra), particularly the shortage of skills and capacity.</p>		
<p>4, 29 Nov 2004</p>	<p>State agreement</p>	<p>Clause 13, sub-clause 1, 2 & 3 - Town Development, Alumina Refinery Wagerup Agreement Act.</p>		<p>We want to see strong agreements put in place between Alcoa, State Government and Local Government to ensure immediate and neighbouring communities gain some direct benefit from the income stream generated by the mining and processing activity in their communities.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Social and Economic Summary for ERMP</p>	<p>Parliamentary Questions – Harvey and Yarloop Hospitals Media Statement: 'State Government announces new police station for Harvey'. Parliamentary Questions – Harvey and Yarloop Hospitals Media Statement: 'State</p>		<p>The Group considered and made further amendments to the Social and Economic Summary for the Peel and Southwest Region (following up from Action item 1 meeting 3).</p>	<p>Pass on to Antonia Hodby the following amendments and additions to the Social and Economic Summary document: 1. Explicit inclusion of the need for mental health and support services in the region 2. Concern that there are no emergency services in Yarloop after 7pm and this is currently inadequate, and will not service</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		Government announces new police station for Harvey'.			<p>a potential construction workforce and increased population.</p> <p>3. Concern for emergency services closure, the ability of hospital services to cope with existing demand, including general and emergency hospital. Citrus and nut trees will be used for tree farming.</p> <p>4. Community concerns regarding lack of Yr 11 & 12 facilities at Waroona High School - Similar concerns for Yr 11 & 12 capacity and student choices at Harvey High School - Acting as a deterrent to attracting and retaining families in the region.</p> <p>5. A consequence of this for some workers is up to an hour and half's travelling after a 12-hour shift, which is a safety issue.</p> <p>6. Demand for housing in Yarloop low; no new housing developments and little demand for existing stock - Relatively higher quality of housing has resulted in a good demand for houses in Hamel.</p> <p>7. This is also linked to the fact that most high quality houses in Yarloop are located in the 'A' Area and have been purchased by Alcoa.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
4	Social and economic components of ERMP	Social & Economic Components of ERMP – Table of contents and status report.		<p>We expressed a concern that we may not be able to explore the social and economic issues in depth in the given time frame.</p> <p>We heard that there is time pressure for the ERMP-related material; and we also heard that the timeline for this consultation has been extended, so there are opportunities for meetings in late January and possibly early February.</p> <p>We would like to continue to explore the longer-term social and economic issues and opportunities as a Group past the ERMP submission.</p>	<p>Clarify with Antonia the status and availability of industrial land in the Peel for the Social and Economic Summary document.</p> <p>Table Public Safety components of the ERMP for discussion at next meeting.</p> <p>Invite Michael Keep to the next meeting for the discussion about the construction workforce.</p> <p>Respond to the issue about public access to the forest referred by the Residue and Water Working Group that it is going to be part of public risk assessment and is on our agenda.</p> <p>Report back to the Land Management Working Group that the issue referred to us about difficulty obtaining bank loans for homes and properties in Yarloop will be examined post-ERMP process.</p> <p>Feedback on industrial land availability from Council meeting.</p>
5, 13 Dec 2004	Regional planning	Planning context for Wagerup Refinery		Ian Brayshaw will write-up this section (of the ERMP) to incorporate the discussion about the State Industrial Buffer Policy.	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
5	Skills shortage	Wagerup 3 Construction: draft strategy on skills shortage (Michael Keep's and Kylie Ashenbrenner's presentation).		We generated some options for addressing construction workforce skills shortage, in response to a presentation from Kylie Ashenbrenner and Michael Keep, to be evaluated for inclusion into the strategy on skills shortage.	
5	Social and Economic Component of ERMP		<p>We added the following issues to the ERMP register:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State Industrial Buffer Policy – knowledge of process by people etc 2. Confidence in expansion = benefit to the local community (e.g. income stream from expansion) and gas, water, sewerage, tourism 3. Alcoa to come “onside” and negotiate with government to ‘save/assist’ local towns. 4. Specific direct community benefits 5. Infrastructure such as gas, deep sewerage, road upgrades, 6. Services such as health, emergency and education services. To generate an income stream for communities. 	<p>Some significant social and economic community issues that have been identified by this Group are beyond the Government's guidelines for the ERMP, as determined by the Environmental Protection Authority.</p> <p>We heard that these are not considered in the Environmental Protection Act but will be discussed further as a priority by this Group when the meetings continue past the ERMP-process.</p> <p>The following information was received prior to this meeting and accepted tonight without further questions: Population projections Indigenous and European heritage Indigenous population Informal Land Management The Public Safety Risk Assessment was also received and we agreed that this warrants further discussion and will invite some representatives to the next meeting to present this report.</p> <p>Note: Evelyn Dyer resigned from the group due to a conflicting commitment.</p>	<p>Provide all the Working Groups with a summary about how to make a submission to the ERMP, for distribution to the wider community.</p> <p>Evaluate this Working Group process at the meetings early next year.</p> <p>Invite a speaker from Qest Consulting and Garry Oliver (Waroona Police Station) to the next meeting to discuss and answer our questions about the Public Safety Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Invite Michael Saunders from the South West Area Health Service, and his ‘equivalent’ in the Peel region, to a meeting in January to dedicate detailed discussion to personal and mental health services in the region.</p> <p>Respond to the issue about public access to the forest referred by the Residue and Water Working Group that it is going to be part of public risk</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
					assessment and is on our agenda. Receive outputs of visual amenity planning related to the potential visual impact of Residue Drying Area after expansion.
6, 20 Dec 2004	Community Development initiatives in Yarloop			Following from the previous attendance of Mike Hepburn (Manager, Department for Community Development, South West District), we were pleased to hear that the Department of Community Development (Family Support Service) is now providing anger management, assertiveness training and counselling services to people in Yarloop. For further information, please contact: Harvey Health and Community Services Group, Lyn Watt, Coordinator, Family Support Program Ph (08) 9729 2323	Invite Michael Saunders from the South West Area Health Service & Ken Monson from the Peel region, to a meeting in January to discuss in detail personal and mental health services in the region.
6	Public safety risk assessment	Qest Consulting overview of findings of Public Safety Risk Assessment		Matt Wylie from Qest Consulting presented the background, process and findings of the public safety risk assessment for the proposed Wagerup expansion. We heard, overall that hazards are largely of a dangerous chemicals nature or a process hazard nature. It was noted that the Wagerup Refinery is not a major hazard facility, by Australian standards, as Alcoa does not	Provide communications guidelines (from Victoria and New South Wales) for public safety risk (from Matt Wylie). Refer the question (with the Residue and Water Working Group) about public notification of blasting from the minesite to the Mining and Management Program Liaison Group.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>store these chemicals in large enough quantities to be classified as such.</p> <p>There are Government regulations in place that require Alcoa to manage impacts on site.</p> <p>Further, the following outcomes arose from this presentation and ensuing discussions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some issues were raised that do not fit within the public safety risk assessment. These have been referred to other Groups or marked down as Issues for future discussion. 2. The question about public notification of blasting from the minesite was raised and we heard that another Working Group has raised this and referred in writing to the Mining and Management Program Liaison Group (MMPLG). We agreed will refer to this Working Group in the letter to the MMPLG. <p>The examination of the public safety risk component has therefore been completed by this Working Group.</p>	
6	Regional social and economic opportunities			<p>We began discussing some of the significant social and economic opportunities and projects that can be harnessed alongside an expansion to Wagerup.</p> <p>We noted that these must occur in addition to improvements to the current situation (i.e. communications and consultation with surrounding regional</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>communities), and heard some of the significant projects identified both by Alcoa and through this Working Group process, including infrastructure, services, and community development projects.</p> <p>We noted that these relate directly to the objectives we set for this Group at our first meeting, and will be discussing these in more detail at our meetings set for next year. In particular, there will be an emphasis not only on progressing the ideas themselves, but also determining how we can engage the broader community in partnership with government (state and local) and Alcoa.</p>	
6	Social and economic components of ERMP	<p>Social and Economic component of the ERMP: updated table of contents and status report</p> <p>Current and proposed workforce numbers</p> <p>Fact Sheet: Social and economic components of the ERMP</p> <p>Social and Economic component of the ERMP: updated table of contents and status report</p>			<p>Receive outputs of visual amenity planning related to the potential visual impact of Residue Drying Area after expansion.</p> <p>Provide all the Working Groups with a summary about how to make a submission to the ERMP, for distribution to the wider community.</p> <p>Evaluate this Working Group process at the meetings early next year.</p> <p>Confirm with Main Roads if any improvements/upgrades to South West Highway are</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		<p>Current and proposed workforce numbers</p> <p>Fact Sheet: Social and economic components of the ERMP</p>			<p>planned during expansion (should it proceed).</p> <p>Distribute potential traffic changes (road and rail) resulting from expansion that have been presented to the Transport and Noise Working Group.</p> <p>Refer the question of clean-up strategies (i.e. post-Wagerup Refinery life) for the Residue Drying Areas to the Residue and Water Working Group.</p> <p>Invite Garry Oliver from the Waroona Police Station and the Local Emergency Management Advisory Committee (LEMAC) to a meeting when we discuss the construction workforce.</p>
6	Emergency telephone health advice				Provide the State Government health helpline details to the Working Group
7, 17 Jan 2005	Emergency telephone health advice	How to access emergency telephone health advice service from the WA State Government		Following up from an action from meeting 6, we received information about how to access emergency telephone health advice from the WA State Government and referred this to the local Yarloop Paper for wider community distribution.	
7	Action follow-up from previous meeting	Guidelines for Major Hazard Facilities G-Community Consultation (Library)			Provide communications guidelines (from Victoria and New South Wales) for public safety risk (from Matt Wylie).

