

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

## **MEETING 8**

5.30 – 8.30pm, Thursday 23 October 2008

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

### **MEETING MINUTES**

(As confirmed at the 9th CESC meeting)

## **1. Attendees and apologies**

### **CESC members present**

Tony O'Hara – Hampton Park Progress Association  
Jim Houlahan – Dandenong Residents and Ratepayers Association  
Thelma Wakelam – Residents Against Toxic Waste in the South East (RATWISE)  
Geraldine Gonsalvez – Community interests in the SE (including RATWISE)  
Jim Memeti – Councillor, City of Greater Dandenong  
Malcolm Baker – Director, Development Services City of Greater Dandenong  
Eric van Toor – Team Leader Asset Management, City of Casey  
Andrew Tytherleigh – Executive Officer, Victorian Waste Management Association (VWMA)  
Michael O'Keeffe – Post Collection Manager, SITA Environmental Solutions  
Evan Kyriakopoulos – Operations Manager, SITA Environmental Solutions  
George Tsivoulidis – Regional Manager, EPA SE Metro Region  
Ian Jenz – President, Colemans Road Ratepayers Association  
Jason Wood – Lynbrook Residents Association  
Alexa Powell – Community Relations Officer, EPA SE Metro Region  
Bruce Turner – Phoenix Facilitation (CESC facilitator)

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

(none)

### **Apologies/absent**

Laurence Halvy – General Manager, Fresh Start Bakeries, Dandenong South  
Rob Wilson – Councillor, City of Casey  
Mark D'Agostino – Environmental Health Officer, Department of Human Services  
Grant Tishler – Manager, Property and Development, Pellicano Pty Ltd.

Michelle Lee from DPCD had informed Bruce that she would not be attending future CESC meetings as she had resigned from her position at DPCD and taken a new role with the Regional Waste Management Group. Mathew Rogers from DPCD will be finding a replacement to join the committee.

## **2. Minutes of previous meeting**

Jani Breider had submitted comments on the record of her statements to the CESC (draft minutes, page 3). These were accepted by the group along with an additional sentence from Malcolm in relation to the City of Greater Dandenong's expectations for community consultation (page 4).

Bruce confirmed the agenda order with the group. Items 6 and 3 were swapped so that Geraldine could participate in the discussion of Items 6 and 4 before she had to leave the meeting.

## **6. Management and coordination of the CESC beyond 2008**

Michael informed the group that SITA's intention from the beginning of the CESC process was to take over coordination of the CESC. He stated that the agreement had been for EPA to develop the committee over a 12 month period and for SITA to take a leadership role after this point, which would be in early 2009.

This would mean that SITA would pay for the services of the independent facilitator of the committee and be responsible for administrative (e.g. minute-taking) processes also.

Tony responded that he felt the independence of the committee could be tainted if SITA was to manage the process. He said he would be more comfortable if Bruce continued to be paid by EPA. Malcolm suggested that the group was progressing well but was still bedding down and perhaps the question of ongoing management and coordination could be revisited in June 2009.

Thelma agreed that the committee was still establishing itself. She said there were mixed messages about who initiated the CESC and did not recall it being a SITA initiative. She and Geraldine thought the idea came from EPA, Councils and John Benny (CEO City of Greater Dandenong).

Malcolm suggested that it was probable the drive to establish a CESC had come from a number of sources and through a variety of forums. He said that when changes were made to the planning jurisdiction over the landfill, the City of Greater Dandenong had had discussions and made recommendations about community engagement activities around the site.

Michael pointed out that SITA needed to manage the CESC if it was to become an Accredited Licensee for its operations at Taylors Road. He explained that the attraction for SITA to become an Accredited Licensee for the Taylors Road (TRL) site was to enhance the company's status and recognition, since no other landfill in Victoria had this accreditation.

Tony reiterated his view that the public trust in the process and the perception of the CESC's independence could be affected by a change in management, and that it would be his preference for Bruce to continue as chair. Jim H enquired why EPA wouldn't continue to fund and coordinate the process.

Malcolm explained that the resources had been provided by EPA for an initial 12 month period and that the initial steering group (prior to the establishment of the CESC) had consisted of representatives from the City of Greater Dandenong, Casey, EPA and SITA who had agreed on the plan for taking the CESC forward. Malcolm suggested that the group would need to continue working together in the same way as it had been to date; it wouldn't be in SITA's interests to change things. George agreed that members would only continue to participate if it was seen to be worthwhile. Geraldine said the process would need to remain open and transparent as it currently was.

