

## MEETING NOTES (APPROVED 01/05/2014)

Thursday, 27 February 2014 at 5:30pm

**Chaired By:** Gareth Jones

Education Centre, 1725 Elizabeth Drive, Kemps Creek

**Note Taker:** Gareth Jones

### ATTENDEES

#### *SITA Australia*

- (AK) – Sydney Landfills Manager
- (PH) – Sydney Resource Recovery Manager
- (LCC) – Elizabeth Drive Landfill Manager
- (NB) – Compliance Officer
- (GJ) – NSW Stakeholder Engagement Manager

#### *Community*

- (PM) – Kemps Creek
- (BF) – Horsley Park
- (PK) – St Clair
- (LK) – St Clair

#### *Apologies*

- (NH) – SITA
- (MT) – Nepean Greens
- (BC) – SITA

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

### 1. WELCOME AND AGENDA

Item	Discussion	Action	By
1.1	<p>GJ welcomed visitors to the meeting.</p> <p>Apologies were acknowledged from NH, MT and BC.</p> <p>GJ announced that BC would soon be leaving SITA, and that from this point forward GJ would be acting as chair and note taker at meetings of the Kemps Creek Community Reference Group.</p>		

### 2. ACCEPTANCE OF NOTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Item	Discussion	Action	By
2.1	<p>Notes from the previous meeting were accepted with no amendments.</p>		
2.2	<p>BF asked how the site tour went at the last meeting.</p> <p>PM said the tour had been very interesting, and that the site was “more than just a tip.” A lot of resources were being recovered and recycled.</p> <p>AK invited BF to contact LC to arrange a personalised visit at a convenient time.</p>		

## 3. OPERATIONS UPDATES

Item	Discussion	Action	By
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Kemps Creek SAWT Advanced Resource Recovery Facility</b>		
3.1.1	PH reported that the current situation has been mostly business as usual. The SAWT facility operates like a factory, with MSW coming in to be processed into compost. Weather has been good lately, and this has helped with odour control.		
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Elizabeth Drive Landfill</b>		
3.2.1	AK reported that the situation at the landfill has also been mostly business as usual. SITA are in the process of relocating the finished SAWT product pad further north, to enable finishing of landfilling at the existing temporary product pad.		
3.2.2	AK added that 30,000t of demolition waste from the Blue Mountains bushfires has been received. SITA has had numerous discussions with Phil Koperberg and the EPA to ensure that only the right material came to site, which was especially important considering the risk of asbestos. Blaxland landfill would have closed if it had to receive the waste, and so the EPA wanted to have a few other disposal options. Homes had to be registered, and each truck had to be checked at the weighbridge. The demolition waste from the Blue Mountains bushfires did not attract the Section 88 Environment Levy.		
3.2.3	AK noted that the NSW Government had issued a media release declaring that the contaminated soil from Hunters Hill would not be taken to SITA's Elizabeth Drive Landfill facility in Kemps Creek.  <i>Copies of the aforementioned NSW Government media release were provided at the meeting, and an additional copy is included with these notes as <b>Appendix 3 – NSW Government Media Release.</b></i>  AK added that SITA has spent a considerable sum on studies and other preparation, including the Geosyntec report, which had found no issues arising with SITA's capability to accept and properly dispose of the soil at Elizabeth Drive Landfill.		
3.2.4	BF asked for more information about the operation of the landfill gas engines.  AK explained that the engines are very expensive to maintain, and that energy can be sold into the power grid to offset these costs. The 3 <sup>rd</sup> party contractor operating the engines needs a good rate of return to proceed with the project. SITA have previously considered using the waste heat for drying operations in the SAWT facility, but at this stage doing so is not considered feasible.  GJ explained the difference between the landfills at Kemps Creek and Eastern Creek, for BF's benefit – Eastern Creek receives putrescible waste, while Kemps Creek only receives dry waste, which does not contain food scraps. Less gas is produced by dry waste landfills.		

AK explained that cardboard, timber and other materials are still present in dry waste landfills, and these break down and release carbon dioxide and methane.

