

## MEETING NOTES (APPROVED 26/11/2015)

<b>Thursday 10 September 2015 at 09:00am</b>	<b>Chaired By:</b> Gareth Jones (SITA)
<b>Lucas Heights RRP – New Illawarra Rd, Lucas Heights</b>	<b>Note Taker:</b> Gareth Jones (SITA)

### ATTENDEES

#### SITA Australia / SUEZ environnement

- (PC) – Sydney Landfill Business Manager
- (AP) – Compliance Officer
- (PK) – Organics Manager
- (RL) – Site Supervisor
- (GJ) – Stakeholder Engagement Manager
- (CN) – Project Manager

#### Residents

- (JRS) – Menai
- (IK) – Como
- (DE) – Illawong

#### Community Groups

- (DP) – Menai Wildflower Group

#### Sutherland Shire Council

- (PT) – E Ward / Independent

#### Apologies

- (LE) – State Member for Heathcote
- (NG) – Illawong
- (GH) – CMAC
- (JRD) – E Ward / Liberal
- (GM) – ANSTO

## RECORD OF DISCUSSION

### 1 WELCOME AND AGENDA

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
1.1	GJ welcomed all present to the meeting. Apologies were noted.		

### 2 SITE TOUR

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
2.1	A tour was conducted for the members present, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customer drop-off areas</li> <li>• Native seedling nursery</li> <li>• PCYC mini-bike club</li> <li>• Organics platform</li> <li>• Active tipping area</li> <li>• Leachate treatment plant at Lucas Heights 1</li> </ul>		

### 3 ACCEPTANCE OF NOTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
3.1	GJ advised that JRY (absent) had requested that item 3.10 be adjusted include a comment by SITA acknowledging that the proposal will have no short-term benefit to the Menai community.		
3.2	DE noted that the words “from Alford’s Point” in item 3.8 should instead read “along Alford’s Point Rd”.		

- 3.3 Notes from the previous meeting were accepted with the above amendments.

## 4 OPERATIONS UPDATES

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
4.1	<p><i>RL's Operations Update is included within Appendix A.</i></p> <p>RL reported that some stormwater drains had been washed away in recent rain, and staff have been busy rebuilding and improving these, with the view of building new infrastructure better than what existed previously.</p> <p>All traffic control signage has recently been upgraded, including speed limit signs as many were faded. Speed humps have also been repainted for improved visibility. Signage on Little Forest Rd is soon to be replaced.</p>		
4.2	<p>PK reported that as with the rest of site there have been no LTIs or MTIs relating to the organics operation in the last 6 months. Environmentally there have been no reportable incidents and fewer complaints received in recent times despite significant rainfall (943mm to end of August against an average of 515-840mm in preceding years). This high rainfall has been quite difficult to manage but staff have done very well.</p> <p>PK reported that 82% of garden organics tonnes currently being received are from Sutherland, Hurstville or Kogarah. Much goes out to local landscape yards, but many high grade top dressing products go to Sutherland Shire Council for use on sporting fields, along with other adjoining councils, and in doing so they are using the organic material being produced locally and returning it in a full cycle. The amount of manure being stored and used on site has been significantly reduced, and turkey and chicken manure is no longer being used at all. This was being used as an additive but the organic product is nutritious enough that it is not necessary. This also helps reduce potential odour sources.</p>		
4.3	<p>JRS noted that SSC has sent out vouchers for people living near bush areas to bring free loads of garden organics for disposal, but he was recently turned away due to having palm fronds in his load.</p> <p>PK said that palm fronds could still be composted – they take a lot longer to break down but this can be managed. Palm trunks are a bigger problem.</p>		
<i>Action</i>	<i>Investigate palm frond acceptance issues and report back to CRG.</i>	<i>PK</i>	<i>Next meeting</i>

## 5 ENVIRONMENTAL UPDATE

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
5.1	<i>AP's Environmental Update is included within Appendix A.</i>		
5.2	<p>PT said he suspects many people notice odours in the area but can't be bothered reporting it as they don't think there's much point.</p> <p>PC replied that if SUEZ receive a complaint from someone who says they can smell it at the time of the call, AP gets in his car and visits to investigate the odour – if it can be detected at the time, it makes it easier to identify and resolve the issue.</p>		

PT suggested that there should be more of an effort to educate the community on the best way to lodge complaints – perhaps more signage.

