

RECORD OF MEETING

Date and Venue of meeting	5 July 2012, EPA Regional Inspectorate, Dublin
Type of meeting	Article 16 discussion
Name of Licensee	Murphy Environmental Hollywood Ltd
Location	Co. Dublin
People present at meeting	<p>EPA: Frank Clinton, Brian Meaney For EPA: Dr Marcus Ford, Geosyntec Consultants MEHL: Patricia Rooney, Ken Rooney For MEHL: Louise O'Donnell, Patel Tonra Catherine Buckley, Arup Eugene Daly, Eugene Daly Associates</p>
Discussion is related to the following	Article 16 notice dated 23 March 2012 and follow up correspondence
Items / matters discussed	<p>EPA (via Geosyntec) led out the discussion on hydrogeological aspects of the application and in particular to explain why the information was sought under article 16. A discussion ensued on certain aspects of the information. MEHL indicated its intention to commence new site investigations – starting with downhole geophysics followed by the installation of a number of new boreholes and a pump test.</p> <p>On vulnerability, EPA explained that it is not possible to change the vulnerability classification of the site (as indicated in Groundwater Protection Responses), but it is possible to address the qualifications in the Responses. MEHL indicated that the article 16 response will address the question of vulnerability matrices and the approach to be adopted in their interpretation.</p> <p>Regarding the Bog of the Ring water supply, MEHL stated its understanding that water is generally drawn from the overlying gravels in the area and not from the Loughshinny aquifer. MEHL also indicated that Fingal County Council have stated a commitment not to pump any additional water from the supply.</p> <p>EPA indicated that there is not enough data to back up the groundwater contour drawings submitted. Faulting can make a groundwater divide preferentially draw flow down the line of a fault. More data is needed to demonstrate where the groundwater divide is now and might be in future as volumes drawn from Bog of the Ring change over time.</p> <p>MEHL indicated its intention to drill off-site if possible. An easterly borehole was proposed as this is the generally posited groundwater flow direction. EPA recommended that a northerly borehole in the context of locating the groundwater divide be considered. It may be that existing data not yet submitted might adequately locate the groundwater divide without recourse to off-site investigations.</p> <p>Regarding any direct between contact between the applicant's and the EPA's consultant hydrogeologists, it was pointed out that any discussions are to be documented and made part of the public record.</p> <p>At this point, Dr Ford, Ms Buckley and Mr Daly left the meeting. EPA indicated to MEHL its intention to request an Environmental Liabilities</p>

Risk Assessment and a Closure, Restoration and Aftercare Management Plan, fully costed. The EPA will also request a proposal for a financial provision and indicated that a decision will be made in due course as to whether such financial provision will have to be in place before the EPA makes a decision on the application.

EPA also indicated that the article 14 response dated 28 May 2012 is inadequate in that it did not address the detail required on waste recovery operations. It was suggested that the applicant might like to reconsider its response.