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		<p>The Dangerous Goods Safety Management Act 2001: Community Consultation and Communication Guidelines (Library).</p> <p>Occupational Health and Safety (Major Hazards Facilities) Regulations 2000: Part 5 – Consulting, Informing, Instructing and training.</p>			
7	Working Group process	Handout SE 7.1 Considering social and economic factors in an ERMP		<p>We had a lengthy discussion about the Working Group process, particularly about our achievements so far (i.e. how are we following through with the objectives we set in meeting 2?).</p> <p>We raised a wide variety of concerns and ideas about the current situation and future opportunities, including the urgency of social issues within the community, the need for infrastructure in towns like Yarloop and entrepreneurial opportunities that could be available, to name just a few.</p> <p>We agreed that we need to be more strategic in the way that we address the objectives and issues raised during this Working Group process.</p> <p>We recognised that there are different needs within this Group, and indeed different needs within the community, so we need to be looking at how to engage the communities to work together to achieve positive outcomes.</p>	Investigate community development case studies or examples to identify the lessons learned and the processes used by those communities.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>Our priority is to finalise the relevant Environmental Review and Management Plan (ERMP) components, particularly the construction workforce, and then move on to review and evolve our process to look at the ongoing social and economic opportunities in the region</p> <p>We strongly recommend that Alcoa include all the social and economic issues and opportunities in their ERMP submission, regardless of the criteria for factors that the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) considers relevant.</p>	
7	Social and economic components of ERMP	Social and Economic component of the ERMP: updated table of contents and status report		We clearly identified the need to get on with the task of preparing our ERMP submission, but we also acknowledge that we have the opportunity to explore all avenues for regional development following the submission.	<p>Receive outputs of visual amenity planning related to the potential visual impact of Residue Drying Area after expansion.</p> <p>Provide all the Working Groups with a summary about how to make a submission to the ERMP, for distribution to the wider community.</p> <p>Distribute potential traffic changes (road and rail) resulting from expansion that have been presented to the Transport and Noise Working Group.</p> <p>Refer the question of clean-up</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
					<p>strategies (i.e. post-Wagerup Refinery life) for the Residue Drying Areas to the Residue and Water Working Group.</p> <p>Confirm with Main Roads if any improvements/upgrades to South West Highway are planned during expansion (should it proceed).</p>
7	Status of Waroona and Yarloop police stations				Write to the Minister's Office to clarify about the concern of some community members about claims by a State election candidate that Waroona and Yarloop police stations closing down as a result of a new police station being built at Harvey.
7				Note Warren East resigned at this meeting.	
8, 7 Feb 2005	Scope of ERMP	Letter from John Clark to Minister for the Environment, and her response		<p>John Clark tabled a letter requesting clarity around the scope of the Environmental Review and Management Plan (ERMP), in particular the social and economic effects on surrounding communities.</p> <p>The Minister's response was not sufficiently clear for the Group to understand and John undertook to write to the Minister seeking further clarification. We also agreed to send both letters to all the other Working Groups.</p>	<p>Clarify further how the Minister will consider social and economic impacts, and the concerns raised by the broader community, in the ERMP</p> <p>Send John Clark's letter to all the Working Groups</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
8	Proposed construction workforce			<p>Rick Reynolds, a consultant to Alcoa, presented information on the proposed construction workforce for the expanded scenario.</p> <p>We drafted some issues of particular interest to us about the construction workforce, as well as ideas about management responses to put to Alcoa.</p> <p>We decided to use some of these points to create options and opportunities for construction workforce accommodation, and then do a sustainability assessment of each option.</p>	<p>Distribute copy of Kylie's Construction Workforce presentation.</p> <p>Distribute full report accompanying Kylie and Rick's construction workforce presentation</p> <p>Populate 'accommodation options' table, incorporating our suggestions from tonight's meeting and distribute to the Working Group (WG) for additional comment (outside the meeting).</p>
8	Proposal for high wide load corridors on South West Highway;			We noted the Transport and Noise Working Group is addressing this and we will keep up-to-date on this matter.	Update the Group on the status of high wide load corridors.
8	Health Risk Assessment				Distribute fact sheet explaining the Health Risk Assessment process.
8	Timeline for the release of the Holthouse Study (which is currently still with Government);				

