

SUEZ
Hampton Park Resource Recovery Facility
Community Reference Group

MINUTES OF MEETING

Meeting No. :	32	Status of Minutes :	Confirmed
Meeting Date :	30 March 2016	Meeting Time :	5:30 PM
Meeting Location :	Hampton Park Resource Recovery Facility Education Centre		
Minutes Confirmed:	Confirmed 25.05.16		

Chairman :	Brian Oates (BO)
Presenters / Observers :	Jaye Muir (JM), Kelvin Sargent (KS), Damian Midro (DM), John Jones (JJ), John Stewart (JS), Andrea Walton CSIRO (AW), Rod McCrea CSIRO (RM), Leigh Bryant EPA (LB)
Apologies :	Robin Dzedins, Sada Cehic, Jason Wood, Jody Beckwith

Attendance:

MEMBER NAME	27/05/2015	26/08/2015	30/09/2015	27/01/2016	30/03/2016
David Banner (DB)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Sada Cehic (SC)	No	No	No	No	No
Robin Dzedins (RD)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Halina Gwizdzil (HG)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ryan Murphy (RM)	No	No	No	No	No
Tony O'Hara (TOH)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rod Spalding (RS)	No	No	No	No	No
Miles Weidemann (MW)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jason Wood (JW)	No	Yes	No	No	No

Item	Issue	Action	By
1	Welcome Attendees welcome and apologies (RD, SC, JW, JB).		
2	Minutes of previous meeting Moved TOH, seconded by MW		
3	Action item updates and progress reports No update on City of Casey landfill rep to present at future CRG. JM advised a landfill gas specialist would not be suitable as they could only comment on the Cranbourne landfill. JM is still waiting on feedback for a Planning rep to attend a future meeting. JM advised David Carter CEO for the Australian Packaging Covenant is confirmed to present to the CRG on 25.05.16. JM advised the renewal of the CRG is still with the corporate office and no new updates have been provided.		

Item	Issue	Action	By
	<p>JM advised no complaints have been received in regards to the new Sth Gippsland Highway entrance/exit for SUEZ-ResourceCo.</p> <p>Sunday opening hours? KS - no further representation as yet to the city of Casey, no further update. Sunday closure is something SUEZ wants. Wade Moss to follow up. MWRG do not want site Sunday closure (SUEZ being held to contract).</p> <p>KS - EPA officers attended site recently (regular ongoing monthly site visit) – SUEZ recently completed a Landfill Gas Audit, as part of their Licence requirements. EPA stated they will take SUEZs responding action plan and issue a PAN requiring SUEZ to conduct the actions SUEZ has scheduled in the action plan.</p> <p>KS – SUEZ has made a representation to the EPA regarding general perception of PANs and their current application by the EPA; PAN currently sitting in draft with the EPA. Current Audit schedule 3 yearly full Audit, conducted relating to landfill gas risks.</p> <p>JJ - This audit includes review of monitoring bore spacing, as an example, with a current recommendation to reduce the spacing between the bores, i.e. add more monitoring bores.</p> <p>KS - Licence holder has an obligation to Audit, actions are scheduled for completion against the audit, with associated reporting requirements. However EPA are taking the actions and placing in a PAN; SUEZ disappointed in this course of action. SUEZ intending to conduct actions.</p> <p>LB - PAN seen as an enforceable agreement with EPA to assist their internal tracking, as a formal process to record agreed actions. EPA saw the charge associated with PANs as the punitive element and have since removed this. EPA representative stated they had no question currently that SUEZ intended to action the items,</p> <p>DB - Group asked if wording could be changed to differentiate between those intending to conduct works and those not complying.</p> <p>LB - EPA stated they only have limited tools to differentiate between issues.</p> <p>Group confirmed if they heard we had been issued a PAN then they would see it as a slap on the wrist or reprimand – TOH, DB, MW.</p> <p>KS - SUEZ raised question regarding potential improvements regarding EPA communication surrounding issuing PANs.</p> <p>Group raised term ‘all operators get tarred with the same brush’ and ‘doesn’t sound fair’.</p> <p>SUEZ ran through brief description of Audit process – annual cycle and reporting requirements, and the perceived duplication of processes by issuing a PAN – JJ, KS.</p>		