GJ advised the current locations of roadside signage advertising the SUEZ Environmental Feedback Hotline. New signs currently under development will also feature the hotline number on the front gate of the site.

PC recommended complaints be lodged directly with SUEZ rather than or in addition to the EPA. Complaints lodged directly would allow relevant staff to receive the information immediately, whereas it normally takes a few days for information to be passed on from the EPA.

RL added that site staff receive immediate notification of complaints lodged through the SUEZ hotline. RL & AP live locally and both have the ability to respond, making it much more likely that odours could be traced back and the source identified.

PT reported that he has noticed odours at night, presumably due to temperature inversions.

AP recommended that if any odours were noticed, members of the community should call the SUEZ hotline as soon as possible.

5.3 IK noted that Sydney Water’s sewage treatment system was recently offline because of a local power outage, and asked if SUEZ received any advice to stop pumping treated leachate to sewer.

PC replied that SUEZ had not been asked to stop discharging, but that if this had been the case it would not have been a problem as there is sufficient storage capacity. 800,000L/day across a 24 hour period is quite a low rate per minute and only a small contribution to the sewage system.

5.4 PT asked where the biomass for the leachate treatment plant is sourced.

PC replied that when a new treatment plant is commissioned, biomass can normally be sourced from other treatment plants. The sequential batch reactor (SBR) at Lucas Heights 1 has been in operation for a long time now, and actually supplies biomass to other treatment plants. Caustic soda is the only additive. If the process had to be shut down for too long and the biomass died, new biomass could be sourced from other plants.

5.5 DE asked if a small map could be printed showing the groundwater wells.

PC replied that he was happy for these to be shown on a plan, but many are on the boundary or off-site, and can be at risk of potential vandalism. There is much vandalism already occurring in nearby council-owned land.

AP added that the wells are inspected by an external contractor and the results are reported directly to the EPA. As such, if a vandal got into a well and poured something in this could be quite problematic.

<i>Action</i>	<i>Bring a map of groundwater well locations to CRG meetings.</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>Next meeting</i>
---------------	---	-----------	---------------------

**6 DEVELOPMENT & EIS UPDATE**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Due</b>
6.1	PC reported that SITA have been progressing through finalising the EIS documents, taking on board all comments received at CRGs and through other sources. Particular areas have been updated, including the consultation section. SITA have been working with GHD and communicating with ID at Sutherland Shire Council on an almost daily		

basis. ID has had the opportunity to brief Councillors on numerous occasions, and the document will hopefully be put to council soon for final consideration.

- 6.2 PT noted that ID is doing a fantastic job, and has been running a series of workshops before Council meetings, which give Councillors the opportunity to examine various aspects of the proposal and put forward any concerns. PT's concern is that once any project progresses to submission of an EIS, a decision has to be made, which normally ends in approval regardless of public feedback. PT would have preferred to see better consultation prior to the EIS stage, and believes that not enough people have been reached. It would be better to know if the community wants the development to proceed to the EIS stage before that happens. The community has not had enough opportunity to say yes or no at this stage. Councillors have been working through many issues which need to be included in relation to the final landform and future maintenance.
- PC replied that there have been several recent examples where major projects were put forward to DPE, and the EPA and DPE have rejected the application. One example is a recent waste project proposal in western Sydney.
- JRS noted that once the EIS is published the community will have the opportunity to lodge submissions.

- 6.3 JR asked if there was any idea of the future timing for finalising matters through Council.
- PT said that this is unclear, and a number of issues still need to be addressed.
- PC said he was also unsure of the expected time frame.
- PT added that the EIS needs to be examined thoroughly. The community has not had enough opportunity to receive complete information about the proposal.
- PC said that the process ID is undertaking has been intensive and thorough – ID's ultimate goal is that if this project goes ahead it is at the highest possible standard. ID has done a fantastic job.