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
8	Proposal by Owen Hunt to look at socio-culture opportunities for Yarloop, to be discussed in more detail in the post-ERMP consultation phase.				
9, 21 Feb 2005	Zoning for industrial land			Following up on a question from the previous meeting about the expansion of industrial zones at Pinjarra for the Residue Drying Areas (RDAs), we heard that the land around the RDAs at Wagerup will not need to be rezoned in the same manner, as it is already zoned 'special industrial'.	
	Construction workforce	Wagerup Unit 3 Construction Workforce – presentation from meeting 8, Monday 7 February Draft Construction and Operational Impacts and Contingent Management Responses – Section 2 of the ERMP that will address social and economic impacts and opportunities, incorporating the conversations from this Working Group and from the experience at Pinjarra.		We overviewed a range of accommodation options for the construction-related workforce, including: 1. Construction worker preference for caravan-style accommodation: Caravans or 'dongers' on land; 2. Accommodation options for senior construction management: Yarloop, Waroona homes for backpacker style accommodation; 3. Short-term small businesses to service construction workers: Catering, cleaning, other services; and	Find out more information about options for a caravan park in Yarloop, starting with the Business Enterprise Centre and the Peel Development Commission Find out more information about community-owned caravan parks, particularly how they are managed. Check policy on the potential accommodation uses of Area A

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>4. Workers involved in social activities/groups to boost viability/funding/outcomes: Eg local football club, bowling, rec centre, arts.</p> <p>We spoke at some length about the potential for establishing a caravan park in Yarloop, that could be either community-owned, council-owned or a private enterprise operation.</p> <p>We agreed to seek further information about how to go about this, with a view to holding a public meeting involving all the relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>empty houses</p> <p>Provide feedback to Kylie through Michelle McManus about the draft Section 2 of the ERMP that deals with the construction workforce matters.</p>
9	Regional community development opportunities		<p>We believe that building and strengthening existing community organisations, and how to access the appropriate support, to contribute to local sustainability is important to consider alongside community development initiatives.</p>	<p>We spoke at length about our enthusiasm to enhance community development in the region.</p> <p>We recognise there are social and economic opportunities that the Wagerup expansion may provide to communities, as well as those to consider regardless of the expansion.</p> <p>We would like to consider how we can develop leadership in the wider community and within this Group (in whatever form it may take); as our work evolves, we would welcome community members and local shire representatives to contribute, and we are open to exploring all the potential opportunities.</p>	<p>Invite representative from Department of Community Development (DCD) or Daniela Stehlik to talk about building community capacity.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
9	Visual Amenity Plan overview	Visual Amenity Study – Photographical locations		Ian Yull, Environmental Consultant to Alcoa, presented an overview of the visual amenity plan for the Residue Drying Areas (RDAs), which included: 1. Existing and modelled views of the RDAs from various locations, 2. Proposed plantings for 2005 and 3. Alcoa's Long Term Residue Management Strategy (LTRMS). 4. We are aware that visual amenity has been discussed in detail in the Residue and Water Working Group, and we have confidence that this Group has addressed this and other residue issues thoroughly.	Find out how much residue (in m3) there is at Wagerup, Pinjarra and Kwinana refineries. Circulate information about composition of residue to Helen, Owen and John Clark.
9	Final outcomes from the WG	Updated table of contents and status report, current for 21 February 2005.	How do we share our outcomes with the wider community, before they go into the ERMP, to attract wider interest and understanding?	We agreed to commence drafting our final outcomes to go into the Environmental Review and Management Plan (ERMP) at the next meeting, Thursday 10 March 2005.	
9	Traffic on Southwest Highway				Update the Group regularly on the status of High Wide Load Corridors for the South West Highway (particularly Mandurah to Wagerup)
10, 10 Mar 2005	Ernesto Sirolli workshop	Social Enterprise Partnerships flyer on free seminar		We reflected on the keynote speech and workshop by Ernesto Sirolli at the Australian Regional Economies Conference that some of our members attended on Tuesday 8 March and express our thanks to Alcoa for the invitation and covering the expenses for the day. Overall, we believe that the idea of supporting local entrepreneurs through	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>mentoring and networks can be a positive way to promote economic development in this region, as part of a wider community development effort.</p> <p>Further, we identified a number of key discussion matters to explore further in partnership with Alcoa and the rest of the community, post-ERMP, including:</p> <p>A member's suggestion to relocate Alcoa's head office to Yarloop to demonstrate their confidence and commitment to the community; Seeking out and listening to social entrepreneurs; Infrastructure projects in Yarloop; and Training in areas of skill shortages to meet current and future education needs, including those in the mining industry.</p> <p>We also heard that Alcoa is currently developing a model for identifying and implementing opportunities and ideas (including those that have emerged from this Working Group), to be developed further in partnership with the community and regional stakeholders.</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
10	Action follow-up from previous meeting				Update the Group regularly on the status of High Wide Load Corridors for the South West Highway (particularly Mandurah to Wagerup). Find out more information about options for a caravan park in Yarloop, starting with the Business Enterprise Centre and the Peel Development Commission
10	Final outcomes from the WG to ERMP		We believe that we need to clearly articulate what we have addressed over the last 3 months in this Working Group to the broader community.	We commenced drafting our Working Group outcomes that will go into the ERMP.	
10	Future meetings and agenda items			Future meeting details: • Thursday 31 March, 2pm, Waroona Community Centre Generation of final ERMP outcomes	Find out how much residue (in m3) there is at Wagerup, Pinjarra and Kwinana refineries.
11, 31 Mar 2005	Interim HRA outcomes	Interim HRA outcomes Presentation - Tim McAuliffe		Tim McAuliffe, Environmental Consultant to Alcoa, presented an overview of the interim HRA outcomes, which covers the current and future expanded scenarios. We understand that the HRA report is not yet complete, and the work completed by the HRA Consultant indicates that: Short term (acute) hazard risk, longer-term (chronic) hazard risk and the Incremental Carcinogenic Risk for health for current and expanded	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>refinery meets world benchmark targets (i.e. for hazard index).</p> <p>We believe that Alcoa should strive to continuously improve and remain at the forefront of current standards.</p> <p>The majority of Group members felt reassured by the outcomes of the Health Risk Assessment and able to plan for the future with more confidence.</p> <p>We believe Alcoa should continue to improve transparency and communication with the public.</p> <p>A member of the Group also encourages Alcoa to embrace health impact assessment, which includes a Health Risk Assessment and a social assessment.</p>	
11	Final ERMP Outcomes		Carol Dyson resigned from the Working Group at tonight's meeting and wished the Group well in their deliberations and sign-off of their final outcomes.	<p>We completed and signed off our final Working Group outcomes for submission to Alcoa for inclusion in the ERMP.</p> <p>Note: Carol Dyson resigned from the group during the meeting.</p>	

