

## MEETING NOTES (APPROVED 09/07/2015)

<b>Thursday 11 June 2015 at 5:30pm</b>	<b>Chaired By:</b> Gareth Jones (SITA)
<b>Club Central Menai – 44-60 Allison Crescent, Menai</b>	<b>Note Taker:</b> Gareth Jones (SITA)

### ATTENDEES

**SITA Australia / SUEZ environnement**

- (PC) – Sydney Landfills Manager
- (KR) – New Illawarra Rd Landfill Manager
- (PK) – Lucas Heights Organics Manager
- (AP) – Compliance Officer
- (NR) – Project Manager
- (LS) – Corporate Affairs Manager
- (GJ) – Stakeholder Engagement Manager

**Community Groups**

- (LH) – Menai Wildflower Group
- (GH) – Cronulla Model Aero Club

**Sutherland Shire Council**

- (ID) – Principal Environmental Scientist
- (GS) – Building Assets Manager
- (SS) – E Ward / Liberal
- (PT) – E Ward / Shire Watch Independents

**GHD**

- (DG)
- (MU)

**Residents**

- (JaR) – Menai
- (IK) – Como
- (NG) – Illawong
- (DE) – Illawong
- (JoR) – Menai

**State Member for Heathcote**

- (LE)

**Apologies**

- (GP) – Barden Ridge

## RECORD OF DISCUSSION

1 WELCOME AND AGENDA			
Item	Discussion	Action	Due
1.1	GJ welcomed all present to the meeting. Apologies were noted.		
2 ACCEPTANCE OF NOTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING			
Item	Discussion	Action	Due
2.1	Notes from the previous meeting were accepted, incorporating amendments suggested by GH prior to the meeting.		
3 OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT UPDATES			
Item	Discussion	Action	Due
3.1	The Operations updates and Environment update was tabled and provided to members in hardcopy. The document is included as Appendix A.		

## 4 MAJOR DISCUSSION: LUCAS HEIGHTS RESOURCE RECOVERY PARK PROJECT

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
4.1	<p>MU explained that GHD has been engaged to prepare the EIS for the project, and also to assist with the stakeholder engagement and community consultation process, which is part of MU's role. DG has been overseeing the development of the EIS along with SITA staff and Council staff, which has involved many months' work to date. This meeting forms another part of the community consultation process, with the purpose being to receive further feedback now that the draft EIS has been prepared.</p> <p>PC provided a summary of the key milestones and progress of the project to date. The expansion project had been developed by SITA and presented to Council for endorsement to proceed in April 2013. These earlier stages were confidential negotiations with council. The outcome was the Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA), an early draft of which is included with the draft EIS. The State Significant Development (SSD) support documentation was also prepared at the same time – these documents describe the project, announce the intentions to the Department of Planning &amp; Environment (DPE), and request EIS requirements from the DPE (known as the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements or SEARS). The document could become public knowledge on 24 November, which was the day of the special CRG meeting to announce the project and its progress at that point. The community consultation process began that day. 10,000 brochures were sent out to the immediately surrounding suburbs. Three community information sessions were advertised and held at the beginning of December. Significant work has been undertaken by consultants over the last 6 months to prepare the EIS. Engagement had taken place with council on the suite of documents. SITA are now finalising the EIS and seeking to obtain Council approval so that they can sign the DA as a joint applicant. The VPA includes a number of benefits to council, including price preferential treatment, reserved landfill input capacity, first right of refusal for processing of garden organics, and a range of environmental commitments. Upon reaching final capacity, it is proposed that the site be turned into parkland similar to the existing development consent, however under the new proposal the size and scale of the parklands will be 25ha larger than what is currently approved. SITA will also need ANSTO consent to proceed as the owner of approximately two thirds of the site. The documents distributed thus far are in draft form only and not to be considered final. After submission of the EIS, the final documents will be available on the DPE website for exhibition and accessible to everyone for review. At that point DPE will be able to receive submissions and assess the project for approval. There is now a significant period of work ahead to finalise the technical studies and analysis. There is still some way to go yet before the project may be submitted for approval by the State Government.</p>		
4.2	<p>JaR noted that while SITA had commissioned the distribution of 10,000 brochures, she and many others didn't receive these.</p> <p>PC replied that this was a known issue and had been followed up with Australia Post.</p> <p>JoR and NG said they received the brochure.</p> <p>MU added that he had made and paid for the Australia Post bookings, and organised for the printers to deliver to the Australia Post distribution centre.</p>		

