

MEETING NOTES (APPROVED 10/09/2015)

Thursday 9 July 2015 at 5:30pm	Chaired By: Gareth Jones (SITA)
Club Central Menai – 44-60 Allison Crescent, Menai	Note Taker: Gareth Jones (SITA)

ATTENDEES

SITA Australia / SUEZ environnement

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

Community Groups

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

Sutherland Shire Council

- (ID) – Principal Environmental Scientist
- (GS) – Building Assets Manager
- (SS) – E Ward / Liberal
- (JRD) – E Ward / Liberal

GHD

- (DG)
- (MU)

Residents

- (JRS) – Menai
- (JRY) – Menai
- (IK) – Como
- (DE) – Illawong
- (GP) – Barden Ridge

Apologies

- (NR) – Project Manager
- (LE) – State Member for Heathcote
- (NG) – Illawong

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 with the following amendments:

- GH suggested that item 4.19 be amended to include his response to SS's comment regarding increasing landfill costs for ratepayers, in which he had said that while this was the case, increased landfill costs would be shared among ratepayers across Sydney.
- GH suggested a new item to be added between items 4.46 and 4.47: *SS commented that the CRG is being controlled by SITA, who are not adequately listening to CRG members as representatives of the community. The controlling presence of SITA is not beneficial to the community. SITA should make more effort to acknowledge the views of CRG members.* This amendment to be discussed with SS following this meeting.

- *Note: This amendment was discussed with SS following the meeting, and SS provided alternative phrasing to better reflect his comments.*
- IK noted that the reference to the next meeting specified that a site tour would be included, but this is obviously not the case.

3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT – QUESTIONS AND FEEDBACK

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
3.1	<p>JRS asked if the questions submitted by CRG members since the last meeting and the responses provided by SITA to those questions will form part of the EIS submission to DoPE, or if the CRG should lodge the questions and responses document as a submission during the exhibition period.</p> <p>PC replied that the document is considered part of the community consultation process, and as such will be included as part of the EIS. There is no need for the CRG to resubmit the questions & responses document, however if a CRG member has questions which they believe are not resolved satisfactorily during the exhibition period, these should be submitted to the Department. Through this process SITA have taken on board questions which have assisted in evolving the EIS. We hope we have adequately addressed the issues which have been raised.</p> <p>DG explained that the process during exhibition is that the general public have the opportunity to lodge formal submissions to DoPE, who will then send collated submissions to GHD and SITA for response. Changes have already been made to the EIS in response to the questions received.</p>		
3.2	<p>JRY stated that the response to JRY’s question regarding traffic impacts on the Bangor Bypass/New Illawarra Rd intersection is that it is 4km away, which seems inappropriate. JRY said she believes up to 25% of the trucks accessing the Lucas Heights facility will be coming down that road, and a significant impact is likely to be made on that intersection in regard to exhaust braking noise as an example.</p>		
3.3	<p>JRY said she could see that SITA and GHD had put a lot of work into the responses, but feels that it has not been possible to articulate the benefits for the local community between 2025 and 2040 by the tip’s lifespan being extended. None of the items listed as community benefits are of any actual help to the local community, as they would have come about in 2025 under the current approval.</p> <p>PC replied that this was not quite true. Under the current approval, the garden organics facility will continue to operate indefinitely, even after the landfill reaches capacity and is converted to parkland. The new proposal includes discontinuation of garden organics operations when landfill capacity is reached. The statement regarding delaying outcomes is correct, however the range of initiatives included in the new proposal means that the environmental performance of the site will be improved if the proposal proceeds, with environmental impacts being lower than the currently expected situation.</p>		
3.4	<p>JRY asked if the CRG could see a picture of a person standing next to the “mountain of garbage” as if they were at the site on the day it was finished, for comparative/illustrative purposes.</p>		

PC replied that the maximum height increase will be approximately 8m, which is roughly 4 times the height of a person. But considering the lateral size and scale of the proposal, the visual impact from this increase in height will mean a person could stand on the surface and be looking at a relatively flat area. The landform itself will not be a “mountain” as such – more a gradually rolling surface over a large area.