Water & Residue Working Group

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
1, 20 Oct 2004	Background to consultation	ERMP public consultation, statutory processes and timeline Refinery Process Overview Document Emissions and Health Open Forum outcomes Open Forum Report			Glossary of terms and acronyms of ERMP specific terms
1	Outline of Working Groups			A concern was raised as to what 'independent facilitator' actually means. Although Leigh and Bradley are paid by Alcoa, they do not work for Alcoa, but are committed to ensuring that this process is fair, open and transparent. We also noted that as members of the Working Group, we undertake to ensure that this process is open, fair and independent, and if any member feels this is not the case, they should feel free to speak about it to the Group.	
1	Selection of Working Group members			We noted that there was a lower than expected turn-out by the community at tonight's initial meeting. In particular, we agreed that representation from shared water users and neighbours to residue is important. Although it was noted that Steve Pinzone fits both of these criteria, we agreed that it would be useful to have another significant water user.	Follow up with another community member for participation in the Working Group.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>During this discussion, we also noted it will be useful to have a second Government department representative, from the Department of Environment, particularly someone with expertise in water allocation.</p> <p>The members of the Residue and Water Working Group are: Matthew Turner – Waroona Vanessa Guthrie – Alcoa Sustainability Manager Liana Sandstrom – Yarloop Hayden Dyer – Yarloop Steve Pinzone – Wagerup Louis Bursztyn – Department of Industry and Resources Alan Cook – Department of Environment</p> <p>We agreed that Matthew Turner is here as an interested community member, but where necessary, he is available to provide advice on behalf of the Shire and this will be noted as such.</p>	
1	Terms of Reference	Draft Terms of Reference		<p>We agreed to the following changes to the Draft Terms of Reference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Under 'Membership' – point 4 – change the number of Government or other representatives with relevant expertise from (1) to (2). 2. Under 'Code of Conduct', we decided to remove 'issues' from the first bullet-point to reflect that we are not just looking at 'issues' in terms of 	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				'concerns'.	
1	Reporting to other WGs and CCN	Wagerup Unit Three Consultation - CCN charter Wagerup CCN relationship to Working Groups (diagram)		We agreed that Hayden Dyer will present the outcomes from this meeting at the next CCN meeting and from then on it will be on a rotational basis.	
1	Independent expert review panel	Independent expert review process Criteria for expert reviews			
1	WG Communication process				
1	Working Group discussions	Draft sequence of discussion points for meetings Wagerup Water Circuit Diagram Bauxite Residues - A High Volume Resource Wagerup Refinery & Bauxite Residue Operations Annual Environmental Review	During the discussion about the noted lower-than-expected community representation, we talked about the tensions between this process – where the community is involved in the plans for expansion – and the way things could have been done – where decisions would be made by Alcoa, then the resulting plans pushed on to the community and then defended by the company. At the Open Space Forum, for instance, some community members expected concrete plans to be produced for them to comment on. So, we clarified that this Working Group process is	We acknowledged that, until December, the Working Group process is designed to provide input to the ERMP and involve the community, relevant government departments and Alcoa in this process. It was noted that, in terms of residue management, Alcoa has a legislative commitment in the form of a Long Term Residue Management Plan, which is reviewed every 5 years. Although the next review is not due until 2006, Alcoa sees the process of community consultation for the Wagerup 3 expansion ERMP requirements as potentially overlapping with the long-term residue management plan. We therefore understand that there is an opportunity and a desire on Alcoa's	Copy of Wagerup's existing Water Circuit and Water sources to the Working Group Copy of current status of groundwater impacts to the Working Group Copy of the current (2001) Long-term Residue Management Plan to Working Group posted to members Bring synopsis of studies completed on the application of residue mud (alkaloam)

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
			<p>an opportunity to participate in the planning process from the beginning and that the outcome of whether the refinery will expand, is not predetermined.</p>	<p>behalf, to continue the Working Group process beyond the ERMP requirements to address broader issues of continuing concern within the community, and opportunities as well.</p> <p>We noted that the meeting expressed a positive, constructive and creative attitude.</p> <p>We agreed that information and agenda items for meetings 2, 3, and 4 will also be dependent on the outcomes and questions arising from meeting 1.</p>	
<p>2, 27 Oct 2004</p>	<p>Action follow-up</p>		<p>We noted that some of the information we will rely on to make assessments and decisions for the ERMP is based on models, which have underlying assumptions and baseline data which may not yet be complete.</p>	<p>We confirm that the documents that were promised to us from the previous meeting were received.</p> <p>We followed up on our actions from the last meeting & agreed that the Working Group will continue with the members that are here tonight. We continue to encourage observers to attend & keep up to date with the process.</p>	<p>Working Group Contact List to be distributed internally to all members</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>Scope of ERMP</p>	<p>Environmental Review Management Plan (ERMP) Scope WATER</p> <p>Wagerup Environmental Review Management Plan (ERMP) Scope RESIDUE</p> <p>Bauxite residues - A High Volume Resource</p>	<p>We need to establish a level of confidence in the data and the modelling.</p> <p>This means that the person presenting the modelling information needs to outline data, models and assumptions as they relate to each other.</p>	<p>In examining the water components of the ERMP, we agreed to the key issues that have been suggested in the scope (provided by Tim address an additional point – the potential water supply to include natural and non-natural (for example, desalination) sources. McAuliffe).</p> <p>We also added that when examining</p>	<p>2003 Ground and Surface Water Review to be available to the Group as a 'library copy' and a CD for Tony Hall.</p> <p>Bring one-page summary of information about the use of saline water in refinery processes & desalination options for water source.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>Water sources and impacts, we are looking at both quantity and quality. We also agreed to address an additional point – the potential water supply to include natural and non-natural (for example, desalination) sources.</p> <p>We prioritised the Residue ERMP-related issues for discussion at the next meetings, with the addition of visual amenity footprint in to the key issues.</p> <p>We recognised that there are some obvious overlaps with issues that are being addressed by other Working Groups. We agreed that we will consciously flag these issues with other groups and refer them as issues we would like discussed.</p>	<p>Distribute more detailed information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Particulate size distribution of residue (note: not yet captured for dust) • Chemical composition of both mud and sand. <p>Copy of Alternatives for Dust Control trial study (note: only for roads in the RDA) distributed to the Working Group.</p> <p>Provide comparative information about dust lift-off from crusted and non-crusted surfaces of residue mud.</p> <p>Provide radiation assessment of the residue material (report) to the Working Group.</p> <p>Check availability of information about</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of mercury inquiry and • Asbestos risks information. <p>Check availability of information about off-site impacts of dust on rainwater supply.</p>
2	Wagerup refinery current water uses and water sources	Water Study Fact Sheet	We recognised that we will need to invite someone with the relevant knowledge about groundwater management and impacts		