BF said he was disappointed that gas lines weren't installed from the start at many dry waste landfills, and mentioned that Transpacific had installed extensive gas infrastructure at their Enviroguard landfill at Erskine Park recently, which had the potential to cause significant odours in the process.

AK said that the Elizabeth Drive landfill doesn't generate a lot of odour – carbon dioxide and methane are odourless. Certain trace elements including sulphides and mercaptans cause odours, but this landfill doesn't generate much of those.

PH added that the SAWT facility doesn't generate methane gas.

- 3.2.5 PK asked who undertakes the environmental testing at the site.
- AK replied that consultants are employed to carry out regular testing, but SITA staff also take their own observations and conduct site patrols in order to pick up any potential problems.

## 4. ENVIRONMENTAL UPDATE

Item	Discussion	Action	By
4.1	<p><i>NB presented the Environmental Update included with these notes as <b>Appendix 1 – Environmental Update.</b></i></p> <p>BF asked about the odour suppression system NB mentioned.</p> <p>NB &amp; AK explained that the system being trialled heats a chemical to turn it into a vapour, which is then blown with a fan through a 2.5" diameter pipe. It is not an odour fence like the one installed around the compost pads.</p>		
4.2	<p>PK asked if the direction of prevailing wind is related to the number of complaints received.</p> <p>AK said that this is sometimes a factor depending on where SITA's neighbours are located – some are right next door.</p> <p>GJ added that wind direction is always taken into account in NB's investigations into odour complaints.</p>		
4.3	<p>AK noted that the EPA sends out complaint notifications to all potential sources, of which there are several in the Kemps Creek area. When SITA report annually to the EPA they include all complaint notifications as formal complaints.</p>		
4.4	<p>LK mentioned that she has recently noticed chicken farm odours around St Clair.</p> <p>GJ noted that there are several chicken farms on Luddenham Rd.</p>		
4.5	<p>NB reported that the last round of environmental monitoring on site found no compliance issues. All data is now available on the SITA</p>		

website.

AK explained that every licenced waste facility in NSW has to publish their monitoring results, including facilities operated by SITA. Results were published within 2 weeks of being received.

4.6 PK asked how many waste facilities are in NSW.

BF said there are many just in the Kemps Creek area alone, and recommended PK look at the report produced for the EPA by The Odour Unit.

PM said that when many waste facilities were established in the area years ago, there were very few people living nearby – housing has developed in the time since.

## 5. PROJECT UPDATES

Item	Discussion	Action	By
<b>5.1</b>	<b>SAWT Expansion and Upgrade</b>		
5.1.1	<p>PH reported that work has been completed on the 8,000m<sup>2</sup> concrete pad upgrade on the main maturation pad, to improve the odour situation and wet weather conditions. The concrete drains very well into the adjacent leachate pond, while soil pads normally tend to become soft, channelled and harder to manage. The concrete pad had cost approximately \$3.5m. The next step is to build a 4,000m<sup>2</sup> concrete surface on the higher pad plus 5 aerated floor bunkers. The combined investment across the two pads will mean even very heavy wet weather will not result in any impact to operations – these conditions have previously stopped operations and bogged down the process. PH said he hopes to sign the contract for the bunkers in the next two weeks. The second concrete pad should be complete by the end of May, and the bunkers are expected to be finished in 6 months.</p>		
5.1.2	<p>BF asked how much of the operations at SAWT take place under cover, and how much are out in the open.</p> <p>PH replied that the two previously mentioned concrete pads are outdoors.</p> <p>AK added that the total site area is about 7ha, including the enclosed building in which compost is processed inside sealed concrete tunnels.</p> <p>PH estimated that 1/3 of the area is covered by the SAWT building (about 20,000m<sup>2</sup>), and the other 2/3 is open.</p> <p>AK added that when waste arrives it is unloaded inside the building, and this helps to reduce the odour level outside the building.</p>		
5.1.3	<p>AK mentioned that there is a Development Application currently being reviewed by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, which proposes an expansion of the facility, including enclosure of all activities. SITA are waiting on the results of the approval process.</p> <p>BF asked how long the approval process is expected to take.</p>		

AK said he was not sure, and that several responses have to come back to the Department of Planning from various people. Approval is expected to be received later this year.