Item	Issue	Action	By
4	<p>SUEZ-ResourceCo Presentation – Damian Midro</p> <p>Damian Midro would have been presenting – personnel injury.</p> <p>Kelvin presented (DM) available on speaker phone for clarification and questions.</p> <p>Several non-SUEZ projects across Victoria, producing materials. These are short term projects (24/7 – short term projects for a period of 10 days)</p> <p>Mention of roughly half million cubes clean fill, during slide 1</p> <p>Currently two permits relating to area of site proposing acceptance of a project.</p> <p>Ran through current opening/operating hours – allowable and actual gate open times currently (clarified – JM)</p> <p>SUEZ looking to amend licence times to allow material in to meet contract requirements</p> <p>ERR have stated they will allow a limited extension of time depending on accepting and complying with a list of proposed conditions (listed on slide), including communication, of which this meeting is part of. Referred to a few items specifically, including extension of earthen bund – limited extent.</p> <p>JM clarified the change was only for 10 days with City of Casey – (specifically confirmed 1 lot of 10 days) Sunday is the big change when compared to the permit requirements through Earth Resources Regulation– JM</p> <p>Kelvin opened floor to questions, volumes and logistics discussed but no confirmation regarding actual total volume to be received</p> <p>Truck movements on highway raised – TOH</p> <p>Storage and placement on site questioned: height and how processing would be facilitated; SUEZ clarified that this was quarry rehabilitation (cleanfill) not processing of any sort – KS</p> <p>Question raised regarding asbestos etc. – MW material source, clarified. The material has been analysed and reports submitted to SUEZ (and other parties) relating to any materials being accepted; project is government related and has a level of sensitivity associated with it. We will only accept cleanfill at SRC– KS</p> <p>Compaction question raised – MW Materials pushed out with dozers – KS</p> <p>Other suitable sites competing for equivalent works – no one site accepting all works</p>		

Item	Issue	Action	By
	<p>EPA – light/dust/noise are potential issues for all these projects – LB SUEZ has addressed these potential issues in planning for the project</p> <p>Clean fill has no requirement for EPA approval – any requirements regarding final land form falls under ERR.</p> <p>Advantage of our site – all weather entrance</p> <p>Group asked about communication and if we were seeking comment regarding consultation – BO</p> <p>Asbestos question re raised – MW Separate reports have been conducted for individual projects. SUEZ only accepting the clean fill component.</p> <p>Group questioned if potential odour would be an issue – Damian responded – virgin natural excavated material, ‘never been open to human activity prior’ 1m-9m virgin material.</p> <p>Kelvin questioned odour assessment. No material assessed as clean fill with odour will be accepted in this project</p> <p>Is there anything SUEZ is seeking from the CRG – BO</p> <p>Would be happy to accept any feedback, specifically reaching the wider community.</p> <p>Definition of wider community - ?</p> <p>Slide showed where material would be accepted during this project – 600m to boundary, so roughly 400m outside boundary. Letter box drop etc. in this radius.</p> <p>Appreciate any feedback; slides to be forwarded to CRG – KS</p> <p>Minutes make up part of communication requirement.</p> <p>Communication at this meeting is first public communication regarding this project.</p> <p>Traffic changes during the project and increase early evening raised. All weather staging area – processing can be facilitated on site, so no actual sitting time on main roads. All down time can be facilitated on all weather areas on site.</p> <p>Visual impact questioned – CRG to follow up concern</p> <p>CRG confirmed they raised concern regarding increased traffic in the area during this project and suggested preferred traffic routes should be communicated to reduce risk of collision off site. SUEZ took this on board and unlikely to be able to ‘force’ this in any way however willing to communicate ‘preferred’ routes potential signage suggested but SUEZ cannot do anything in regards signage off site. VIC roads responsible – Group suggested SUEZ to communicate with VIC roads.</p> <p>Slides to be communicated to CRG, and letter drop to be conducted in regards to project.</p>		
5	<p>CSIRO Discussion – Andrea Walton & Rod McCrea</p> <p>Not minuted.</p>		

Item	Issue	Action	By
10	Review of progress / next meeting(s) Next meeting is 25 May 2016		
Meeting Closed :	7:50 PM		

Next Meeting :	25 May 2016 5:30pm
----------------	--------------------

ACTION SUMMARY

Item	Issue	Action	By
Meeting no. 32			
	JM to distribute SUEZ-ResourceCo presentation – COMPLETE.	JM	20.04.16