- 
- 4.3 JaR suggested that the number of people who attended the community information sessions be added to the slides.  
NG noted that this information was included in the EIS.  
DE added that the timing of these sessions had been bad, not long before Christmas.  
MU replied that the sessions were on the 4<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup> of December, which is not that close to Christmas. The sessions were also advertised through local newspapers. The proposal did receive a lot of media interest, and was featured on the front page of the Sutherland Shire Leader.  
JaR said that the newspaper image should have shown the garbage in the active landfill rather than the parkland proposed for the landfill after closure.  
PC noted that the photograph in the newspaper was taken on site.
- 
- 4.4 JaR added that she felt the special CRG meeting held on Monday 24 November was an insult, as the Council and local journalists were already aware of the proposal. The meeting was called at very short notice.  
PC replied that the VPA agreement between Sutherland Shire Council and SITA committed specific benefits to council, and required confidentiality until the proposal could be announced to the public. The CRG were informed of the proposal before any other members of the public.
- 
- 4.5 JaR asked what percentage of the waste brought to the site would be from other councils.  
PC replied that the waste sources were discussed in the EIS, however exact waste volumes and sources in the future were not known as it is a competitive market. This facility will provide services to Sydney – not just the Shire.
- 
- 4.6 PT asked when the Eastern Creek landfill is expected to close.  
PC replied that the Eastern Creek landfill is expected to close in 2017. The next closest landfill for putrescible waste is Woodlawn, which is approximately 200km south.  
PT asked what percentage of Sydney's waste Lucas Heights would be taking as of 2017.  
PC said he would take this question on notice.
- 
- 4.7 JoR said that holding the information sessions during day was not inclusive enough.  
MU replied that the sessions were held at different times on different days of the week, including on a weekday evening and on a Saturday, in order to give opportunities to as many people as possible.
- 
- 4.8 GH said he was concerned by the consultation process, particularly in that consultation is discussed in the EIS but the underpinning information was not present.  
PT added that he was unable to attend any of the sessions due to work, council and family commitments.  
MU replied that these factors were the basis for also having a website, a dedicated 1800 information number, and a dedicated email address.  
GH reported that he had called the 1800 number and the staff didn't know anything about the information sessions.
-

- 
- 4.9 SS noted that Council always gets blamed that consultation on projects is insufficient, and asked what members present would want to see as consultation, and how they would like it advertised. It is an ongoing problem. Yes, 9 people is not enough, but SITA have made genuine attempts.
- LS added that the consultation program was developed in conjunction with Council. SITA had been surprised at the limited attendance given the extensive advertising, letterbox drop etc. Community consultation is very unpredictable – sometimes hundreds of people will participate, while at other times only a small number of people will respond. The number of people who attended the Community Information Sessions and facility tours has been included in the EIS in the interest of full disclosure. More Community Information Sessions will be held later in the process, perhaps in shopping centres.
- JaR said she had previously suggested shopping centre stands.
- PT added that the proposal is as significant as the Bangor Bypass, for which the RTA rented a small shopfront as a drop-in information centre. This is what should be emulated. People need to understand what is going on.
- LS replied that appreciation needed to be given to the intricacies of timing, confidentiality with Council etc. SITA are taking this feedback on board.
- PT suggested a shopfront information centre would be appropriate, given the amount of money the State Government will receive in waste levies from the project.
- MU reported that a Community Information Session had been set up on a Saturday morning in the largest shopping centre in the community, and no-one had turned up despite extensive advertising.

- 
- 4.10 PC explained that the community consultation activities relating to the Bangor Bypass development had taken place during the formal consultation process, which happened after the EIS was submitted for approval. The Lucas Heights development is at a much earlier stage in the process, and all of the community consultation that has taken place so far has been prior to the EIS being finalised and submitted. This is an ongoing consultation process that will continue after the EIS is submitted and the formal consultation takes place. What has been done to date is unusual and in addition to what would normally take place for a development of this nature. The process also still has a long way to go.

