

TAYLORS ROAD 'LYNDHURST' LANDFILL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT STEERING COMMITTEE

MEETING 15

5.30 - 8.30 pm, Thursday 20th August 2009

Meeting room, SITA Environmental Solutions, Taylors Road Landfill (TRL),
Taylors Road, Dandenong South

MEETING MINUTES

(As confirmed at 16th CESC meeting)

1. Attendees and apologies

CESC members present

Jim Houlahan – Dandenong Residents and Ratepayers Association
Thelma Wakelam – Residents Against Toxic Waste in the South East (RATWISE)
Ian Jenz – Colemans Road Ratepayers Association
Tony O'Hara – Hampton Park Progress Association
David Richardson – Manager Engineering and Environmental Services, City of Casey
Cr Yvonne Herring – Councillor, City of Greater Dandenong
Colin McIntosh – EPA Victoria
Michael O'Keefe – Post Collections Manager, SITA Environmental Solutions
Bruce Turner – Phoenix Facilitation (CESC facilitator)

Visitors (non-members)

Renee Deverson – Compliance EH&S Officer, SITA Environmental Solutions (Minute taker)
Rod Kean – City of Greater Dandenong (for Malcolm Baker)

Apologies/absent

Mark D'Agostino – Environmental Health Officer, Department of Human Services
Cr Lynette Keleher – Councillor, City of Casey
Geraldine Gonsalvez – Community interests in the SE (including RATWISE)
Jason Wood – Lynbrook Residents Association
Marc Boxer – Department of Planning and Community Development
Malcolm Baker – Director, Development Services City of Greater Dandenong
Andrew Tytherleigh – Executive Officer, Victorian Waste Management Association
Susan Carter – Community Engagement Facilitator, EPA Victoria
Evan Kyriakopoulos – Operations Manager, SITA Environmental Solutions
Helen Russo – Colemans Road Ratepayers Association
Laurence Halvy – General Manager, Fresh Start Bakeries, Dandenong South

Bruce advised that Jason had informed him that the Lynbrook Residents' Association is in the process of disbanding due to lack of interest. Nevertheless, Jason had indicated he would like to remain on the CESC as a general voice for the Lynbrook community. It was generally agreed that this would be very helpful.

2. Minutes of previous meeting(s)

The draft minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the previous meeting.

3. Matters carried over from previous meetings

3 a. SITA Waste Update

Michael outlined the background to the issue of the proportion of Prescribed Industrial Waste (PIW) in the total waste being received at TRL. He said there had been a spike in PIW received just prior to the increase in waste levies which meant SITA had applied for, and been given, an EPA exemption so as to temporarily exceed the limit of 40% PIW in any six month period. As a result of the dramatic increase of general waste received from cleanup of the Victorian bushfires, the percentage of PIW has come down to somewhere in the 20% -30% range. Michael advised that the exact figure would be available at the following meeting.

ACTION 15.1: SITA to provide figure on current ratio of PIW to general waste at the next meeting.

3 b. EPA summary of impacts of increased levies for Prescribed Waste

Bruce referred to the previous meeting where Susan provided a report on prescribed industrial waste (PIW) tonnages from July 2007. In response to the CESC's request for more historical data on tonnages disposed to landfill, Colin circulated copies of historical graphs showing trends for manufacturing waste and contaminated soils respectively. He noted that in 2007, before the levy increase, 77,000 tonnes of manufacturing waste was sent to landfill, while the following year the amount dropped to 47,000 tonnes.

Michael confirmed that in June 2007 the levy increased from \$26 to \$130 per tonne and in 2008 it increased from \$130 to \$250 per tonne. Yvonne asked how the drop in tonnages had been achieved. Michael said that an increase in recycling would have been partly responsible, as well as cleaner production at factories, the impact of the financial crisis and/or the levy increases. He said SITA was aware of a number of industries which have scaled back production or moved out of Victoria due to the increase in costs.

Colin referred to the graph for contaminated soil disposed to landfill and said there was no clear trend in the figures as the amounts related to development patterns.

Ian raised the issue of on-site containment of contaminated soils and expressed concern that these weren't included in the figures. Colin commented that on-site containment was not the same as landfilling so the former were not included in the figures for waste going to landfill. Ian referred to the Dandenong 'CALM' (old Melbourne Water site) and said there is a lack of community knowledge of what is contained within the soil. He said he felt that, based on the CALM report, the CALM is a mini landfill and should be classified as such and have a sign on the site letting people know what is there. He questioned if there was any licensing or permit for the CALM.