GH commented that the northern end of the landform would be much higher than the eastern end – towards New Illawarra Rd it would be relatively flat, but as you move towards the gun club it would be a mountain. In presentations and the EIS the profile is shown from several kilometres away, but if you’re standing at the gun club it will be a mountain. GH would like to see how the landform compared against a car or person at that part of the site, or perhaps at the northern boundary.

PC replied that this comparison could be presented at the next meeting.

Action	SITA to present a comparison between the height of a person and the final landform profile at the steepest sections of the proposed landform.	SITA	Next meeting
3.5	<p>JRY said she was still trying to work out why the Menai community were going to be “stuck with everything here,” and why other landfills can’t be licensed to take putrescible waste.</p> <p>KR explained that many other landfills aren’t designed to take putrescible waste, and can’t be retrofitted to allow this. The previous owner of the site, WSN, was a government entity which controlled most of the putrescible waste sites in NSW apart from a few smaller council tips.</p>		
3.6	<p>JRY asked for a clarification of the response to her question regarding which councils currently send waste to the site and which would do so in the future.</p> <p>PC explained that the tonnages currently received through direct deliveries and transfer station deliveries had been provided. Some direct deliveries from other waste companies are also brought to the landfill, and this is in addition to the figures provided.</p>		
3.7	<p>JRY asked for a clarification of the response to her question regarding the percentage of Sydney’s waste that the facility would accept in the future.</p> <p>PC explained that the facility currently receives 5.7% of Sydney’s waste, and this was likely to rise to 5.9% in the future. The total number of tonnes accepted at the site would increase by 30% during this time.</p>		
3.8	<p>JRY returned to her earlier question about traffic impacts on the Bangor Bypass intersection, stating that it seems like a significant increase in traffic will come through these traffic lights. The fact that it’s 4km away is not particularly relevant, as it still seems like a sensible question.</p> <p>DE added that whether the trucks were to come via the Bypass or along Alford’s Point Rd they would still go through that intersection.</p> <p>IK noted that in the traffic impacts section it was stated that 10% of current traffic on New Illawarra Rd was heavy vehicles, and asked how many of those vehicles are currently going to the facility.</p> <p>PC replied that these statistics are provided by RMS based on their traffic counts. We’ve done analysis of what our proposal will generate. RMS provide expected growth figures across all of the Sydney network, and</p>		

based on this we have estimated what percentage increase our development will add.

JRY said that while the Bangor Bypass intersection was not analysed, Heathcote Rd and New Illawarra RD had been included. JRY would like to know how SITA think trucks will get to these roads from outside the area.

PC replied that the road network in Sydney, which is state-owned infrastructure, is designed to accommodate growth of the city taking into account expected developments in different areas. RMS have absolute responsibility as part of the development approval process to examine SITA's traffic study and determine if the development will have a significant impact on the performance of the network, not just on local roads but beyond. RMS will determine if the network is capable of supporting the project.

JRY said that traffic impacts would not just affect peak hour, but the amenity of the residents in the area – not just people driving through on their way to work. The information in the questions and responses document doesn't reflect that. 145 trucks seems like a lot to be coming up and down these roads for 30 years. JRY feels that the traffic questions were answered poorly.

LS replied that more in-depth information on the traffic studies is in the EIS. Any additional concerns CRG members may have which they feel have not been addressed properly in the EIS can be raised in submissions during the exhibition period.

3.9 GH said that CRG members had presented their questions in good faith. SUEZ have taken time to respond, with some questions answered satisfactorily, but many very vague. GH finds it disappointing that many response advised members to refer to appendices in the EIS which had not yet been provided for CRG members' reference.

3.10 JRY asked how any of the benefits listed in the questions and responses document under item 9.16 could be better than the tip being closed, as if the tip closed there would be little to no odour, fewer trucks, less litter etc. LS replied that this would have to be taken as a comment, but noted that the proposal does include local employment benefits. PK added that the EIS listed the number of staff involved at each facility. Local residents would be employed where possible and available. PC stated that while the proposal would not result in a significant benefit for the Menai community in the short term, SITA are seeking to provide a longterm solution for Sydney's waste and have identified Lucas Heights as a preferred location to do that. Thus we are putting in a proposal to the State Government with Council to develop longterm facilities for this site. The benefits are in future operations versus current operations, council having a local facility for an extended time, and ultimately parkland which will be designed and constructed for longterm better environmental performance outcomes. The comparison is not to be made between "do nothing" and "do something" – the comparison is between continuing with current operations and making sure the facility is the best possible facility we can operate.