- 
- 4.11 GH said he felt that the language used in the EIS to describe the response to community consultation efforts should include words like “regrettably”, “unfortunately” etc.
- SS said that while he keeps hearing about who didn’t turn up, and who didn’t have the opportunity to participate, the reality is that the process was in place to provide opportunities for people to get there and get information. That’s what Council and corporations like Woolworths do for their developments.
- GH replied that SITA are constantly talking about the efforts they have made, but not acknowledging that the process hasn’t seemed to work so far.
- PC replied that perhaps SITA did get it right and that the reality may be that there is not that much willingness to engage.
-

---

SS suggested that the CRG discuss the consultation process and agree on the process before it commences.

---

4.12 PC advised that the EIS is now developed in draft, and the goal is to meet the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs), which were received in February following SITA's submission of the preliminary State Significant Development proposal documents. CRG members had been provided with Volumes 1 and 6 of the draft EIS. Volumes 2-5 contain the details of the technical studies, including methodologies, assessments and outcomes. These volumes are summarised and consolidated in Volume 1, which has been provided to CRG members as a starting point.

---

4.13 PC explained the modelled traffic impacts, which showed that there would not be a significant increase in traffic, and that the development would not affect the performance of Heathcote Rd or New Illawarra Rd, nor create any additional delays. An impact had been forecast on the waiting time required when trucks turned out of the facility, and it had been found that longer delays may result if all 3 facilities were simultaneously operating at their maximum capacity, however the delays would not exceed acceptable standards.

---

4.14 JaR noted that the report had found that there would be increased traffic during construction, and asked how long this period would last. Also, the report had only examined peak hour traffic over a 1 hour period, and didn't include any information on the Bangor Bypass intersection. The report also didn't examine exhaust braking noise which is already a problem. How many of the additional vehicles will be the new large green trailers? These are noisy and uncomfortable to drive around.

MU replied that this was very good feedback.

PC advised that there was insufficient time in this meeting to address these important issues properly, but that they would be taken on notice for the next meeting.

GH added that the number of additional trucks seems like a lot, and asked if this meant a large increase in incoming waste.

JaR added that if people knew it would be 32 more trucks per hour, all of which were to be large trailers with loud exhaust braking noise, they would not be happy and would start objecting.

PC replied that there would be traffic growth all over Sydney in the future, and that this development would only make a very small and insignificant impact to existing traffic levels, however the feedback is being taken on board.

---

4.15 PC reported that extensive analysis and modelling had been conducted to a very high level of detail, well beyond the level analysis that has been done for any other waste facility he knows of. This is partly because of the current concerns around odour, and partly because of the use of a range of different techniques. Volume 1 of the EIS demonstrated that compared to current operations, the proposed development will actually reduce the odour impact on the surrounding community. Improved operations would be implemented on the site, with additional ongoing gas capture, and completion of final capping. The garden organics facility will be relocated to the Heathcote Rd side of the site, further away from residents, and upgraded from an open windrow system to a concrete bunker construction with aerated floors and breathable membranes covering the material. This represented a significant change from current operations, and would result

---

---

in a significant reduction in odours. The ARRT facility will be fully enclosed and under negative air pressure, with all air from inside the building being treated through a biofilter. The odour modelling had been conducted based on a 'worst case scenario', assuming all facilities were operating at full capacity, and assuming 99<sup>th</sup>-percentile worst weather conditions.