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
			to future meetings.		
2	Wagerup residue operation and management overview (including long-term residue management)	Long Term Residue Management Strategy (LTRMS) Paper			
2	Expert review Panel	Expert review Panel and Technical Experts Paper Independent Expert Reviewer - WATER - Mick Flemingh Independent Expert Reviewer - WATER - Noel Merrick		We decided to select our expert reviewers when we have milestone reports to examine. We agreed to divert the decision about an expert reviewer to the next meeting.	
3, 10 Nov 2004	Information from previous meeting actions	Wagerup Mercury Survey Sept 2001 - summary Summary of Wagerup's Refinery Mercury Mass Balance Fact Sheet - Mercury in our Refineries Wagerup Mercury Survey Presentation Asbestiform Fibres Email Explanation (From Gerald Roach - Alcoa Kwinana Technical Manager - Extraction Technology Wagerup Residue Area Road	We need to address two issues related to the CSIRO findings about dust lift-off: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pure dust lift-off from RDA • Dust emissions (as part of wider modelling for emissions). We noted that feedback from the radiological council would need to be tabled for discussion, when this information is available.	In response to a concern about asbestos risks raised at the last meeting, we heard that asbestiform fibres are not existent in bauxite ore and are therefore not a risk.	Find out how community concerns around mining impacts are being addressed in the ERMP community consultation process. Bring information about the health impacts of mud bricks, from the Department of Health (specifically radiation - Tony Hall) and Alcoa. Follow up on particle size distribution information for mud. Look for more specific information about fluoride and chloride levels in residue. Circulate the results of

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		<p>Dust Suppressant Trial</p> <p>Radiation Fact Sheet</p> <p>Bayer Process Radiological Evaluation Status Review 2004</p> <p>Composition of Residue (Chemical Breakdown Table)</p> <p>GEOPROC Pty Ltd Library Papers;</p> <p>Re: Quality of water sampled May 27, 04 from rainwater collection tank on property xxx Cookernup;</p> <p>Re: Quality of water sampled May 20, 04 from rainwater collection tank on property xxx Waroona;</p> <p>Re: Quality of water sampled Dec 3, 03 from rainwater collection tank on property xxx Wagerup;</p> <p>Interim Report of the Alcoa Wagerup Community Health Awareness Group WG, Aug, 2001</p>			<p>independent rain water sampling, undertaken on behalf of the Yarloop and Districts Concerned Residents Committee, to Working Group members.</p>
3	Wagerup Unit Three water assessment	<p>Wagerup Potential Water Sources (Hayden Dyer, Community WG member, Nov 2004)</p> <p>Water Quality Control</p>	<p>We noted that we have not yet adequately addressed water sources and still need to cover details around:</p> <p>1. What are the water</p>		<p>Find out the proposed options for power requirements for the expanded refinery and how they may impact on water demand.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		<p>Initiatives- H.Dyer November 2004</p> <p>Surface Water Perspectives - presentation Prof Peter M. Davies</p> <p>Alcoa Wagerup Review of Impacts of Waters (Copy)</p> <p>Wagerup Surface Water Systems Overview October 2003 (map)</p>	<p>sources?</p> <p>2. Where are they?</p> <p>3. How would we make a decision about them?</p> <p>These will be addressed at meeting 5.</p>		
3	Use of saline water in the refinery processes	Handout 3.2 - Saline Water Addition to Process and Desalination Plant			
3	Residue and cooling pond modelling	<p>The Wagerup Unit 3 Modelling Sequence</p> <p>Odour Measurement - RDA and cooling ponds, presentation</p>	We need to consider expert reviews for the odour sampling report/study. Tony Hall forwarded his preference for AWN to be considered as an expert reviewer in this process.		Organise to gather comparative RDA information between Worsley and Wagerup.
3	ERMP issues			<p>We commenced logging water and residue issues that we would like overtly addressed in the ERMP.</p> <p>We agreed that this document is a work in progress and will form a significant part of the outcomes of this consultation process.</p>	
3	Parliamentary Inquiry at Wagerup				Present the findings relevant to residue and water, from the Parliamentary Inquiry, to this Working Group.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
3	Working Group make-up			<p>We recognised that the make up of this Group does not capture the voices of every key stakeholder (in Alcoa's operations) in this process of examining ERMP-related issues. We noted that this is just one part of a longer term consultation process, and there are ongoing opportunities to be involved.</p> <p>Steve Pinzone noted that he is on this Group representing himself and not the wider community, particularly farmers in the area.</p>	Make names of the Working Group members available to the public.
4, 24 Nov 2004	Information from previous meeting actions	<p>Handout 4.2 Composition of Residue (2) – replaces the handout from the previous meeting</p> <p>Chloride and fluoride in residue</p> <p>Handout 4.3 Existing Ministerial conditions and their relationship to the ERMP process</p> <p>Handout 4.4 End use of Bauxite Residue – Trials with Red Mud Bricks</p> <p>Handout 4.5 Legislative Council Inquiry Report into Wagerup Refinery –</p>		<p>In response to information distributed by Tony Hall to WG prior to this meeting, particularly the Wagerup Action Plan (WAP), the following recommendations were made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All scientific sampling to be done systematically as suggested in the WAP 2. That results and progress from the WAP recommendations are made available to this Group (see Actions) 	<p>Follow up information about health impact of mud bricks for discussion - meeting 5.</p> <p>Review WAP and provide the following: Reports and recommendations relevant to this WG; Status of recommendations; Relevance to ERMP</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		recommendations relevant to the Residue and Water Working Group			
4	Residue dust prosecution	Media Statement - Alcoa Dust Prosecution		In response to residue dust prosecution case, we request that Alcoa provide this Group with a contingency plan to prepare for extreme weather conditions	
4	Visual amenity	Wagerup 3 Proposal Visual Amenity Plan - Approach		<p>Ian Yull presented the approach to the Visual Amenity Plan for Wagerup 3 Proposal.</p> <p>We agreed to address this component when we discuss dust suppression and identified two particular issues regards visual amenity that are of concern to the R and W Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Potential increased height of RDAs 2. Accounting for dust lift-off from the RDAs. We decided to refer following issues to the Social and Economic WG for their discussion: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issue of how people can have an input and understanding of public amenity and access to forests. 2. Seek clarification from the MMPLG about how they are dealing with community's concerns for mining for proposed expansion. <p>We would like formal feedback from the S and E WG about question 1 and from MMPLG for question 2.</p> <p>We decided to refer following issues to the Social and Economic WG for their discussion:</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>1. Issue of how people can have an input and understanding of public amenity and access to forests.</p> <p>2. Seek clarification from the MMPLG about how they are dealing with community's concerns for mining for proposed expansion.</p> <p>We would like formal feedback from the S and E WG about question 1 and from MMPLG for question 2.</p>	
4	Ground water	<p>Presentation – Groundwater at Wagerup Refinery (accompanying Gordon Baird's presentation on the summary of the draft groundwater impacts report)</p> <p>Groundwater at Wagerup Refinery; Wagerup 3 - Water Supply Options Table</p>		We recommend that a comparison between surface and groundwater quality for the pre-refinery situation, present situation and expanded scenario are included in the ERMP.	Summarise data for surface and groundwater composition at Wagerup
4	Dust control	Handout - Upgraded Sprinkler System Assessment - Approach	A question was raised as to whether a concentric sampling program for dust monitoring would be considered for the residue operations.	<p>We heard that the community observer who attended previous R and W meetings has queried the potential for using residue sand as a road base material at the Refinery.</p> <p>We request that Alcoa consider using the widening of the SW Highway as a pilot for using the material</p>	<p>Bring the following information to inform the detailed discussion of the Dust Management Strategy for the following meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map of the current dust monitoring locations at Wagerup (as available in Long Term Management Plan). • Existing database of dust sampling (i.e. what the current monitors are telling us). • Current dust control strategies.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
5, 1 Dec 2004	Working Group report			<p>We noted that it would be useful to capture main discussion points when we are tracking the main issues, in particular to give the wider community a better idea of what conversations take place in this meeting.</p> <p>We suggested generating a list of main discussion points to make available to the public (to be recorded as an outcome).</p>	Review report previous meeting
5	Dust management	<p>Handout 5.4 Residue Dust Studies</p> <p>Handout 5.2 Wagerup Residue Area Licensed Ambient Monitoring Data (24th average) 2000 to present</p> <p>Wagerup Refinery Licence 6217/7 Map</p>	<p>Concern about the effectiveness of dust control techniques of the proposed upgraded sprinkler system</p> <p>Concern about the location of two internal dust monitors relative to the height of residue as an early warning system</p>	<p>We recommend that composition and particulate size of uranium and thorium are included in the list of compounds to be covered in the HRA and we acknowledge that composition of residue is considered in the HRA</p> <p>We discussed the residue dust prosecution case (2002) and noted some concerns about the potential reoccurrence of extreme weather events and the effects of massive dust movement on nearby residents, among whom there is concern about dust composition.</p> <p>We believe there should be an investigation to establish whether the fine paid to government can be returned to impacted community, possibly through a partnership between state, government, Alcoa and community.</p> <p>It was also recognised that learning</p>	<p>Request that the dust sampling results that included pH content undertaken by Department of Environment as part of the dust prosecution case is made available to this Group, when the court case has finished.</p> <p>Distribute copies of Residue Area Dust Generation Study to WG and Strategic Land Planning Study (2001).</p> <p>Investigate specific dust results of where there are high levels (but not exceedences) of dust, particularly during winter and spring</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				from 2002 dust case, the community would like information from Alcoa first hand.	
5	Wagerup Air Quality Action Plan	CSIRO Wagerup Air Quality Review - program update		We recommend that indoor air quality monitoring be undertaken in Yarloop, as part of the overall dust monitoring program for Wagerup	<p>Distribute previous WAP meeting minutes that reference indoor air quality to Greg Power and WG members.</p> <p>Find out if Alcoa's quality control programs for their cattle include blood samples and if so , make available to WG</p> <p>Make available results of monitoring for sheep and cattle grazing on RDA rehabilitation area</p> <p>Find out and make available any public health research on aluminium uptake</p>
5	Groundwater	Groundwater Sampling Program - Wagerup Refinery			
5	Radiation in bauxite	Low Level Radiation Presentation - Barry Chesson, manager, Occupational Hygiene WA Ops.			Follow up information about health impact of mud bricks for further discussion.
5	Mining				<p>Provide feedback on water usage and dust impacts associated with mining activities, on communities</p> <p>Distribute TOR for the MMPLG.</p>
5	Water supply assessment5	Handout 5.1 Water Supply Options Table			Review Water Supply Options table and provide feedback to Ian Yull (Coordinating – 0418