Rod and Yvonne noted that the CALM was done as part of the remediation works for the old sewerage treatment site for future use as an industrial estate. The CALM contains contaminants that were already on the site with no Category A or B permitted in the CALM. As the waste was already on the site, it is not a landfill, as landfill accepts fill of various materials from outside the landfill site. The CALM was developed under a Planning Permit and a Works Approval. The Works Approval was required to be advertised by the EPA.

3 c. Comments from A. Lane regarding Groundwater Salinity

Bruce referred to Jani Breider's questions after Anthony Lane's presentation at the April CESC meeting about the salinity levels in the local groundwater. Anthony had classified the groundwater as 'Segment B' while Jani had referred to a Nolan-ITU Report (2000) which stated the groundwater had originally been less saline ('Segment A2'). Jani followed up by sending Anthony an extract of the Nolan-ITU report with a letter dated 15 April 2009.

Michael circulated hardcopies of Anthony's response (which included references) to the members present. Anthony had reviewed the Nolan-ITU report and confirmed his opinion that the historical water quality for the local area at Taylors Road Landfill is Segment B. He said he would review this opinion in the 2009 groundwater audit report taking into account further data.

There was further discussion of the reports. Ian enquired if segment B water was safe to use on his garden. Colin confirmed that this level of salinity is suitable for such use.

Michael confirmed that Anthony's response could be provided to Jani.

ACTION 15.2: Bruce to send a copy of Anthony's response to Jani.

4. Soil Processing Facility Proposal and Community Engagement Plan

Bruce referred to the previous meeting and Evan's presentation regarding SITA's proposal to establish a soil processing facility at Taylors Road. As there were some members present who missed Evan's presentation, Michael recapped the presentation again, highlighting the fact that SITA's proposal would be very different to the soil treatment facility for which Renex is currently seeking a works approval. He said that SITA's proposal was still in the very early stages of development.

Michael referred to the draft Community Engagement Plan (CEP) that was circulated on Monday 17 August via email for discussion at the meeting. Michael said SITA's consultation with the CESC was aimed at being more transparent and better prepared to address community concerns upfront compared to Renex's approach. He said that SITA wanted to ensure it had the most effective community engagement plan and that this was the main focus of the night's meeting.

Before the CEP was discussed, members raised a number of questions and comments about the proposal itself:

- Doubts about the mobility of treatment plants and the feasibility of temporarily setting them up at Taylors Road (Thelma). (Michael advised that the majority of equipment – which would be selected according to the soil type and contamination – would take a few days to set up, and that the technologies are already in use in suburban Melbourne.)
- Need to identify all aspects of materials handling; from storage on site (especially if Category A wastes – concerned about potential for dust to be blown to surrounding communities) through to disposal. (Tony)
- Need to know what emissions there would be from thermal treatment, if any are likely to be carcinogenic, and how often this type of treatment is to be used. A plume and emissions chart similar to that produced for the Renex proposal would be helpful. Also need to know what monitoring will be used (Ian, Tony, Jim)
- Need to be clear on the differences between Renex's thermal treatment process and SITA's; in terms of process and emissions (Bruce, Ian, Jim)
- Are organics to be treated in windrows? (Tony)
- Clarify why it makes sense to move contaminated soils to be treated off-site at TRL, if they aren't going to be disposed of to the landfill. (Tony) (Michael stated it is due to the size of source sites as well as time constraints for developers trying to develop a site).

Michael stressed that many details of the proposal are yet to be finalised. Some members were concerned that there was not enough detail for them to be able to think of all the questions and issues the community might have. Jim said he felt it was good to be discussing the proposal at an early stage but noted that Renex had been criticised for not being able to provide answers to questions about its proposal. Michael pointed out that the Renex proposal had been in the post-application phase (i.e. after lodging with EPA) when it had received these comments, while SITA was initiating discussions at the pre-application stage and was looking to focus on shaping the CEP as part of this stage.

David highlighted the difficulty that SITA faced in detailing in advance all the soil processing that could be hosted at TRL. He suggested it would require community confidence in the management of the facility. Michael said SITA may potentially deal with this challenge by undertaking a works approval to construct the site for soil processing, and then apply to EPA for a 'Section 30' approval as a form of commissioning approval to commence the use of a process technology. It is envisaged that EPA will outline specific requirements for each technology.