Tony and Jim H suggested deferring transfer of management responsibility for 6 and 12 months respectively.

Malcolm pointed out that the group was only being asked to consider who paid the facilitator and who produced the initial draft minutes that were reviewed by the facilitator and group before being published. Tony asked what would happen if the group felt the process was not independent enough; could this affect SITA's accreditation. George confirmed that any accreditation is continuously under review (and can be revoked).

Eric drew the group's attention to the checks already in place to address concerns about the impartiality of the facilitator (paragraph 3 of point 6 in the CESC Terms of Reference): *If the facilitator or any other participant becomes aware of any circumstances that might reasonably be considered to affect the facilitator's capacity to act impartially, the CESC will be informed of those circumstances and the Committee will advise whether to continue the process with the current facilitator.*

Thelma said she would like further information about the advantages of Taylors Road Landfill becoming accredited for both SITA and EPA. Ian suggested the Hallam and Taylors Road facilities could be accredited together.

George suggested that EPA would be happy to continue publishing CESC minutes on EPA's website and that other than financial management the process wouldn't need to change very much. He said the strength of the process was that it was public and that the minutes were a record of the meetings.

Jim H asked if SITA could gain accreditation as long as the CESC exists, irrespective of who manages it. Alexa pointed out that it would be inappropriate for EPA to approve SITA as an accredited licensee while EPA was also coordinating the community engagement strategy for the Taylors Road landfill and paying for the facilitator. She said it was an integral part of industries demonstrating best practice that they coordinate their own community engagement activities. George pointed out that many 'Community Liaison Committees' at industry facilities are run by company staff, i.e. they do not have an independent facilitator.

There was general support for the role of independent facilitator for the CESC and some concern about what would happen if a new facilitator was needed at some point in the future. Geraldine suggested that a clause be included in the Terms of Reference document about how a new facilitator would be appointed.

The CESC agreed to revisit this topic at the next meeting.

**Action 1: EPA and SITA to prepare a summary of the advantages for each of their organisations in SITA achieving accreditation for its Taylors Road Landfill (for discussion by the CESC at the next meeting).**

**Action 2: Bruce to draft an additional clause for the CESC Terms of Reference to guide the appointment of new facilitators (for review by the CESC at the next meeting).**

#### 4. Towards a Community Engagement Plan

Alexa reported that no comments had been received on the plan since the last CESC meeting.

Michael discussed the proposal for the Taylors Road Landfill (TRL) Open Day:

- A marquee tent would be set up and have information boards about landfill management and engineering (similar to the information boards in the Hallam Rd meeting room)
- Bus tours of the landfill would operate approximately every 15-30 minutes
- Interested people would be able to drop in at any time throughout a ~3 hour period on a weekday afternoon-evening and could take a tour and talk with SITA staff in the marquee
- Packages of information about TRL would be available for people attending.

Ian said he thought the Open Day should be targeted at the most local residents and businesses, although it should also be open to anyone interested.

Geraldine said it was important to keep up the contact with people and suggested that a follow up event should be arranged in the New Year, such as a public forum with a panel of speakers at the Drum Theatre in Dandenong. Bruce suggested that this style of forum would lend itself to a time when there was a definite proposal that the community was being consulted about. Tony said that such a forum allowed different people to ask questions and those who were hesitant to voice their opinion could have their questions asked by others.

Thelma suggested that there could be a designated time for a 'forum' within the Open Day format. She suggested there could be a questions box provided. Bruce said he understood the desire to have a question and answer session, but was concerned that the marquee would not provide comfortable space for a lot of people to attend at the one time.

A number of other suggestions were made by the group:

- Councillors from CGD and Casey should be invited to attend
- Let local real estate agents know about the Open Day
- Local Schools be invited with bus tours offered to them earlier on the same day
- If possible Council publications be used to advertise the event, and local papers
- Make use of the CESC article that has yet to be published – publish it prior to the event and use it to promote the event
- Locate the marquee at the front entrance, if possible
- Ask people to indicate 'online' if they are planning to come (to have some idea of the numbers to plan for)
- As many CESC members as possible to attend and to wear badges (provided by SITA) to identify them (members also welcome to wear badges indicating the group or organisation they represent on the CESC).