## 5.2 Landfill Gas Infrastructure

5.2.1 AK reported that the flare is now fully operational, and that SITA are hoping to soon install gas engines to generate power for SAWT from landfill gas. SITA are in final negotiations with a 3<sup>rd</sup> party who will install and operate these engines. The gas collection infrastructure has been installed over the last 3-4 years.

## 6. ACTIONS OUTSTANDING

Item	Discussion	Action	By
6.1	<b>6.1 SITA to provide detailed updates at each CRG meeting on recent complaints, including their distance and bearing from the site.</b>	<b>SITA</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>

6.1.1 *GJ presented the update, which is included with these notes as **Appendix 2 – Complaints Report**. Presentation of this update will be included on the agenda for all future meetings.*

BF said he had noticed that some people had “run out of puff” complaining, and stopped calling despite odour continuing.

PK asked what the response has been when BF had called to make complaints.

BF replied that it depends who you call – one can call the EPA hotline or SITA directly. The EPA operators don’t ask as many questions as the SITA call centre. BF has found the SITA call centre staff to be very polite, asking the right questions, and explaining that the call can be anonymous – although it is better if you do give your details, especially if you want to be called back.

AK added that the SITA call centre operators will also ask for your location to enable comparison with wind and other weather conditions.

BF said there was no need to provide your details if you don’t want them to be known – the complaint would still be investigated and reported to the EPA.

AK said the advantage of calling SITA is that relevant staff receive notifications of the complaint immediately, while complaints lodged with the EPA can take a month or more to be passed on to SITA, making investigation and response very difficult.

**ACTION CLOSED.**

6.2	<p><b>6.5</b>     <b><i>SITA to release an information package to the CRG and general public on the Hunters Hill proposal, which includes the independent consultant's report and correspondence with the State Government.</i></b></p>	SITA	<i>When available</i>
-----	---	------	-----------------------

6.2.1     GJ reported that the Geosyntec report had been made available to all CRG members for collection, and was also now a public document.

*Copies of the report which had not yet been collected were available at the meeting.*

GJ also advised that the NSW Government had issued a media release on Friday 21 February advising that it would "not transfer any restricted solid waste from a site in Hunters Hill to Kemps Creek while it pursues an alternative with the Federal Government."

*Copies of the aforementioned NSW Government media release were provided at the meeting, and an additional copy is included with these notes as **Appendix 3 – NSW Government Media Release.***

**ACTION CLOSED.**

6.3	<p><b>6.7</b>     <b><i>ARA to forward recent media articles of interest to SITA.</i></b></p>	ARA	<i>28/11/13</i>
-----	---	-----	-----------------

6.3.1     ARA was not present at the meeting to respond to this action.

A resident suggested that this action be closed, since it had now been on the agenda for a considerable amount of time without a response.

## 7. GENERAL BUSINESS

Item	Discussion	Action	By
7.1	<p>The remaining meeting dates for 2014 are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24/04/2014</li> <li>26/06/2014</li> <li>28/08/2014</li> <li>30/10/2014</li> </ul>		
7.2	<p>GJ asked the group if the meeting time of 5:30pm was convenient, and whether any members preferred an earlier or later meeting time. All present preferred to keep the meeting at the same time.</p>		

MEETING CLOSED 7:00PM

# KEMPS CREEK ARRP

COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP



SITA ENVIRONMENT REPORT HOTLINE: 1800 368 737  
NSW EPA ENVIRONMENT LINE: 131 555

## NEXT MEETING

**Date & Time:** Thursday, 24 April 2014 at 5:30pm

**Venue:** Education Centre – SITA Kemps Creek ARRP, 1725 Elizabeth Drive Kemps Creek

## ACTIONS OUTSTANDING

Item	Issue	Action	By
6.3	ARA to forward recent media articles of interest to SITA.	ARA	

  

Appendices	
	1) Environmental Update
	2) Complaints Report
	3) NSW Government Media Release