

# **TAYLOTS ROAD 'LYNDHURST' LANDFILL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE**

## **SITE VISIT AND 2<sup>nd</sup> MEETING**

2.00 – 5.30 pm, Friday 2 May 2008

Site visit - Taylors Road landfill, Dandenong South

Meeting - Meeting room, SITA Environmental Solutions, Hallam road Landfill,  
Hallam Road, Hampton Park

### **MEETING MINUTES**

(As confirmed at 3<sup>rd</sup> CESC meeting)

## **1. Attendees and apologies**

### **CESC members present**

Tony O'Hara – Hampton Park Progress Association

Jim Houlahan – Dandenong Residents and Ratepayers Association

Jason Wood – Lynbrook Residents Association

Thelma Wakelam – Residents Against Toxic Waste in the South East (RATWISE)

Mark D'Agostino – Environmental Health Officer, Department of Human Services

Geraldine Gonsalvez – Community interests in the SE (including RATWISE)

Malcolm Baker – Director, Development Services City of Greater Dandenong

David Richardson – Manager Engineering and Environmental Services, City of Casey

Rob Wilson – Councillor, City of Casey

Ian Jenz – President, Colemans Road Ratepayers Association

Evan Kyriakopoulos – Operations Manager, SITA Environmental Solutions

George Tsivoloudis – Regional Manager, EPA SE Metro Region

Alexa Powell – Community Relations Officer, EPA SE Metro Region

Bruce Turner – Phoenix Facilitation (CESC facilitator)

### **Visitors (non-members)**

Daniel Fyfe – State Manager, SITA Environmental Solutions

### **Apologies**

Grant Tishler – Manager, Property and Development, Pellicano Pty Ltd

Andrew Tytherleigh – Executive Officer, Victorian Waste Management Association (VWMA)

Laurence Halvy – General Manager, Freshstart Bakeries, Lyndhurst

Jim Memeti – Councillor, City of Greater Dandenong

Michael O'Keeffe – Post Collection Manager, SITA Environmental Solutions

## **2. Landfill gas management presentation**

Evan delivered a presentation on landfill gas management for the Taylors Road site. (The presentation will be circulated to CESC members).

He explained that landfill gas (LFG) is produced by organic waste (household garbage and green waste) decomposing under anaerobic (oxygen-free) conditions in the landfill. LFG needs to be captured and managed because if it is left in its natural state it can become explosive and it also significantly contributes to greenhouse gas emissions.

All landfills which handle putrescible waste must have a gas management system in place as part of their operational and rehabilitation procedures. These systems involve boring down through the landfill and enabling the gas to be captured through pipes. Evan said the installation of a new gas well causes temporary odours from the gas that is released.

At the Taylors Road landfill there are over 270 LFG bores. An external specialist gas management company manages the system and processes the gas, which involves 'scrubbing' it on the way to the gas plant on-site. The gas is then used to generate electricity at the Berwick Power Station which is fed back into the metropolitan power grid. The majority of the '*green energy*' on offer to households and businesses in Victoria is generated by LFG from landfill sites. Evan said there needed to be a flow of

LFG of at least 570 m<sup>3</sup>/hour to enable electricity generation. Otherwise the gas was flared (burnt) at the gas plant on-site.

Tony asked about the “cocktail” of chemicals in the Prescribed Industrial Waste (PIW) landfill cells and the potential for heavier-than-air gas from these cells migrating across the perimeter of the site towards nearby factories. He also referred to an on-site incident some years ago when he understood someone had been hurt due to an escape of gas.

Ian pointed out that the local residents on Coleman’s Road were much closer to the site than factory workers.

Daniel explained that the incident that Tony referred to was due to the lid on one of the leachate sumps blowing off after trapping gas as well as leachate. He said the leachate sump lids were now fitted with gas collection pipes, and were now made of steel and bolted on so that this could not happen again. He said the gas collection system is run at a slight negative pressure so LFG generated within the putrescible waste cells is sucked in to the system.

Daniel explained that PIW did not create LFG as it doesn’t contain degradable (i.e. organic) material; consequently there are no gas bores in the PIW cells or a need for a gas management system.

Geraldine asked how deep the gas wells (bores) were. Evan replied that bores had varying depths of between 15 – 20 metres. Daniel added that the bores are approximately 6-7 metres from the base of the landfill so there was no danger of the drilling piercing the landfill liners. Geraldine asked whether the base of the landfill was below the watertable. Evan replied that it was which helped reduce the risk of groundwater contamination. If a hole developed in the lining system groundwater would leak *into* the landfill (because it was lower than the water table) and be pumped out with the leachate rather than leachate leaking *out* of the landfill and into the groundwater.

Geraldine also asked about the potential for chemical reactions in the PIW cell. Daniel said the majority of waste stored in the PIW cell was non-reactive, generally slightly alkaline material. Any acidic waste was deposited separately from other waste in the cell.