3.11 JRY asked what other sites were examined as alternatives. PC replied that in Sydney there are currently two putrescible landfills in operation – Lucas Heights and Eastern Creek. A number of other dry waste landfills operate but these are not licensed to receive household garbage.

DoPE recently approved a modification to extend the Eastern Creek landfill's lifespan by 1 year, but that is all the remaining physical capacity available. After that, Lucas Heights is the only remaining facility. It is always better in practical and economic terms to use existing facilities rather than creating new facilities. While this doesn't answer the question of "Why in my backyard?" from a development perspective this is the right solution for the region.

- 3.12 JRY said she had moved into the area knowing there was a tip but under the impression that it would close in 2025. The extension of operations to 2037 would bring no benefit to the local community.
- PK replied that the \$100m contribution to Sutherland Shire Council would be a significant benefit to the local community. This might not represent what JRY wants specifically, but it is not reasonable to say there is zero benefit.
- GH commented that the allocation of these funds is better left for discussion with Council.
- DE commented that raising the \$100m contribution is like saying money overcomes all problems, and residents can be bought.
- PK replied that he was not saying that, but rather simply saying that it cannot be said that the \$100m contribution is not significant.
- GH noted that at the last CRG, SS had said the Barden Ridge complex development had cost a total of \$123m. This implies that \$100m is not going to get much for the local community.
- MU noted that the preferential treatment afforded to Sutherland Shire Council would mean lower rates for all residents, and also that Council would be able to do other things with the money that would have otherwise been spent on waste services.
- IK disagreed and explained that rates are itemised with a waste service levy, and a reduction in this line item would reduce the overall rates charged and received by council – they wouldn't receive extra money to spend on other things.
- ID noted that transporting waste to Goulburn would cost Council and ratepayers an extra \$4m per annum.
- JRS said that this wouldn't equate to much when divided by the number of ratepayers in the Sutherland Shire.
- ID commented that the Sutherland Shire comprised approximately 75,000 rateable properties.
-

- 3.13 GH noted that there are 13 staff employed on the site at present, but of which only one resides in the Sutherland Shire.
- PK replied that these are the employment figures for the garden organics facility only.
- KR added that the St George residential collections trucks are based at Lucas Heights, and while not part of this proposal, 65 people are employed in this part of the site and roughly 50% are local residents. Energy Developments Limited (EDL), who operate the gas infrastructure for the landfill, employ 7 local residents.
- GH asked how many full-time equivalent employees will be required to run the new garden organics and ARRT facilities, noting that based on 5 additional staff and 7 at the peak this would give a total of 25 jobs, and
-

even if all new employees came from the Shire there would still be fewer than 50% of the staff sourced from the local area.

PC replied that since it's a free market, people can work where they want to work. Of the 75,000 households and 250,000 people in the Sutherland Shire, a large number must currently travel to somewhere else to work. We can offer opportunities for local employment, but it is up to individuals to seek out these employment opportunities.

PK added that SITA welcomes staff who are local because it solves a raft of operational issues and makes many things easier in day-to-day operations. While 1 out of 13 is not great, SITA took over in 2011 and had to bring in new staff to transition from the previous contractor, and as such there was a need to bring in people already experienced in operating the facility. If we can employ people locally we do so, but our staff turnover in the last 3 years has been zero.

GH asked if the roles of the 50 new staff required to operate the ARRT have been costed and had their position descriptions prepared, or if the number was an arbitrary figure or estimate.

PC explained that there are two pathways to get these numbers – one is SITA's current and previous experience with similar facilities elsewhere, and the other is based on standard industry numbers which link investment with employment in various types of facilities. Before consent to build is granted, it is not possible to predict exact roles and positions in great detail, as the picking line itself hasn't been designed let alone approved.

DG added that there would also be indirect employment benefits, for example site staff would likely use various services provided by local businesses.

