Hi Kieran,

(Despite appearances) I’ve clocked off for the day – I won’t run the story today without your response.

I will touch base in the morning.

Warm regards,

Kieran Lewis

---

Hi,

I’ve left some voicemails for you re this. Unfortunately we may not be able to meet your deadline today for a response to these questions. When you have a moment are you able to give the EHP Media Unit a call so we can discuss?

Thanks

Kieran Lewis

---

Hi,

I am writing a story regarding a development in the Ipswich City Council area, detailed below and in the attached PDFs.

I would like to know the extent of the Environment Department’s involvement in the approval of this development?

Is it aware of the type of lining and use for ponds referred to below? (Full original email is below)

- The approved plan of 2016 (refer attached) show that the 2 dams also on the near map image below are stormwater collection ponds. This is only partly correct as they operate as leachate ponds collecting untreated waste water runoff from the windrows as shown on the image below. However these dams were never designed, lined with adequate clay liners, or intended to protect the environment from leakage into the aquifers. As part of the application process the applicant was not requested to provide evidence that these dams were adequately lined, or, requested to provide geotechnical certification that the dams are structurally sound.

Would this type of development usually be referred to the department?

Has EHP inspected this site? If so, can you please provide detail including dates, times etc.

Can EHP assure Ipswich residents no hazardous material has impacted underground aquifers?

If you could get back to me by 5pm, Wednesday September 27, that would be greatly appreciated.

Kind regards,
I
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Warm

Kieran
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Thanks Helen.

Kieran

From:

www.npsr.qld.gov.au
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LEWIS Kieran <Kieran.Lewis@ehp.qld.gov.au>

Hi Kieran,

(Despite appearances) I've clocked off for the day – I won't run the story today without your response.

I will touch base in the morning.

Warm regards,
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Tel 07 3339 5831
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FW: Nu Grow DA approvals and 'illegal activity'

(NO: A separate email has been sent to the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning)

Hi,

I am writing a story regarding a development in the Ipswich City Council area, detailed below and in the attached PDFs.

I would like to know the extent of the Environment Department’s involvement in the approval of this development?

Is it aware of the type of lining and use for ponds referred to below? (Full original email is below)

- The approved plan of 2016 (refer attached) show that the 2 dams also on the near map image below are stormwater collection ponds. This is only partly

correct as they operate as leachate ponds collecting untreated waste water runoff from the windrows as shown on the image below. However these dams

were never designed, lined with adequate clay liners, or intended to protect the environment from leakage into the aquifers. As part of the application

Thanks for your enquiry. Please find the EHP response attached.

Regards

Andrea

Andrea Dobbyn
Senior Media Officer

Media Services | Corporate Communications
Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing/Department of Environment and Heritage Protection

P 07 3339 5848 or ext 74848
GPO Box 2454, Brisbane QLD 4001

If it's a media matter, please include the group email media@npsr.qld.gov.au
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I am writing a story regarding a development in the Ipswich City Council area, detailed below.

I would like to know the extent of the Environment Department’s involvement in the approval of this development?

Is it aware of the type of lining and use for ponds referred to below? (Full original email is below)

- The approved plan of 2016 (refer attached) show that the 2 dams also on the near map image below are stormwater collection ponds. This is only partly correct as they operate as leachate ponds collecting untreated waste water runoff from the windrows as shown on the image below. However these dams were never designed, lined with adequate clay liners, or intended to protect the environment from leakage into the aquifers. As part of the application process the applicant was not requested to provide evidence that these dams were adequately lined, or, requested to provide geotechnical certification that the dams are structurally sound.

Would this type of development usually be referred to the department?

Has EHP inspected this site? If so, can you please provide detail including dates, times etc.

Can EHP assure Ipswich residents no hazardous material has impacted underground aquifers?

Please attribute to a Department of Environment and Heritage Protection spokesperson

**Question 1:** I would like to know the extent of the Environment Department’s involvement in the approval of this development?

**Response:** The applicant lodged an application to Ipswich City Council under the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 on 20 December 2014. As assessment manager for the application, the Ipswich City Council determined that no referral agencies were applicable to the application and EHP was therefore not triggered as a referral agency.

**Question 2:** Is it aware of the type of lining and use for ponds referred to below?

**Response:** The operator is required to install an impervious barrier to subsoil and groundwater associated with the collection and storage of leachate. The operator previously advised that the storage dams were constructed with a clay layer.

Additionally the operator is required to monitor groundwater and provide the results to the department.

**Question 3:** Would this type of development usually be referred to the department?
Response: For a change to a development approval, an application is required under the Planning Act 2016 (previously the Sustainable Planning Act 2009).

If a referral agency is triggered as part of the development, applications must be lodged through the State Assessment Referral Agency (SARA), within the Department of Infrastructure Local Government and Planning, as the point of contact for all State government agencies.