Bruce suggested that the CESC might oversee the production of a fact sheet to help explain the LFG management system to the wider community.

**Action 1: The CESC to consider what would be useful in this regard (and for any other insights that resulted from the site visit) to begin to share information with the wider community – for the agenda of the next meeting.**

### 3. Site visit

After the landfill gas presentation, the CESC members boarded a bus for a tour of the Taylors Road site. The group were shown a number of points of interest at the site including:

- The PIW cell (12B), which is in current operation. Evan gave an explanation of the cell construction and liners and how the PIW cells were designed and constructed to be entirely separate from the adjacent ‘normal’ waste cells (particularly cell 11)
- The newest putrescible waste cell (number 20), which was still being constructed (this cell is located in closest proximity to the nearest neighbours on Coleman’s Road)
- The operational putrescible waste cell (number 19), which is currently receiving household waste.
- The landfill leachate treatment ponds.
- The leachate sump that had had its lid blown off (as previously discussed and recorded under item 2 above).
- The gas plant
- The weighbridge and entry to the landfill.

The group then left the bus and posed for a photo in front of PIW cell 12B (see below). The group visited the weighbridge office where Evan demonstrated the testing and approval/receiving process each truck entering the landfill goes through. The group then returned to the Hallam Road Landfill via Colemans Road to see first hand the closest residential properties to the landfill.



The CESC meeting was resumed back at the Hallam Road Landfill.

## Meeting (Part 2)

Bruce formally welcomed and introduced the members who had been unable to attend the first meeting: Jason Wood and Mark D'Agostino. The group then introduced themselves.

### 4. Minutes of previous meeting

There were a few corrections regarding CESC member's names and titles but otherwise the draft minutes from the previous meeting were confirmed as an accurate record.

The group agreed that the minutes would be published on the EPA website with links to this from the councils' sites. Evan agreed to distribute his presentation on LFG management to the group, but that presentations wouldn't automatically be published on the website due to the size of the documents.

Thelma suggested that it could be helpful to tape future meetings to ensure there was an accurate record of discussions if members ever needed to check back on the detail. There was some discussion about the suggestion. Given the limited meeting time remaining and the absence of a number of members, Bruce suggested the question of whether to record meetings be further discussed at the next meeting.

**Action 2: List the question of whether meetings should be recorded for discussion at the next meeting.**

### 5. Terms of reference

Bruce indicated he had only received comments on the latest draft TOR from Andrew Tytherleigh who had concerns about the statement on page 5 that "once information is legitimately in the public domain, members are not constrained from publicly expressing their interest group's or individual opinions, provided they make it clear that they are not representing the views of others on the CESC". Andrew's concern was that this provided an avenue for members to use information they gathered in the meetings to publicly criticise the views of others which would undermine the CESC process. The group discussed Andrew's comments. Tony suggested that one way of preventing this from occurring could

be for an additional clause to be added which would state that “*no one is able to quote others on the CESC*”. Bruce reminded members that in joining the CESC and endorsing the TOR (once finalised) they were implicitly supporting the overall purpose and aims of the process as outlined in the first sections of the TOR.

**Action 3: Bruce to update the draft TOR to reflect the above discussion.**

## **6. Landfill update**

There were no further updates on the landfill (other than the LFG management report). This is to be a standing item for SITA to use to report on recent events or activities to the CESC at future meetings.

## **7. Communications**

The group discussed some of the media coverage that had occurred since the first meeting. Tony referred to a Cranbourne Journal article of 28 April 2008 which had been circulated to the CESC. He explained that he had been misquoted and the journalist had used information from an interview that occurred before the inaugural meeting. Geraldine indicated that the press had not accurately quoted her either.

Ian said that people need to be conscious that misconstrued comments can be very harmful to local and nearby residents and generate fear in the community. Daniel added that some SITA staff had been very concerned about the publicity the committee had received. However, he acknowledged that it is quite possible that SITA or RATWISE or other interest groups would continue to be misquoted in future and that this was part of the process.

Bruce suggested that it would be an appropriate time for the group to produce a media release to announce the CESC's formation and membership. There was brief discussion of the key content and Bruce invited members to provide him with quotes (with their group's approval, where necessary). The group agreed to submit comments to Bruce over the weekend for inclusion in a media release.

**Action 4: Members to submit comments or quotes to Bruce by/on Monday 5 May and Bruce to circulate a draft media release to members for comment prior to him submitting it to local papers.**

## **8. Next meeting**

5.00pm – 8.00pm Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2008

### **Agenda items for the next meeting:**

- **Site visit followup, including a more detailed explanation of the relationship between cells 11 (normal waste) and 12A (PIW)**
- **EPA briefing on the PIW system and terminology**