LS explained that the employment figures were informed estimates based mainly on SITA's previous experiences operating similar facilities.

MU asked if it would help if there was a commitment to advertise in the local newspaper when any new job opportunities arose.

CRG members agreed that this would be a positive step.

Action	EIS to include commitment to advertise job vacancies in the local newspaper.	SITA / GHD
<i>Note</i>	<i>While not discussed during the meeting, an Administration Assistant position at Lucas Heights RRP is currently being advertised on Seek.com.au under 'Southern Suburbs' and 'Sutherland Shire.'</i>	
3.14	JRS asked if SITA support apprenticeships or traineeships. KR replied that several apprentices are employed throughout the organisation at different locations, and work experience is often also provided for school and university students.	
3.15	GH asked if the VPA has been signed off by Council. ID replied that the VPA had not yet been signed off, and that SITA and council were still finalising the document.	
3.16	GH raised the issue of land becoming progressively available from 2015 to 2040, and noted that this represents a 25 year wait for local community groups who still do not have fields, of which Cronulla Model Aero Club (CMAC) is one. The needs of existing groups such as CMAC need to be	

addressed, and while they are encapsulated in the plans for 2040, what is being done in the interim?

PC replied that the current approval allows landfill operations to continue until 2025 and parkland construction to commence thereafter. It also states that activities such as dog training and aeromodelling may be considered as potential future uses of the site subject to Council and ANSTO approval. Following engagement with various groups, the EIS now includes a commitment by Council to maintain parkland constructed on the site after the landfill closes, and specifically to identify a location that can be used by CMAC. This will still be subject to ANSTO approval, as they have certain rights as an agency of the Federal Government.

GH asked if ANSTO have control of the site beyond their boundary.

PC replied that ANSTO do have a say in future use of areas close to their boundary.

-
- 3.17 GH noted that a question he had put to SITA regarding the capability of the final landform to be made suitable for equestrian activities, aeromodelling, etc. had not been properly answered. The response had been that the landform would be 'reasonably suitable' but this not really adequate. Could the surface be reprofiled flat?

PC said that this was a misconception and was disappointing after last month's presentation in which the proportions of the landform at different grades was highlighted. The minimum future slope cannot be less than 5%, as regardless of how the site is used after its closure, it will still be a landfill and still needs to be managed as such. A 5% slope will reduce rainfall infiltration and meet EPA guidelines. 52ha of the site will be at a grade between 5% and 10%, which is reasonably flat – a fall of 5-10cm per 1m horizontal distance. This grade would be suitable for a range of different uses, and is the minimum that can be physically built while meeting environmental performance requirements.

JRY said that this response was good, and that she would like to see more explanations of this quality in future communications.

GH asked how the Lucas Heights landfill compares to the Green Hills development atop the old Kurnell landfill.

PC explained that Kurnell was a dry commercial and building waste landfill, receiving different waste with different settlement characteristics and excavation depths to what is involved with putrescible landfills like Lucas Heights.

-
- 3.18 GH said he was concerned with the infrastructure on parkland, and how much it would cost to maintain. These figures haven't been provided, with the response being that one option would be that Council could take these costs out of the \$100m contribution.

PC replied that the response was that Council would take responsibility to own and manage the parkland following closure of the landfill. SITA are proposing a parkland facility 25ha larger than that proposed under the current consent. From Council's perspective, they are required to take on the parkland post-closure, and in this regard there is no change from the current expectations. How Council chooses to fund this in future is up to Council.

GH said that this should be made more clear for the community. If Council can't afford it, it's going to be expensive for ratepayers in 2040 if parkland maintenance costs are added.

MU replied that this means Council needs to deliberate over what the final parkland will be and how much it will cost to maintain.

PC added that SITA will build and fund the construction of the parkland as defined in the EIS, and this is included as part of the proposal. After that, the finished parkland site will be transferred to Council. SITA has ongoing responsibility to manage gas and leachate. In 2025, under the current consent, Council will get 125ha of parkland to maintain. That's currently acknowledged by Council. SITA are proposing to increase this by 25ha to a total of 150ha. This is not a significant change from current plans.