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
					937 963; ian.yull@alcoa.com.au)
6, 12 Jan 2005	Dust management	Tour of Residue Drying Areas and Control Room - Allan Bermingham, WA Residue Operations Manager and Jamie Muir, Residue Supervisor, Wagerup Wagerup Refinery Residue Dust Management System - presentation by Allan Bermingham, WA Residue Manager		We commenced today's meeting with a tour of the Residue Drying Areas (RDAs) conducted by Allan Bermingham (WA Residue Manager, Alcoa) and Jamie Muir (Residue Supervisor, Wagerup) and a presentation about Wagerup's residue dust management system, which covered: 1. Overall dust management strategy – proactive and reactive approaches 2. Specific proactive measures (annual, weekly and daily) - On the tour, we observed a range of dust suppression methods including used oil on roads, mulch, grass and water. 3. Use of weather forecasts for dust control strategies and forming daily dust risk ratings - Including an example response to daily dust risk rating 4. Improvement opportunities, in particular sprinkler upgrades (independent of expansion approval)	
6	Water sources	Water Availability in the Lower Harvey River Catchment – presentation by Ian Yull, Senior Consultant, Environ		We also suggested including information about the water sources for local towns such as Yarloop and Waroona, for comparative purposes with Wagerup existing refinery water sources). We recognise that Ecological Water Requirements – set by the State	Provide Environmental Water Provisions Policy, from the Water and Rivers Commission

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				Government – need to be met by Alcoa for any water supply option that is selected, in order to maintain social and environmental values of that particular system.	
6	Water supply options analysis, incorporating feedback and input from WG members	Handout 6.1 Wagerup refinery future expansion – Water Supply Options Analysis Handout 6.2 Wagerup Refinery Future Expansion – Water Conservation Opportunities		After examining the issue of water sourcing at some length, we heard that Alcoa has selected four water options for further investigation for the proposed expansion and requested that these be presented to the Group in more detail. We agreed to a presentation of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final report on Water Availability in the Lower Harvey River Catchment (Ian Yull's presentation) and • How Alcoa intends to present their preferred option in the ERMP. 	
6	Bringing WGs together			We discussed the opportunity for bringing all the Working Groups together within the next month, and we believe that at this stage, there is little value in bringing all the Working Groups together unless there is clearly defined objective. We suggested that there may be value in coming together after we have generated and finalised our outcomes (table, report or whatever format that may be), which will form a clear, defined purpose for that meeting.	
6	Information from previous meeting actions	Handout 6.3 Details of Ambient Dust Samples Exceeding 200um/m3, but not exceeding licence limit			Follow up on information about the health impacts of mud bricks, for further discussion when the information becomes