---

- 4.16 JaR asked why odours had not been modelled using a receptor at Menai. DE asked why a receptor in Engadine North had been used as the basis for the odour survey when the report indicated winds were mostly SE and SW. The modelling should be done using receptors to the NW and NE. PC replied that a number of receptor locations had been simulated in different residential areas, including Barden Ridge and Menai. PC explained that the odour modelling considers all wind directions, not just one; night time, day time; adverse weather conditions etc. There are two parts to the modelling – how the odour is generated (including its character and strength), and where it goes. The odour modelling assessed the situation at a number of phases, for example when the garden organics facility is still located on the western side, after it is moved to the eastern side, and when landfilling operations are in progress at various different locations around the site. The modelling shows that the strength of the odour (measured in Odour Units) decreases with distance from the site. ID added that 252 pages in the EIS had been dedicated to air quality.
- 

- 4.17 PC explained that the VPA outlines a unique and comprehensive complaint management process, under which certain numbers of complaints will trigger internal investigations at different levels. This represented significant and strong commitments by SITA, and had been negotiated and agreed with Council.
- 

- 4.18 JaR asked what is meant by "landfill over previous landfill areas." Does this mean the landfill will be excavated and refilled? PC explained that the proposal involves overtopping existing landfill surface. This will require removal of the capping material, but would not involve disturbing or removing the waste already present.
- 

- 4.19 PC explained that litter and illegal dumping is an issue which affects everyone everywhere and has challenging impacts. Council has significant concerns around this issue too. SITA will be ensuring that the active tipping face continues to be covered at the end of daily activity. Portable litter nets will continue to be used around the tip face. Regular litter patrols are and will be carried out around the boundary and nearby roads. All trucks accessing the site must be covered with their tailgates secured. DE commented that litter can be spilled from trucks, and she has also observed a significant amount of illegal dumping in Illawong. PC replied that any trucks dumping waste illegally are not SITA trucks and not carrying waste for SITA. SITA are nevertheless working with Council to develop strategies to try to manage this. JaR commented that if the tip closed then illegal dumping would not be such an issue. SS replied that if the tip closed the Sutherland Shire would have a very rapidly increasing waste bill, and ratepayers would have to fund it. We need to have access to a landfill, and since the Lucas Heights landfill is here we need to use it and make the most of it.
-

---

GH replied that while this was the case, increased landfill costs would be shared among ratepayers across Sydney.

DE said that local residents are proud of the area and their homes, and don't like their friends seeing illegally dumped rubbish when they visit.

NG added that there is a lot of other litter around, and not all is related to the Lucas Heights landfill.

GH noted that there is a significant amount of illegal dumping rather than litter on Heathcote Rd.

PC said that the State Government are investing \$58m in programs to combat litter and illegal dumping across the state.

ID reported that Council has recently joined the 'RID Squad,' a regional program to manage illegal dumping, and is partnering with adjoining Councils to help improve surveillance and prosecution on a regional basis. Sutherland Shire Council are developing better intelligence and operational relationships with adjoining councils as a result of the program, which involves a \$150,000 per annum commitment, shared 50/50 between Council and the State Government. The program has been running for a number of years.

DE said she had been informed that dumping is 'not a Council problem.'

SS replied that this was the case for main roads, which are not Council's jurisdiction, but rather that of the State Government.

GH commented that illegal dumping is an issue which will not go away anytime soon, and Council, SITA and the State Government need to work together. Fines need to be issued and people need to be caught so precedents are set and a deterrent exists.

PC added that the EPA received new powers late last year to help combat illegal dumping.

GH said he had observed that dumping was more prevalent around the tip and in lower socio-economic areas.

---

4.20 JoR asked for an explanation of the process by which garden organics enters and leaves the concrete bunkers.

PC explained that garden organics will be shredded and placed in the bunkers, which will be fitted with aerated floors, and the material will be covered with breathable membranes. This system assists with the management of odours and degradation during the early phases of composting.

JoR asked if a spike in odour would be released when the covers were lifted to allow new material to be added.

PC replied that the technical study examines the process by which wastes will be received and handled. Volume 1 of the EIS is only a summary. The key outcomes are identified in the summary document, and when the EIS becomes publicly available then the full suite of documents will become fully available for comprehensive review.

---

4.21 PC provided a summary of the noise study, which had found that noise would not be a significant issue at any time during construction or operation.

---

4.22 PC explained that as the landfill is completed and capped, the surface will be grassed and blend in further with surrounding landscapes.

---

---

JaR asked if this will take place in 2037.

PC said that the finished parts of the landfill will be progressively revegetated during operation as each area is completed.