-
- 3.19 GH noted that the response to his question about infrastructure was that this would be on the landscape diagrams in the EIS, but that sewage, electricity and amenities had not been addressed, with the response being that this would be decided closer to 2035. Notwithstanding that technologies change, Clause 3 of the VPA states that if the parties involved can't agree on the final landscape plans, then what's written in the landscape plan in the EIS is what will be done. Unless infrastructure and lighting are planned now, we may get to 2035 and find that only a very limited landscaping plan is put in place.

PC replied that the landscaping plan been developed based on the footprint of the landfill, and was very similar in layout, design and purpose compared to the landscaping plan included in the current consent. There are some changes in terms of the species of vegetation selected. In the next version of the EIS there will be expanded discussion on potential future use and what the parkland will look like. There is a significant amount more work to be done in this area.

-
- 3.20 GH noted that he hasn't seen which parts of the site can and can't be built on, and said it is important for Council to know this so that they know where buildings can be placed.

PC replied that the diagrams in the EIS show the extent of the boundary of the landfill, and the parkland area matches those boundaries. There are no locations within those areas on which significant infrastructure can be built. If composting toilets are used, these could be put in place and moved around, but any brick buildings or the like will need to be built on solid ground rather than within landfilled areas.

GH said he doesn't believe the information provided on the landscape plans is sufficient, and there needs to be more discussion between Council and SITA on what will and won't be included. GH does not want to see the community in 2035 realising they need to pay the maintenance costs.

-
- 3.21 GH noted that SITA had used AS31000 for risk management, and noted that this standard involves a 3x3 risk profile but the industry standard is 5x5. A majority of risks would fall into high or medium categories under AS31000.

-
- 3.22 GH said he had spoken to Menai Sand & Soil who said that they have had no dialogue with SITA – this makes 5 or 6 groups that SITA say have been contacted but they say they've never been contacted.

-
- 3.23 JRS said that when he read the responses to the questions, he could see a lot of work had gone in, but there also seems to be a lot of spin involved in crafting the responses rather than simply using plain English. The CRG is not a hostile group – very passionate about their local community – and if
-

the responses were in plainer English this would help us understand and pass on the information to others outside the group.

LS said this feedback would be taken on board, and replied that the responses had been written by planners rather than public relations people.

3.24 DE commented that if the EIS volumes provided had been provided earlier, the CRG members would have had more time to read them properly and wouldn't have had to ask some of the questions which were submitted.

MU replied that the questions asked are likely to be common questions from people who haven't been able to read the EIS properly, and thus are still helpful at this stage.

3.25 GH said he had previously observed waste transport vehicles leaking greasy liquids, which often end up on windscreens and cause visibility problems. What can be done to address this?

JRS added that about 3-4 years ago he had raised the same issue with the committee, and thought SITA were going to address it, perhaps by notifying other councils to make sure they weren't leaving liquids behind on roads.

PC replied that the new transfer trailers which had recently been added to the fleet are purpose-designed as waste transport vehicles. The seals around the rear doors was a key design aspect. When these trailers were first added to the fleet, we had significant problems with leakage, but the Plant & Equipment team and the manufacturer had worked together to develop a new system which is very effective and has now been rolled out to 95% of the fleet.

3.26 SS said that there was a significant amount of waste on the roads to and from the site in the Alford's Point, Dead Man's Creek and Waterfall directions, and that he would have thought by now that SITA would have come back with options to deal with this. Perhaps the EIS could guarantee audits would be conducted, or commit to no rubbish falling out of trucks. This would be helpful and reassuring for the community.

PC explained that while SITA control their own fleet, which included some council collection vehicles along with transfer trailers bringing waste from other parts of SITA's Sydney transfer station network, other trucks are not under SITA control but still have a legal obligation to do the right thing. There is also the EPA requirement that all trucks are covered, with hefty fines for uncovered loads. SITA require all vehicles accessing all of our sites to be covered on arrival to ensure compliance with legislation, and if this is not the case then we raise the matter with the operator and/or owner of the vehicle.

SS replied that the solutions suggested to date have not satisfied the community. Council has to clean up litter. As a neighbour and longterm business, SITA's reputation is important. SITA should be more proactive and take additional measures such as litter clean-up patrols.