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		<p>Trial final report, October 1998 - Monitoring the Heavy Metal and Mineral Status and Health of Sheep Grazing on a Rehabilitated Bauxite Residue Stockpile</p>			<p>available.</p> <p>Distribute Tony Hiscock's advice about National Livestock Identification Scheme (NLIS), of which Alcoa is now part.</p> <p>Distribute previous Wagerup Action Plan meeting minutes that specifically reference indoor air quality to Greg Power and the Working Group members.</p> <p>Distribute Terms of Reference for the MMPLG (Louis Bursztyn, Department of Industry and Resources WG member).</p> <p>Lodge a Freedom of Information application to obtain the Department of Environment's dust sampling results from the dust prosecution case (note: there is not likely to be a conclusion until after the ERMP process).</p>
<p>7, 2 Feb 2005</p>	<p>Action follow-up</p>	<p>Mining and Management Program Liaison Group Terms of Reference (follow-up action from meeting 6)</p>			<p>Follow up on information about the health impacts of mud bricks, for further discussion when the information becomes available.</p> <p>Check status Freedom of Information application (Action from previous meeting)</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
7	Water supply options	<p>Handout 7.1 – Wagerup Unit 3 Approach to Water Supply Option Selection</p> <p>Preferred Water Supply Option for the proposed Wagerup Unit Three expansion – presentation by Ian Yull</p> <p>Maps – Lower Harvey Catchment and Harvey River Pumpback.</p>		<p>Ian Yull, Senior Consultant from Environ, presented in detail the four short-listed water supply options for Wagerup Unit Three:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harvey Main Drain – through increased winter runoff harvesting; • Harvesting winter runoff from other agriculture drains in the area (i.e. South Samson drain, North Samson Drain, Waroona Main Drain); • Irrigation waters gained through efficiency measures; • Transfer a portion of the Alcoa farmlands Irrigation Water Entitlement. <p>We understand that none of the water supply options for the refinery will affect the drinking water supplies of Harvey, Yarloop and Waroona townsites, as these have a different allocation from the Water Corporation.</p> <p>However we believe that the wider community lacks accurate information about Alcoa’s water use and potential increases due to the expansion, as well as the associated costs.</p> <p>We request that Alcoa prepare a fact sheet to distribute to the wider communities, about their water requirements and source options, and how this may affect other users.</p> <p>We received the short-listed water</p>	<p>Table a draft a fact sheet of Alcoa’s total water usage, in the context of the broader requirements of the region, particularly community and agricultural use.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>supply options tabled from Alcoa and recognised that Alcoa's preferred option is Harvey Main Drain Pumpback.</p> <p>We recognise that the wider community needs more information to feel comfortable with this being the way forward.</p>	
7	Water efficiency			<p>Angelo Futia, Chemical Engineer at Wagerup, presented the ongoing potential opportunities for water conservation and efficiency regardless of any future expansion.</p> <p>This included the social, economic and environmental aspects of these, and issues of concern identified by Alcoa (some of which are also community-based).</p> <p>Some of these options are already in place or are progressing, and include process-related options to reduce evaporation losses and reduce residue dust control water consumption, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vapour Condensation Recovery; 2. Non-evaporative Cooling (e.g. Fin fan coolers); 3. Upgraded sprinkler and meteorological system; and 4. Covers on water storage areas and non-process related options for water use reduction and efficiency through: 	<p>Look into CSIRO research about use of Cetyl Alcohol and other measures to reduce evaporation from farm dams, for potential as water efficiency option.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>5. Alcoa Farmlands On-Farm Irrigation Efficiency Water;</p> <p>6. Harvey Water Off-farm Irrigation Efficiency Water;</p> <p>7. Community Water Consumption (supporting local government in reduction campaigns).</p>	
7	Remaining key water and residue issues			<p>These have been forwarded to Peter Di Marco, the consultant engaged to undertake the Health Risk Assessment (HRA) for his consideration of what needs to go into the HRA.</p> <p>We believe that Alcoa should investigate improving overall security for both the Refinery and the RDAs.</p> <p>We need to keep updated of the implementation of WAP outcomes.</p> <p>On our recent site tour, the Group witnessed visible dust localised in the bauxite grinding area.</p> <p>We have since been advised that this was due to a failure of dust suppression equipment, and heard that remedial action to repair the equipment has been taken, and Alcoa's management systems continue to monitor for any future occurrence.</p> <p>We requested that Alcoa consider biological monitoring of water on site</p>	<p>Bring analysis of the security system for RDA 8 and future plans.</p> <p>Distribute previous Wagerup Action Plan meeting minutes that specifically reference indoor air quality to Greg Power and the Working Group members.</p>

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				in the Environmental Review and Management Plan, particularly freshwater sources at the refinery and downstream from Refinery.	
8, 9 Feb 2005	Residue Drying Area (RDA) security	Access security at Wagerup		<p>Following a question raised during our Residue Drying Area (RDA) tour about site access security, we received information about Wagerup's risk assessment approach and were satisfied with this response.</p> <p>We also heard that Alcoa values having the interaction with community members, through consultation processes such as this, for bringing these issues to Alcoa's attention.</p>	Report back about fencing upgrades specifically on the residue access road/highway interface.
8	WA Dust Studies and dust particle size and composition	<p>Handout 5.4 – Residue Dust studies</p> <p>Handout 4.2 – Composition of Residue (2) to review dust particle size</p>		<p>Gordon Baird, Environmental Team Leader for Alcoa, summarised the current WA Dust Study, which investigates particle size and composition of dust leaving the residue area.</p> <p>We support the research into dust deposition and chemical composition of dust and suggest that it be closely incorporated into Alcoa's overall management program for Residue.</p> <p>This material should be turned into a fact sheet for communication to the wider community.</p>	Follow up on information about the health impacts of mud bricks, for further discussion when the information becomes available.
8	Visual Amenity - Alcoa's approach	Ian Yull's presentation 'Visual Amenity Summary – Wagerup'		Ian Yull, Environmental Consultant to Alcoa (Environ), presented the visual amenity summary for the Residue Drying Area (RDA), based on RDA 7	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>Visual Amenity Plan and the Long Term Residue Management Strategy (LTRMS), which included reference to height and the planting program for 2005.</p> <p>We understand this to be Alcoa's plan for dealing with visual amenity for the residue area, and believe it should also include wildlife corridor connections.</p> <p>We also identified that visual amenity planning is an ongoing process. In particular we identified that farmland management and ongoing visual amenity are issues to be further addressed in the Long Term Residue Management Strategy.</p>	
8	Provision of accurate information by Alcoa			<p>The other discussion topic from today's meeting was: Reaffirming the need for Alcoa to provide clear and accurate information to the wider community about water use, water sources and water cost.</p>	Table a draft a fact sheet of Alcoa's total water usage, in the context of the broader requirements of the region, particularly community and agricultural use and about Alcoa's residue dust studies.
8	Remaining key water and residue issues				Distribute previous Wagerup Action Plan meeting minutes that specifically reference indoor air quality to Greg Power and the Working Group members.
8	Surface water evaporation measures			The Group was presented information on measures to reduce surface evaporation as a water efficiency measure and heard there are no current methods of significant value for larger areas of water that will	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				assist this Project.	
9, 23 Feb 2005	Alternative uses of residue in mud bricks			We refer the issue and implications of the alternative use of residue in mud bricks to the consultation process for the Long Term Residue Management Strategy group for further consideration.	Provide the name and copies of the full report about health impacts of mud bricks.
9	Final outcomes from the WG	Preparation of submissions to the ERMP and updated ERMP public review timeline		We continued with the drafting of our final register of outcomes to go in the ERMP. We scheduled an additional meeting to continue drafting our residue issues to go in the ERMP for Monday 28 February, 6:30pm, at the Waroona Community Centre.	
9	Draft water fact sheet	Draft Fact Sheet: Water use at Alcoa's Wagerup refinery and Willowdale Mine			Incorporate the Group's feedback to the draft water fact sheet and re-distribute for comment to the Working Group
9	Environmental monitoring and health impact linkages	Draft Report: Wagerup Alumina Refinery – Environmental Monitoring and Health Impact linkages Wagerup Community Working Group meeting minutes, 25 September 2003 Wagerup Environmental Review and Management Plan extracts from 1978			