**Question 4:** Has EHP inspected this site? If so, can you please provide detail including dates, times etc.

Response: In recent years EHP has regularly inspected the NuGrow site, including conducting a comprehensive audit of the site’s activities as part of EHP’s Swanbank Odour Targeted Compliance Program.

**Question 5:** Can EHP assure Ipswich residents no hazardous material has impacted underground aquifers?

Response: EHP has no evidence to suggest any adverse impacts to groundwater aquifers from the activity.

EHP is currently conducting detailed inspections of waste management facilities in the Ipswich region, which includes a full review of all groundwater monitoring data, as part of Operation TORA.

ENDS

For further media enquiries contact Media Services on (07) 3339 5831 or email media@ehp.qld.gov.au
Hi, a statement re the NuGrow EPO is attached.

Regards Anna

Good morning all, happy Monday.

I had a brief inquiry in relation to the transportation of contaminated water from RAAF Base Amberley to NuGrow at Swanbank. According to The Australian, EHP investigators are assessing the situation.

At what stage is the EHP’s investigation into NuGrow and its handling of the contaminated water?

Does the EHP intend to progress the matter through the courts?

According to The Australian, NuGrow said the EHP’s requirement that waste have no total organic fluorine levels was unreasonable as it was impossible to guarantee no contamination at all.

How does the department respond to the company’s claim?

What are the dangers of per-fluorinated chemicals in the environment and can they pose a risk to human health?

Is there anything else you’d like to add?

A response by 4pm if possible is appreciated. If there are any queries or concerns, please get in touch.

Kind regards, Hayden

Journalist

260 Brisbane Street West Ipswich QLD 4305

T s. 78B(2) M s. 78B(2) E s. 78B(2) @qt.com.au

Proudly supporting 1 degree, A News Corp Australia initiative.
Media response

Re: NuGrow
For: All media
Deadline: ASAP
Date: 4 June 2018

Please attribute to a Department of Environment and Science (DES) spokesperson:

As the environmental regulator, we have taken enforcement action against NuGrow for accepting 880,000 litres of PFAS contaminated waste water for composting – which we allege is in breach of their environmental authority (EA).

We acted swiftly and issued NuGrow with an environmental protection order (EPO) on 26 July last year to secure compliance with EA conditions and the general environmental duty.

The EPO required NuGrow to:
- cease the receipt of any liquid waste containing PFAS
- investigate the extent of PFAS contamination on site
- remove contaminated material that poses an unacceptable risk to public safety and the environment
- remediate the impacted area
- transport and dispose of contaminated material in accordance with relevant legislative provisions.

NuGrow is appealing this decision. As this matter is now before the Court, we cannot go into the specifics for legal reasons.

We have some of the highest environmental standards in the world and Queensland has a strong record when it comes to compliance.

Last financial year (2016-17) alone the state’s environmental regulator carried out more than 8700 compliance checks to ensure our high environmental standards are met.

The department has also been active in launching prosecutions.

Further information on PFAS is available at www.qld.gov.au/environment/pollution-management/investigation-pfas
Hi

Pam Frost in the Minister’s office asked me to send you this departmental statement.

Regards Anna

Anna Hanson
Media Service
Department of Environment and Science
P 07 3339 5831
Level 31, 400 George St, Brisbane Qld 4000
PO Box 2454, Brisbane Qld 4001
Media response

Re: NuGrow
For: All media
Deadline: ASAP
Date: 4 June 2018

Please attribute to a Department of Environment and Science (DES) spokesperson:

As the environmental regulator, we have taken enforcement action against NuGrow for accepting 880,000 litres of PFAS contaminated waste water for composting – which we allege is in breach of their environmental authority (EA).

We acted swiftly and issued NuGrow with an environmental protection order (EPO) on 26 July last year to secure compliance with EA conditions and the general environmental duty.

The EPO required NuGrow to:
  o cease the receipt of any liquid waste containing PFAS,
  o investigate the extent of PFAS contamination on site,
  o remove contaminated material that poses an unacceptable risk to public safety and the environment,
  o remediate the impacted area,
  o transport and dispose of contaminated material in accordance with relevant legislative provisions.

NuGrow is appealing this decision. As this matter is now before the Court, we cannot go into the specifics for legal reasons.

We have some of the highest environmental standards in the world and Queensland has a strong record when it comes to compliance.

Last financial year (2016-17) alone the state’s environmental regulator carried out more than 8700 compliance checks to ensure our high environmental standards are met.

The department has also been active in launching prosecutions.

Further information on PFAS is available at www.qld.gov.au/environment/pollution/management/investigation-pfas
From: Media DES [Media@des.qld.gov.au]
Sent: Monday, 4 June 2018 6:45 PM
To: Media DES
CC: Media DES
Subject: Media response - NuGrow - The Australian
Attachments: 040618 - NuGrow and PFAS - The Australian.pdf

Hi,

Apologies for the delay – please see our response attached.