Several members asked if, given that examples of the technologies SITA was proposing to host at the landfill were already in use, the CESC and community could get information on how these are performing now. Colin explained how monitoring data is collected by the companies involved, that there are numerous thermal treatment technologies used, and that results are dependent on the types of contaminants and the soil structure. Therefore, the amount of information covered in such a broad request would be voluminous. This data is stored on individual files generally for a specific site within the region where the soil treatment took place. EPA does not have one central database for this information. This was of considerable concern to some CESC members.

There was further discussion around the topic of the accessibility of data and the need for transparency in the monitoring of the performance of the array of soil processes being used around the State. A number of members were very concerned that data is owned by the processing companies and is not easily accessible to the public. In conclusion, it was made clear that the onus is on SITA to provide information about the performance of any technologies it proposes to host at TRL. It was also stated that there needs to be adequate monitoring to ensure that the local community's interests are safeguarded.

Bruce noted how a range of questions and issues had been raised through the discussion and asked members to provide any further questions or issues to SITA as soon as possible after the meeting. It was agreed that comments/questions regarding the proposal were to be forwarded to SITA by 3 September for SITA to be able to start preparing information in response.

ACTION 15.3: CESC members to provide further comments to SITA (cc to all) by 3 September.

Michael confirmed that more information on the proposal would be available at the next meeting.

Bruce reminded the group that the main purpose of the evening's discussion was to help SITA develop a credible community engagement plan that will meet the needs of anyone in the community who is interested in the proposal. He emphasised that by helping to shape the community engagement process, members were not being asked to endorse the proposal.

The group reviewed the draft CEP and Bruce undertook to circulate a revised draft with the changes as discussed.

ACTION 15.4: Bruce to circulate revised Community Engagement Plan with CESC revisions marked.

Michael indicated that SITA was aiming to lodge the works approval application in late October 2009. Tony commented that the public advertising period should be a suitable time and not over the Christmas period.

The planning permit process was also discussed. Rod reminded the CESC that the Minister for Planning is the responsible authority for planning approvals for new developments (buildings and works) at TRL. Rod commented that while the Minister issues the permits, Council is still responsible for the enforcement of them. A soil processing facility might require a new permit or amendment of an existing permit.

Bruce referred to an email that Jani Breider had sent to some CESC members prior to the meeting regarding TRL's location within a Farming Zone. Jani had asserted that this meant a soil processing facility would be prohibited, as it is an industrial use, and only rural industry is allowed in a Farming Zone. Bruce indicated that he had discussed this issue with DPCD and had been advised that with legitimate planning permits already in place before the Farming Zone was introduced, SITA was able to apply for a planning permit for 'ancillary' uses.

Ian reiterated his view that it is important that above all SITA and EPA work together to address issues surrounding potential emissions. Colin noted that there are regulations in place to protect air quality (such as the SEPP) which will have to be addressed in the application.

Yvonne asked what information would be provided to the community. Michael said he envisaged information to include a site layout plan and some images and information on the technologies in both a community bulletin, with additional information (e.g. on management systems – safety and environment) available at the proposed Open Day.

Yvonne and others suggested that some detail on the proposal would need to be in the bulletin. Bruce relayed that he had received an email from Jason suggesting that it was important to keep the bulletin very general and plain English with a link to a website where more details could be obtained (i.e. information similar to what would be available at the Open Day), including contact details of CESC members. Jason had also suggested that it would be helpful if people could submit questions and comments online. Michael responded that this may be possible and thought it was a suggestion worth pursuing. Tony asked if it was likely that SITA would include frequently asked questions with answers for the Open Day. Michael confirmed that this would be likely.

Bruce also suggested that a letter box drop, as well as advertising in the local newspapers (as per last year's Open Day) should be undertaken again by SITA. It was also noted that adequate time for schools to be informed of the opportunity to attend would be needed.

6. Communication and Consultation

This item was largely addressed as part of the previous agenda item.

ACTION 15.5: SITA to forward draft bulletin to CESC members prior to the next meeting. Members to come with comments to the meeting.

7. Next Meetings

The next meeting is scheduled for 5.30 – 8.30pm, Wednesday 23rd September at Taylors Road Landfill.