JRY noted that the responses say there are measures to be put in place but no specifics are given.

GH suggested that technology such as numberplate recognition could be used to detect trucks entering and leaving areas near the Lucas Heights facility. If a vehicle is detected entering full and leaving empty without visiting the facility, dumpers could be detected and prosecuted.

PC replied that the issue of illegal dumping is a state roads issue.

GH suggested that RMS, Council and SITA could get together to discuss solutions.

PC reported that if a vehicle arrives at the Lucas Heights facility and decides not to pay, a record of the registration is kept and reported to the EPA if a similar looking load appears dumped near the site. We follow up where we can assist the EPA.

SS said that Council and the State Government need to do more about illegal dumping. There are laws about what you can do on a road.

PC replied that SITA are still talking to Council about how we can support Council with illegal dumping campaigns, not just in the local area but throughout the Shire.

GH said it would go a long way if SITA could start to advertise this within the community, for example in the local newspaper.

MU added that if cameras were installed they would be spotted quickly and dumping would occur in other areas instead. Facebook pages exist which share information on the locations of dumping cameras so that people can dump rubbish in other areas without detection.

SS suggested roadside signage recommending people witnessing dumping to report it to SITA.

DE noted that there was previously a councillor who used to drive along Heathcote Rd and New Illawarra Rd early in the morning looking for dumpers and reporting their registration to Council.

ID reported that there will be a meeting on 29 July involving SITA, ANSTO, Gandangara Aboriginal Land Council, RMS, EPA and others to discuss strategies to combat dumping now that the RID squad has been created.

PC stated that SITA engage with all customers, and that if anyone is found not doing the right thing contact is made with not only the driver but also the company. SITA are always trying to maintain positive ongoing relationships with customers as these issues affect not only the site but the surrounding community.

SS asked if there is a chance this communication isn't working as well as it should.

PC said this would be taken on board for review.

- 3.27 SS asked when the community will receive the remaining volumes of the EIS, noting that it was understood that there is some work still to be done.
PC replied that as indicated at the last meeting, once the EIS is completed with Council & ANSTO signoff, the documents would be submitted to the DoPE for review and exhibition, and the next part of the consultation phase will begin.

Note No further questions or issues were raised by CRG members.

4 EXHIBITION PERIOD COMMUNITY CONSULTATION PLAN

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
4.1	MU presented an overview of the DoPE website, focusing on the following page which explains the process by which development applications are assessed: http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/page/		

-
- 4.2 DE noted that Sydney Water are currently conducting a survey regarding stormwater and asking for submissions, and have invited developers who think their project may impact stormwater systems to apply for funding to mitigate impacts. Have SITA had dialogue with Sydney Water about the possibility of future stormwater impacts?
- MU replied that stormwater impacts are being assessed in the EIS.
- DG added that there is no direct stormwater connection from the site to Sydney Water's stormwater system. Leachate goes through a pipeline to the offsite treatment plant and then into the sewage treatment system. Some discussions had been held with Sydney Water regarding a potential increase in leachate going out of the site in future, and this is covered in the EIS. There is no direct impact on stormwater in the proposal.
- DE asked if there is a possibility of more stormwater runoff resulting from the changed elevation.
- DG replied that the amount of rain falling on the area dictates the amount of stormwater runoff, rather than the profile of the landform. Whether erosion occurs is what changes with changed slopes. Design guidelines have been used to ensure that there will be no longterm erosion problems. The amount of stormwater produced on the site will not be affected.

-
- 4.3 MU reported that in February 2015, DoPE told SITA how they needed to consult in the production of the EIS. SITA started consulting several months earlier than DoPE had required.
- MU explained that the exhibition of the EIS is managed by DoPE rather than SITA, and this gives extra rigour and independence to the process. DoPE place advertisements and advise SITA where to place copies of the EIS for exhibition. DoPE hosts the EIS documents on its own website, and SITA will provide links to the DoPE website from the SITA website. This adds transparency to the process as there is only one set of documents.
- MU added that additional to DoPE's consultation during the exhibition period, SITA are proposing additional avenues for the community to ask questions and get more information.