The group discussed a draft bulletin that had been prepared by SITA. Michael explained the information had been influenced by the numerous enquiries the company had received due to the Stevenson's Road landfill issues. The feedback and discussion on the bulletin included the following points:

- The bulletin should be focused on TRL (not Hallam) and purpose made for the open day
- It should include some more information on PIW, gas management (including potential local offsite effects of gases on residents, workers etc) and cell construction
- Consider using a Question & Answer (Q&A) format to make the information more accessible and less technical sounding

- There was concern that the opening paragraphs of the draft with the history of waste and SITA might put people off
- Have some simpler materials for younger children (for schools visits)

The group agreed that the SITA TRL Open Day would be held on Wednesday 10 December 2008. The hours it would be open were tentatively agreed as 4pm to 8pm.

Bruce reported that Laurence Halvy had offered to supply all the rolls and bread necessary for SITA's open day courtesy of Fresh Start Bakeries.

**Action 3: SITA to circulate to CESC members for quick review, a) a detailed plan for the Open Day, b) a refined draft of the bulletin, and c) draft text for the information panels to be displayed in the marquee**

## 5. Taylors Road Licence

Bruce reminded the group that the licence would be the main focus of discussion at the next CESC meeting on 27 November 2008 and that Colin McIntosh from EPA would be in attendance.

### *Licensed ratios for Prescribed Industrial Waste (PIW)*

Ian indicated he had concerns about the PIW ratios which had been discussed at the previous meeting (not attended by Ian) and recorded in the minutes. Ian stated that he was unaware SITA could receive more than 35% PIW (out of all waste received) at the landfill.

Tony read out clause 1.8 of the licence:

*With written consent of the Authority the amount of prescribed industrial wastes deposited at the landfill may exceed the maximum ratio of 40% by weight of the total waste placed in the landfill in any six month period.*

Ian said that the Colemans Road Residents Association (CRRRA) had an agreement with SITA, EPA and the City of Greater Dandenong that Ian would be kept informed about any significant developments with the landfill. He said he was concerned that Clause 1.8 in the licence had been introduced without a Works Approval and he was not confident that residents would be notified in the future. He reiterated that if there any changes to the licence were planned or proposed for the landfill, the CESC and CRRRA must be notified.

### *Jani Breider's correspondence*

Bruce asked the group for suggestions on how best to coordinate responses to a set of follow-up questions that Jani had sent to Bruce and a number of CESC members on 22 October 2008.

Tony expressed concern about going over old ground and using the CESC time to discuss things which had been concluded. He said he was not concerned with penalising SITA because of the ambiguousness of the height clause in the Licence. He suggested the focus should be on controlling the maximum height from now on by clarification of the Licence, rather than trying to reduce the current height.

Jim H suggested that the issues being raised were not reflective of the CESC members' views and concerns. He said he was not concerned about the height of the landfill, but was looking for assurance from EPA and independent auditors about the integrity of the liners and risks of airborne emissions. He suggested that issues relating to height needed to be raised after the community were assured the site posed no threat to safety.

George informed the group Jani had been provided with a number of forums to discuss her concerns and that the CESC was not the only place where she was directing correspondence. Thelma commented that nevertheless the correspondence could not be ignored. She asked if SITA could answer the questions that Jani had directed at the company.

After further discussion, the group agreed the best way forward would be to wait until a decision on how to proceed with the licence had been made before responding to Jani's questions.

**Action 4: Bruce to inform Jani of the CESC decision.**

### **3. Community Update**

Jason informed the group that he had spoken to a community member who was looking at building in the Marriot Waters estate near the landfill. The person had spoken to him after he had already spoken to Evan at SITA. He said the focus of the conversation had mainly been on how Jason felt living in Lynbrook Estate.

### **7. Communications**

The group discussed the most effective ways to communicate with the community about the Open Day.

- Fliers posted on community notice boards by the CESC community representatives
- Dandenong and Casey councils representatives would follow up on whether it was feasible to use their respective community newsletters
- EPA would publish the Open Day on the Lyndhurst page on the website (and Councils would look at publishing it on their websites)
- SITA would conduct a doorknock of neighbouring businesses and factories to handout invitation fliers
- A small addressed mailout of the flier to the immediate areas surrounding the landfill (NB it was felt that wider letterboxing was not worthwhile as many people do not read unsolicited material).

### **8. Next Meetings**

5.30pm – 8.30pm, Thursday 27 November 2008

Bruce also proposed a short meeting at the conclusion of the Open Day (in the marquee?) to evaluate the Open Day and celebrate the end of the year.

### **9. Other Business**

Alexa informed the group she would be requesting that they all complete a short online survey in the next few weeks. The survey is anonymous and is related to how the Community Engagement process has been coordinated by EPA. The findings will assist EPA in formally reviewing the CESC project and improving future community engagement activities.