- 
- 4.23 PC explained that the reprofiling of the landfill surface will improve environmental outcomes by shedding stormwater and reducing leachate generation. Flooding and other impacts on Mill Creek have been assessed. DE asked if drainage has been improved on site following a recent accident. PC replied that the past drainage issues have been resolved. Lessons learned at Lucas Heights recently have also resulted in improvements at other SITA sites.

- 
- 4.24 PC explained that the final landform will incorporate grasslands with landscaped sections. The overall size of the site is about two thirds the size of Centennial Park (149ha). Under the current approval, the garden organics facility will continue to operate forever, even after the parkland is developed on the rest of the site. Under the new proposal the garden organics facility will stop operating when the landfill closes. JaR asked what guarantee exists that the landfill's lifespan won't be extended again in the future. SS replied it is impossible to know what the future holds on these matters.

- 
- 4.25 GH commented that the community has been waiting for the land to be made available for recreational use but the date keeps getting pushed back. SS replied that Sutherland Shire already has many playing fields and something like 97 recreational parklands. There is not a shortage of playing fields – this land is what we're talking about, not playing field availability.

- 
- 4.26 PC presented cross-sections of the proposed final landform, indicating that the slopes will be very gentle. 35% of the park area will be at a 5-10% grade, 24% will be at a 10-18% grade, and 3% will be at an 18-25% grade. DE asked what height the peak would be above sea level. PC replied that the peak would be 180m above sea level. PC added that two identified possible future uses include aeromodelling and dog training, but future use is subject to ANSTO and Council requirements. These uses could also include archery, equestrian, off-leash dog areas etc. Aeromodelling will be specifically allocated an area along the northern boundary, and this is documented in the EIS.

- 
- 4.27 JaR said that her reading of the draft EIS has led her to conclude that there would be more pain than gain for the local community. NG added that Council should commit something to the community, perhaps in the form of a specific dollar amount from contribution that could be allocated specifically to the Menai area. SS reported that \$20m has been allocated to the local area for new capital works. Many items have been brought forward for consideration but no decisions have been made on individual projects to be funded. When the previous landfill was closed, it was turned into a \$122m sporting complex that the area would never have received if it wasn't for the tip.
-

---

DE commented that the Menai area has to put up with 100% of the problems that come with having a landfill nearby, and are only receiving 20% of the money.

SS replied that if a new entertainment centre was built in Sutherland, Menai residents would benefit from this even if it wasn't in Menai.

IK commented that the State Government will receive \$100m in landfill levies per year, and that some of this should come back to the Menai community.

GH said that the issue around allocation of funds is something that needs to be discussed in a separate forum between the community and the Council, as it is outside of the scope of SITA and GHD.

- 
- 4.28 GH said he had many questions on the EIS, including the cost of maintaining such a large parkland area, and the reasoning behind shutting down the garden organics facility in 20 years if it is something that provides a service. Such a facility could be ongoing concern for community, providing jobs etc.
- ID replied that in the VPA, a clause says that in 2035 SITA and Council would sit down again and review the longterm plans. The opportunity does exist to consider keeping the garden organics facility going, among other longterm possibilities.

- 
- 4.29 GH said he had noticed in the consultation section of the EIS a claim that 18 local community organisations had been contacted by email, however he knows of several organisations listed who say they haven't been contacted.
- LS replied that all correspondence has been logged and recorded, and the details of letters and emails sent can be provided.
- GJ added that the publicly advertised contact details for all of these groups had been used.

- 
- 4.30 JaR asked why the Eastern Creek or Spring Farm facilities were not being expanded, and why Councils on the Northern Beaches for example weren't building their own facilities.
- PC replied that the Eastern Creek landfill will close in 2017 when it reaches its final capacity, and no opportunities remain for further expansion. The Spring Farm landfill does not take putrescible waste and as such is not suitable for the same type of waste received at Lucas Heights. The Belrose landfill reached its final capacity in 2014. Veolia's Woodlawn landfill, near Goulburn, still has capacity for some time into the future. A group of Northern Beaches Councils are in fact examining the possibility of building a new waste processing facility at Kimbriki which would accept and process the same type of waste that Lucas Heights currently receives.
- PC added that he recognised the question of "where's it coming from, and why is it coming to Lucas Heights?" SITA have looked at this in terms of ensuring that the solution for Sydney has as minimal impacts on the local community as possible going forward. No-one wants to manage waste in their own local area, but Lucas Heights is an appropriate location.
- SS commented that in some ways the landfill is similar to the desalination plant – it could have gone to 1,000 different areas but it came to the Shire because the State Government chose the location. The Council could have said no and fought against it, but the needs of the State overrule the needs of the Shire. Not every deal is a good outcome for everyone. It is necessary
-