Note MU's presentation is included for reference as Appendix A.

-
- 4.4 JRY asked why flyers can't be letterbox-dropped in Menai too.
- DE added that prevailing winds often take odour from the site to Menai.
- MU replied that Facebook advertising is likely to reach a lot of people in Menai, Woronora etc. Barden Ridge and Engadine have been targeted for letterbox drops.
- LS replied that he is happy to look at expanding the letterbox drop.
- JRS reported that he lives in Menai and his back fence is near fire trails leading to the old tip site, and is within the zone affected by odours. Would like the letterbox drop increased to include at least the older areas of Menai – maybe expanded from a 2km radius to a 4km radius.

-
- 4.5 JRS asked the hours of operation for the 1800 number.
- MU replied that the community information hotline is manned during business hours but a message taking service operated after hours, with messages responded to in the morning.
- LS added that this was deemed to be the most cost-effective and appropriate level of operation for this method of communication.
-

JRY reported that the staff on the odour hotline don't seem to know anything about the development.

LS explained that there are three numbers for different purposes – the 24/7 Environmental Feedback Hotline for odour complaints, the SUEZ customer service hotline for pricing and opening hours information, and the GHD-managed community information hotline for enquiries on the proposal.

4.6 JRS asked when the EIS will go on exhibition.

LS replied that exhibition will commence once the EIS is finished and signed off with Council, and submitted to the DoPE.

PC added that SITA are getting closer to finalising the EIS now. There have been multiple iterations and amendments. Originally it was very much a technical document, but now it is more a technical and communication document. Ultimately it still needs Council signoff before submission.

4.7 JRS asked if there is a reason why the Barden Ridge sports complex has been excluded from the consultation process, as people using that facility come from all parts of the Shire and it is quite close to the site.

PC said this will be considered. The advantage of establishing a static information display in Menai Marketplace is that it's a controlled, enclosed space, making it easy to set up a permanent short-term display which can be available to people at a range of different times of day.

MU added that enquiries were made at Barden Ridge regarding potential drop-in sessions, but from memory the location was not suitable for this.

4.8 GH noted that Miranda Fair isn't mentioned as a location to provide information with a shopping centre display.

MU replied that Engadine Shopping Centre had been considered but it doesn't allow short term stand leases. We aimed to target the people most likely to be affected. Menai Marketplace is the only local venue accepting short-term pop-up stands.

GH replied that locals could be consulted at Menai Marketplace, but this is a Shire issue and as such Miranda Fair would be a beneficial addition.

JRY replied that Menai Marketplace is the best option. The only people who have a strong opinion on the development are those living close to the site. People in Miranda only care about receiving \$80m in community funding.

DP commented that a static display at Miranda Fair should be established for at least a short period of time.

SS said he felt that a display at Miranda Fair would not be necessary.

4.9 JRY said she was not sure what information presented at recent CRG meetings lately she was able to share with broader community.

LS replied that much of the information, such as the community information materials, provided at CRG meetings to date is publicly available.

PC added that SITA are not averse to communicating about the project, and that's why we started reaching out to the community in November 2014. We provided the CRG with hardcopies of an early draft of the EIS and asked that it not be copied and distributed. The full EIS will be available in due course and be publicly available.

JRY asked if she would be permitted to answer specific questions if people asked her for information about the proposal.

PC replied that he was happy for JR to provide information to her community networks, but that he would also ask that JR refer people to ask SUEZ their questions directly.

LS added that the best thing to do at the moment is for people to visit the project website – <http://www.sita.com.au/lucasheights>.

4.10 GH suggested SITA prepare 'mud map' mock-ups showing the development and how the various facilities would work, in order to give people a better understanding of what is proposed, so that they can ask the right questions.

4.11 GH said that as a CRG member he is not averse to attending community information sessions to act as a person for the community to use as a channel to relay questions and comments, as some people will be reluctant to talk to consultants and company representatives.

4.12 MU reported that he has seen Facebook advertising work quite well, and can see good results being achieved with Facebook engagement.