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		Registry of Toxic Effects of Chemical Substances: Aluminium oxide, November 2004 update			
10, 28 Feb 2005	Final outcomes from the WG			We continued with the drafting of our final register of outcomes to go in the ERMP.	
10	Water fact sheet	Second draft water fact sheet			Provide feedback to Jodie Read on the draft water fact sheet.
10	Willowdale mining operations	Letter from MMPLG in response to Working Group concerns			
10	Health Risk Assessment	Review of compound selection – Wagerup Refinery Expansion (background to Health Risk Assessment).			
10	Alternative use of residue in mud bricks				Provide the name and copies of the full report about health impacts of mud bricks
10	Radiation from residue operations				Distribute feedback from the radiological council
10	Oxalate storage				Provide briefing paper on oxalate storage to all WG members
10	Outstanding WG issues				Seek feedback from the Social and Economic Working Group about public access to the forest.
10	Future meeting dates and agenda items			We scheduled the following meetings to conclude our business: • Tuesday 8 March, 6:30pm, at Waroona Community Centre: Finalise draft residue and water outcomes;	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>Oxalate storage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wednesday 30 March, 7am, Waroona Community Centre Diffuse source modelling Health Risk Assessment • Monday 4 April, 6:30pm, venue to be advised Complete outcomes register 	
<p>11, 8 Mar 2005</p>	<p>Health Risk Assessment</p>	<p>Review of compound selection – Wagerup Refinery Expansion (background to Health Risk Assessment) (from previous meeting)</p>		<p>Peter Di Marco, the consultant engaged by Alcoa to undertake the Health Risk Assessment (HRA), presented an overview of the HRA process (which looks at the current and expanded scenario), including the aims, key principles, how to identify chemicals of concern and how to identify hazards and assess risk.</p> <p>We suggested that the following compounds be included for assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aluminium and its related compounds; 2. Silica; 3. Oxalate 4. The alkaline dust particles <p>We heard that Multiple Chemical Sensitivity is not assessed as part of the HRA, but would need to be dealt with in a separate process.</p> <p>Some community members are concerned that there is limited understanding within the community about how to make complaints against</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>the company.</p> <p>We were told that Alcoa has a dedicated telephone contact line for complaints, available 24 hours a day, 7 days per week. The local community has previously been advised of these contact details and it was suggested that a secondary awareness program be undertaken.</p> <p>Some community members have also expressed concern at Alcoa's response to concerns when they have been raised.</p> <p>We also suggest that Alcoa liaise with previous complainants about health effects in animals from surrounding farmlands and consider developing a process to deal with these more effectively.</p> <p>Peter will present the outcomes of the HRA at the next meeting on Monday 4 April, which will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of major hazards; and • Ground level concentrations and risk contours (which combine both refinery and residue sources) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residue sources include some gaseous emissions (such as VOCs) and dust. 	
11	Willowdale mine	Copy of Steve Pinzone's response to the MMPLG letter, plus		In response to the letter from the MMPLG in relation to mining operations at Willowdale tabled at the previous meeting, Steve Pinzone	Follow up within Alcoa in response to Steve's matters re the MMPLG letter.

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
		<p>Copy of a letter from the Pinzone family to Wayne Osborn regarding blasting practices</p> <p>Supplement to Environmental Review and Management Programme, 1978, Section 3.7.3.3 Minesite Noise</p>		<p>raised the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impacts of truck movements leaving the Willowdale minesite; 2. Notification of blasting and public access to blast site; 3. Insufficient minesite community consultation for Wagerup Unit Three; 4. Collection of noise data (dBA) data from the blast radius, as specified in the 1978 Environmental Review and Management Plan. <p>Our Group emphasised that this needs immediate attention by Alcoa.</p>	Follow up with MMPLG on matters raised by Steve.
11	Alternative use of residue in mud bricks				Provide the name and copies of the full report about health impacts of mud bricks.
11	Radiation from residue operations	Radiation Fact Sheet			
11	Oxalate storage at Wagerup	Wagerup Refinery Oxalate Management Strategy			
12, 30 Mar 2005	Willowdale Mine			<p>In response to concerns raised by Steve Pinzone at the previous meeting, Vanessa Guthrie received advice that information about mining operations is being offered to the community in a variety of ways including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mining tours; 2. Mining open day; 3. Through the Wagerup Update <p>In response to the concern about the insufficient community consultation around mining with regards to the proposed expansion, we heard that</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>the MMPLG expects community consultation has taken place in preparing the plans that go to the MMPLG (before the end of the year).</p> <p>We would like to see Alcoa's neighbours current concerns regarding existing mining operations addressed immediately by the company, not just discussed.</p> <p>Tony Hall and Steve Pinzone were concerned that a major part of environmental impacts of mining have been left out of the ERMP and that a decision could be made to allow the expansion without any consideration of these.</p>	
12	Dust Control	Example ground level concentrations (Refinery and Diffuse Sources) WG3		Based on the diffuse source modelling information we received at today's meeting, we recognise that dust control must remain a priority issue for Alcoa to manage in current and future operations.	
12	Freedom of Information Application				Contact the Freedom of Information (FOI) coordinator from Department of Environment about status of the Group's application.
13, 04 Apr 2005	Freedom of Information Application			We decided to forward the response to the Freedom of Information application for Department of Environment monitoring data for the 2002 dust case, to the Group that looks after the Long Term Residue Management Strategy (LTRMS), as we have not received it during the	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
13	Health Risk Assessment Contour Lines - Tim McAuliffe	Wagerup 3 health Risk Assessment - Contours		<p>process of this Working Group.</p> <p>Tim McAuliffe, Environmental Consultant to Alcoa, presented an overview of the Health Risk Assessment (HRA) contour lines, which cover the environmental risk for the current and expanded refinery scenarios.</p> <p>We heard that the supporting text for the HRA is currently being finalised. We understand that the results of the contour modelling indicate that Acute (short-term) Hazard Risk, Chronic (longer-term) Hazard risk and the Incremental Carcinogenic Risk for health, for the current and expanded refinery, meet world class health risk criteria.</p> <p>This information provided a comprehensive picture which increased our confidence in the available knowledge and understanding of health risk.</p> <p>Based on the information presented, we believe this will be reassuring to the community.</p> <p>We request that formal verification of the modelling and the HRA occur and the outcomes of that verification be made available to the community in some format.</p> <p>We believe that the new information</p>	

Meeting	Topic of discussion	Information Provided (before and at meeting)	Working Group Issues	Working Group Outcomes	Actions
				<p>provided by HRA modelling may provide a useful contribution to discussions about the buffer and land management around Alcoa's operations.</p> <p>The information presented tonight confirms our belief that dust control must remain a priority issue for Alcoa to manage in current and future operations.</p> <p>Members would like to receive a copy of the final HRA report.</p>	
13	Final Outcomes for submission to the ERMP			<p>We completed generating our final outcomes for submission to the Environmental Review and Management Plan (ERMP).</p> <p>Members present at tonight's meeting signed off on these.</p> <p>Note: Tony Hall, Louis Bursztyn, Alan Cook and Liana Sandstrom were apologies for this meeting.</p>	