---

to balance competing needs of different parties. Council can negotiate on specifics, but it's a democratic process.

PC noted that the outcomes of the development will be far better than what would have been achieved to date without Council's involvement. Council has worked very hard to achieve a much better outcome than what SITA had originally envisaged.

- 
- 4.31 JaR said that she feels like the Council and the State Government have "just rolled over" on the community.
- ID said that his objective in the project, if it proceeds, is for Lucas Heights to be the best-run waste management facility in Australia.
- MU added that the State Government still need to assess the proposal and will need community input. Community submissions are encouraged during the exhibition period.

- 
- 4.32 JoR asked what proportion of the EIS had been based only on desktop assessments.
- DG replied that analysis of this level can't be done simply from a desk. GHD had fauna & flora experts survey the site, noise auditors assess various locations, and air quality experts examine the processes used on the site. Baseline levels were required in order to do the modelling, which involved an exhaustive program of collecting data. This is one of the most comprehensive EIS processes ever undertaken in the country. The measurements on odour and other impacts far exceed any other EIS DG has ever seen. Council has had a significant role in assisting the process to reach the necessary level of detail. There is a long way yet from the finish line however. GHD are listening to the comments today, and will go back and think about anything that needs more detail and/or needs to be incorporated into the EIS.

- 
- 4.33 JoR asked when the exhibition period is expected to start.
- PC replied that the document is being fine-tuned now with Council, and will incorporate tonight's comments and others. The final draft will then be put to Council, who will need to support it and approve the signing of the DA as the joint proponent. Submission and exhibition is getting closer now and could be as early as July. The DA cannot be submitted without Council support. Any landfill activity, under waste legislation, must be assessed by the State Government as a State Significant Development. The host council at that point can support or oppose it as a stakeholder, but in this particular project Council's input is addressed upfront and this strengthens the overall outcomes of the project.

- 
- 4.34 PT said he was under the impression that the State Government could continue with it even if Council didn't agree with it.
- PC replied that this is not the case – the project relies on Council to proceed, and cannot go ahead without Council support. This is a follow-on from the Commission of Inquiry, which required that any future development on the site must be jointly applied for by Council.
- SS added that under the new proposal, Council is a partner in the DA, and as such has a say in how the development goes ahead.
- PC recommended PT seek clarification on this issue from within Council.

- 
- 4.35 GH asked what SITA will personally do for the local community.
-

---

PC replied that SITA is providing a \$100m contribution to the Council, some of which will be allocated to the Menai community.

GH responded that in SITA's Community Grants program, only \$3,000 went to the local community last year.

LS replied that a new round of grants is now being assessed. Many applications have been received from the Sutherland LGA.

GJ added that approximately \$100,000 was supplied to the Sutherland community every year in the form of sporting and other community sponsorships, approximately half of which is targeted to the Menai area.

- 
- 4.36 JaR asked if there is still a chance of real change being brought about by the community if the consultation takes place after the EIS is submitted, or if consultation at that point would really just be about providing information.
- ID explained that the EIS needs to be fully developed before it is provided to the wider community so that all of the relevant information is available. At this stage only bits and pieces are ready and much material has not yet been publicly released. A small amount of consultation is being conducted beforehand to make sure the EIS is covering the issues of most concern to the community, but the main consultation will start after the EIS is submitted when the information can be made available to the community. The community will then provide feedback to DPE, who will crystallise submissions and return them to SITA and Council in the form of requirements for modifications to the DA in response to these submissions. The proposal will then be modified, and that is what will be submitted to DPE in the end for final approval.
- JaR asked if people will have to go through the whole EIS.
- MU replied that if anyone has a particular concern they will be able to find the right information within the EIS without reading the entire suite of documents.
- ID added that the proponent is required to respond to all feedback received during the consultation phase. A further report will be prepared assessing how the proposal has been modified to address community concerns. The issues raised by the CRG are the issues the rest of community will raise, and the same issues Council has been raising too. SITA may also be required by DPE to make further revisions to address any concerns not properly addressed in the revised DA.