MU shared website statistics from the Lucas Heights project page on the SITA website. The figures show a good baseline level of enquiry at around 1000-1100 visits through July and September 2014. After the distribution of the 10,000 brochures by letterbox drop, newspaper advertisements, etc., there was a noticeable spike in web page visitors. Even though only few people came to the drop-in sessions, there were 400 more unique visitors to the web page in December and January. Visitor rates dropped off again afterwards. The benefit of online methods like web pages is that engagement is measurable – you can measure Facebook ads in the same way – you can see how many people click on an ad and then don't come to drop-in sessions. The 400 or so that went to the website also didn't call or email – we had some calls and emails but nothing like that number.

MU explained the process of setting up Facebook advertising. When you set up a Facebook profile you enter various types of information – where you live, how old you are, whether you're married, etc., and Facebook uses this information to target ads to your demographic. Advertisers can set up several different ads with different images and text, and target specific demographics including location and interests.

4.13 JRS asked ID whether, as joint applicants, Council would be prepared to do its own online consultation.

ID replied that there is an area on Council's website called "Spotlight" in which the four current "hot issues" are in the middle of the front page of the website. These rotate around depending on current issues. For example, when the VPA and the proposal for playing fields at Kurnell was underway, this was displayed on the "Spotlight" section for 4 weeks. Council wants as many people from the community as possible to respond and comment.

4.14 LS reported that following on from the last meeting's discussion of SUEZ actively engaging in the community, a meeting had been held this morning to finalise the successful applications under this year's round of the SUEZ environnement Community Grants (SECG) program. Last year SITA provided \$96k in funding for community projects across Australia, and this year an additional \$154k was to be granted, taking the total for 2 years to \$250k. In terms of local investment, four groups in the Sutherland Shire area are to receive a total of \$16,950 in grant funding. These groups will be advised of their success in the coming days.

4.15 DE noted that a statement in the EIS that no frosts occur at Lucas Heights doesn't seem right.
KR explained that the elevation in particular makes the site more exposed to wind, and that he has not seen a frost on site in the entire time he has been working at the facility.

4.16 GH acknowledged that the SECG program news is very pleasing to hear. In addition to the grants program it was said in the last meeting that approximately \$100k is being given to Sutherland Shire community groups every year. Can we have breakdown of this funding?

Action	GJ to provide breakdown of Sutherland Shire community sponsorship funding amounts and recipients.	GJ	Next meeting
---------------	--	-----------	---------------------

4.17 GH asked if the community should arrange a meeting with Council to discuss recent issues raised not relating to SITA but relating to Council.
SS replied that he was always happy to organise a meeting.
GH said he would organise this directly with Council via SS.

Note CRG members provided no further comments on the Community Consultation Plan. The Plan will be implemented as part of the EIS.

4.18 PC said that the questions and responses document will form the basis of refining the EIS documents. SITA and GHD will try their best to ensure all comments and questions raised tonight are also addressed properly in the EIS.

4.19 PC explained that from here on SITA will be revising the EIS, working with Council to finalise the documents, seeking Council's consent as joint applicant, seeking ANSTO approval as the land owner of part of the site, then submitting to DoPE. As soon as the EIS is submitted, the CRG will be informed. PC appreciates the CRG's participation and contribution.
LS added that during the exhibition period all feedback on the EIS is to be lodged directly and formally through the DoPE website.

4.20 GJ advised that the next meeting is scheduled for Thursday 10 September at 9am, including a site tour, but will be moved earlier if the EIS exhibition period begins before that date. In this case the meeting will be held during the exhibition period.

MEETING CLOSED 8:05PM

NEXT MEETING

Date:	Thursday 10 September 2015, 9am (including site tour)
Venue:	Lucas Heights Resource Recovery Park – New Illawarra Rd, Lucas Heights

APPENDICES

Appendix	Description	Related Item
A	Community Consultation Plan Presentation	4.3

ACTIONS OUTSTANDING

Item	Description	Action	Due
3.4	SITA to present a comparison between the height of a person and the final landform profile at the steepest sections of the proposed landform.	SITA	Next meeting
3.13	EIS to include commitment to advertise job vacancies in the local newspaper.	SITA / GHD	Next meeting
4.16	GJ to provide breakdown of Sutherland Shire community sponsorship funding amounts and recipients.	GJ	Next meeting