Regards Anna

From: [theaustralian.com.au]
Sent: Monday, 4 June 2018 1:33 PM
To: Media DES <Media@des.qld.gov.au>
Subject: additional questions

G'day Anna,

Further to our conversation, documents show that NuGrow has claimed that it has approval to receive the PFAS contaminated material at its Kogan Facility.

Its EA for that site - EPPR03194415 - shows that there is an allowable limit of 0.39 mg/kg for total organic fluorine to be disposed of at the site and used in its manufacture of compost. Is this a true representation of the EA?

Has fluorine been disposed of at the Kogan site?
Has the same material been used in the manufacture of compost and similar products at the site?

We intend to publish a story tomorrow reporting the substance of the EA at the Kogan site.

Regards,

Queensland editor

Cnr Mayne Road & Campbell Street Bowen Hills QLD 4006
M: @theaustralian.com.au
W: theaustralian.com.au

Subscribe to The Australian Follow us online

This message and its attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information. It is intended solely for the named addressee. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee, you may not copy or deliver this message or its attachments to anyone. Rather, you should permanently delete this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by...
reply e-mail. Any content of this message and its attachments which does not relate to the official business of the sending company must be taken not to have been sent or endorsed by that company or any of its related entities. No warranty is made that the e-mail or attachments are free from computer virus or other defect.
Further to our conversation. Documents show that NuGrow has claimed that it has approval to receive the PFAS contaminated material at its Kogan Facility.

Its EA for that site - EPPR03194415 - shows that there is an allowable limit of 0.39 mg/kg for total organic fluorine to be disposed of at the site and used in its manufacture of compost. Is this a true representation of the EA?

Has fluorine been disposed of at the Kogan site?
Has the same material been used in the manufacture of compost and similar products at the site?

We intend to publish a story tomorrow reporting the substance of the EA at the Kogan site.

Please attribute to a Department of Environment and Science (DES) spokesperson:

The allowable limit of organic fluorine listed in the Kogan environmental authority was based on an international standard. This standard was considered to be a safe level for compost feedstock, based on acceptable human health and environmental guidelines.

This limit is for levels in composting feedstock, which is a different substance to wastewater that is the subject of the issue at NuGrow’s Swanbank site.

This 0.39 mg/kg limit for total organic fluorine was applied to have the effect of prohibiting receipt of any materials that exceed this value.

It is important to note that total organic fluorine is not equivalent to just PFOS and PFOA levels in soil. It is a much broader measurement that provides an indication of the total amount of fluorinated compounds present. There are thousands of fluorinated compounds known to have been manufactured globally.

PFAS have been used in a wide range of commercial and industrial applications since the 1950s.

The fact that they do not readily break down means that now, decades later, PFAS compounds are being found throughout the environment.
An independent expert health panel established by the Australian Government concluded there is mostly limited, or in some cases no evidence, that human exposure to PFAS is linked with human disease.

ENDS

For further media enquiries contact Media Services on (07) 3339 5831 or email media@des.qld.gov.au.
Hi

Apologies for the delay. Below is our response. Cheers.

Please attribute to a Department of Environment and Science spokesperson:

The Department of Environment and Science (DES) has made enquiries to Laing O’Rourke, the principal contractor for the Commonwealth Department of Defence’s “Battlefield Airlifter” project at the airbase.

DES has no regulatory control over activities on Commonwealth Defence sites, but has jurisdiction where wastes are removed from site for disposal.

DES has consulted with the Department of Defence and conveyed its expectation that its contractors will operate in all ways that avoid environmental harm.

The department confirms that it identified a compost site where PFAS-contaminated sludge and waste water, associated with works being undertaken at the Amberley Defence site, was being taken. The department intervened by issuing an Environmental Protection Order to the composter (NuGrow) requiring that it cease receiving this material; that it investigate the extent of any PFAS contamination at its site; and that it clean up any contamination detected.

The Environmental Protection Order is currently subject to legal proceedings and no further comment can be made at this time.

ENDS

From:
To:
Subject: Media response - Amberley PFAS-contaminated sludge & waste water

Hi Just wondering have you guys sent anything yet on this?

On 12 June 2018 at 13:49, Media DES <Media@des.qld.gov.au> wrote:

G’days

Just letting you know a statement is in approvals. We will get it to you when finalised.

Regards

Kieran Lewis
From: [s. 78B(2)]@theaustralian.com.au
Sent: Tuesday, 12 June 2018 12:32 PM
To: Media DES <Media@des.qld.gov.au>
Subject: Hi guys as flagged with Andrea can follow up on the Amberley PFAS questions and can you copy me into any response you send back to [s. 78B(2)] as he is tied up in budget at the moment thanks.

--

s. 78B(2)

Defence Correspondent

Cnr Mayne Road & Campbell Street Bowen Hills QLD 4006
M +61 [s. 78B(2)]
E [s. 78B(2)]@theaustralian.com.au W theaustralian.com.au

Subscribe to The Australian  Follow us online
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