- 
- 4.37 JaR requested that before the next public consultation happens, the details of venues and times of consultation sessions could be made available, and the information in the EIS could be put into accessible form for people to review.

LS said that much work had already been done on attempting to make the details of the proposal accessible for as many people as possible. More information is also on the SITA website.

- 
- 4.38 GH said that Councillors are waiting for feedback from CRG members. Providing information on the EIS in "drip feed" form makes it hard to evaluate the overall project. The CRG should have been informed about the proposal earlier.
- PC replied that the draft EIS was only prepared in the form that was sent to CRG members the same week that it was distributed – as soon as it was ready. CRG members have the document before anyone else has it, in a form that makes sense. Prior to that it was various interlinked studies. The
-

---

preparation of such a significant document can't happen overnight and couldn't happen without the SEARs, which were only received in February.

LS added that there were very tight time frames around the initial announcement – the CRG were briefed before anyone else in the community, but admittedly we would have liked to have been able to do it earlier.

DG added that the process of preparing an EIS is quite complex. It starts with the general idea of the proposal for the site – a document was initially issued to Council explaining the proposal to overtop of landfill, build an ARRT and move the garden organics facility. Since then, SITA and GHD have been refining the original idea, testing it against odour/noise modelling etc, and if it didn't meet criteria we had to go back and adjust the design to meet community expectations. It has been a continuous process of refinement – that's why the full information hasn't been available until now. It has taken months to finalise the studies. The documents issued now are result of all of those efforts. The technical studies are very detailed – Volume 1 provides enough information for people with some knowledge to understand, while people with greater technical knowledge will be able to get the information they need from the studies. Consultation requires us to answer all questions received, and no question is unreasonable. A link will be placed on the SITA website to the DPE website at the appropriate time, along with more detailed and up-to-date information on the proposal.

---

4.39 IK asked if Council will make the EIS available in physical form, as these would be much easier to read than digital documents.

ID replied that hardcopies will be available at Council and local libraries, which is the standard process. Significant development applications are usually lodged with DPE, who send copies to the host Council for public exhibition.

MU added that the DPE will receive submissions during the exhibition period and these would then be sent back to the proponent for responses.

---

4.40 JoR said he would like to have input into the consultation plan for the exhibition period, and asked how the CRG could do this if the next CRG meeting is after submission of the DA.

MU replied that forward-thinking organisations consult early and often, and this is the basis on which GHD have worked with SITA. Getting feedback now means can it be incorporated into EIS before exhibition, rather than just waiting until exhibition.

LS added that a section in the community consultation report in the EIS has a summary of the issues raised. If you feel as a stakeholder that your concern is not raised, bring it up and we will put it in.

SS replied that the issue is more about how and where you consult.

LS noted that the proposed exhibition period community consultation plan is summarised in the EIS, and invited feedback from the group.

NG suggested consulting at train stations.

LS said that shopping centres were often good options.

DE suggested sandwich boards advertising drop-in information sessions.

LS noted the previous newspaper advertisements and mail drop.

DE said sandwich boards could be more effective as mail drops are often thrown out as junk mail.

---

DE added that perhaps theatre ads would help reach more people.

JaR suggested advertising on Facebook.

PT suggested renting a shopfront as an ongoing information centre, and said that this doesn't seem unreasonable given this was done for the Bangor Bypass. This would be always open, and people would know they can come in anytime.

LS said the group will consider this, but will need to balance cost with effectiveness.

JaR said that many people will be upset about the proposal but will be reluctant to participate in consultation. Representatives need to be in a public place and be visible.

PT suggested setting up a stand in a shopping centre on a weekend. People are busy with work and family commitments. The consultation measures so far have been difficult for people to access, and it would be easier to reach people when they're doing their grocery shopping. It is important to get people properly informed.

LS replied that if the exhibition period looks like it will happen prior to the next CRG meeting, SITA will find another way to consult on the consultation plans prior to exhibition period.

---

4.41 GH said he had previously proposed that CRG meetings be made monthly rather than quarterly.

PC replied that he would be happy to take this suggestion on board on the basis that questions could be provided to SITA in advance of the meeting, so that time was available to examine the questions and develop responses.

PT suggested that the CRG be invited to put forward items for discussion.

PC said that the process of broad engagement can happen through exhibition of the EIS. The EIS cannot be made publicly available until it is finished.

PC proposed that the community consultation process undertaken during the exhibition period be agreed with the CRG at next meeting, which would be moved forward so that it was prior to submission of the EIS. Then when the full set of documents can be publicly available, the agreed community consultation process would commence.

---

4.42 PT asked what the point of the earlier Community Information Sessions and other activities was if the final information was not yet known.

PC replied that purpose of those early engagement efforts was to announce the overall intention of the project and get a sense of community reactions, concerns, questions etc. Admittedly there was not a strong response, but that doesn't change the next steps. The normal practice is to develop the EIS and submit DA, and then start consulting – we chose to consult earlier.

LS added that the purpose was also to raise awareness of the proposal, which it did seem to do. Everyone was surprised at the limited response received, given the very strong communications plan.

IK said he was not surprised at the lack of response, since most people in the broader community don't care about council plans like this.

---

4.43 GH commented that there were fundamental differences between community consultation and collaboration, which involves working together

---

to agree on the best outcome for all parties. It is better to have consultation in the CRG than to go to the State Government and lodge an EIS which doesn't address those concerns and then be bombarded in the exhibition period.

- 4.44 GH asked if the site will be fenced and gated to prevent access by unauthorised persons.  
PC replied that this is currently the case and will continue to be the case.
- 4.45 GH asked what is proposed for the nearby nightsoil landfill area.  
ID replied that this is partly within the ANSTO buffer, and as such is owned by ANSTO. There are several lots to the east which were also at one time subject to nightsoil filling – these are Crown land, and were under Council control at one point but are now under Crown control again.
- 4.46 GH asked if the Environmental Feedback Hotline could be advertised more widely, as there was only one sign outside the site displaying this number.  
GJ advised that there were at least two signs along New Illawarra Rd which advertised this number. A national signage overhaul is also underway, and it is expected that the Environmental Feedback Hotline will be more prominent on the new signs for all of SITA's NSW facilities.
- 4.47 SS commented that it appeared that SITA have had more time to present their information than to hear the views of the community representatives. A more collaborative approach should be taken by both sides.
- 4.48 PC advised that the next meeting would be brought forward to Thursday 9 July. Questions provided in advance will be responded to prior to the meeting, so that the responses can be discussed at the next meeting. We will agree on a communication program at that meeting which will take place after the DA is submitted. Questions should be provided by Thursday 18 June. Responses will be issued by Thursday 2 July, and then responses will be discussed at the meeting on Thursday 9 July.  
LS invited all CRG members to examine the issues mentioned in the EIS, and provide any additional areas of concern to SITA as soon as possible.

## 5 ACTIONS OUTSTANDING

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
5.1	3.2.2 Add the locations of dust gauges to the aerial photograph currently displaying groundwater monitoring wells.	AP	11/06/15
5.1.1	AP provided an updated aerial photograph displaying the locations of the dust gauges. <b>ACTION CLOSED</b>		

MEETING CLOSED 8:50PM

## NEXT MEETING

<b>Date:</b>	Thursday 9 July 2015, 5:30pm
<b>Venue:</b>	Club Central Menai – 44-60 Allison Crescent, Menai

## ACTIONS OUTSTANDING

Item	Description	Action	Due
No actions are outstanding.			

## APPENDICES

Appendix	Description	Related Section
A	Operations & Environment Update	3
B	Presentation 1: Introduction	4
C	Presentation 2: EIS Review	4
D	Presentation 3: Final Landform	4