## 7 LUCAS HEIGHTS 1 UPDATE

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
7.1	<i>GS was not present to provide an update on Lucas Heights 1.</i>		

## 8 ACTIONS OUTSTANDING

Item	Discussion	Action	Due				
8.1	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3.4</td> <td><i>SITA to present a comparison between the height of a person and the final landform profile at the steepest sections of the proposed landform.</i></td> <td>SITA</td> <td>Next meeting</td> </tr> </table>	3.4	<i>SITA to present a comparison between the height of a person and the final landform profile at the steepest sections of the proposed landform.</i>	SITA	Next meeting		
3.4	<i>SITA to present a comparison between the height of a person and the final landform profile at the steepest sections of the proposed landform.</i>	SITA	Next meeting				
8.1.1	PC reported that he was able to have a conversation with CRG members during the tour to explain the final proposed height in relation to the height of the current rock stockpile.						

PC presented a diagram which showed the final landform, including the current stockpile for comparison, showing an overall very flat surface.

PT asked if there is a geographical point where the peak can be pinpointed.

PC replied that the timber model had been produced and exhibited at another recent CRG meeting, and that the contour plan shows the location of the peak.

PT said that the stockpile is currently visible from Barden Ridge and Menai.

JRS said everyone likes to be able to see a picture of what it will look like.

PC replied that SITA have prepared and previously provided impressions of what it would look like when viewed from the Barden Ridge sporting fields, comparing the current situation to the expected future landform. It is very hard to see any difference from 6-10km away. The final landform will be a relatively flat surface rather than a peak.

PT reported that people have told him they are concerned about the increase in height, and need to understand how the difference in height is going to impact on them.

PC said he would have montages of the final profile as viewed from various locations around site enlarged onto A1 paper. PC offered to visit PT's house to take a photo of the view towards Lucas Heights RRP, and have the final contour overlaid onto it.

PT said this would be beneficial.

PT said that topographic maps and contour lines are very hard for people to grasp. There needs to be a simpler way to illustrate the difference between the current situation and the proposed final landform.

PC replied that this has been presented previously and will be in the EIS, as viewed from Barden Ridge, which is the closest location available.

JRS noted that not all parts of nearby residential areas will see any change at all, but if you live high enough you can see it clearly.

**ACTION CLOSED – NEW ACTION:**

Action							
	<i>Prepare A1 montages of final profile as viewed from various locations around LHRRP, including from PT's residence.</i>	<i>PC</i>	<i>Next meeting</i>				
8.2	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3.13</td> <td><i>EIS to include commitment to advertise job vacancies in the local newspaper.</i></td> <td><i>SITA / GHD</i></td> <td><i>Next meeting</i></td> </tr> </table>	3.13	<i>EIS to include commitment to advertise job vacancies in the local newspaper.</i>	<i>SITA / GHD</i>	<i>Next meeting</i>		
3.13	<i>EIS to include commitment to advertise job vacancies in the local newspaper.</i>	<i>SITA / GHD</i>	<i>Next meeting</i>				
8.2.1	<p>PC advised that this would be included in the EIS. In addition, SUEZ also recently advertised for an administration assistant, as the former administration assistant has returned to her home country. The new administration assistant lives in Menai.</p> <p><b>ACTION CLOSED</b></p>						
8.3	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>4.16</td> <td><i>GJ to provide breakdown of Sutherland Shire community sponsorship funding amounts and recipients.</i></td> <td><i>GJ</i></td> <td><i>Next meeting</i></td> </tr> </table>	4.16	<i>GJ to provide breakdown of Sutherland Shire community sponsorship funding amounts and recipients.</i>	<i>GJ</i>	<i>Next meeting</i>		
4.16	<i>GJ to provide breakdown of Sutherland Shire community sponsorship funding amounts and recipients.</i>	<i>GJ</i>	<i>Next meeting</i>				
8.3.1	<i>GJ's report as included as Appendix B.</i>						

PT said this information should be included in community consultations, as it shows that the presence of SUEZ and Lucas Heights RRP does represent benefits to the community.

PC added that the SUEZ Community Grants program is a corporate structure in place across the nation. Local community sponsorships are part of ongoing engagement with the Lucas Heights area as part of the ongoing operation of the site.

JR asked if schools are eligible to participate in the SUEZ Community Grants program. GJ replied that schools are eligible, and that several schools have received funding this year.

**ACTION CLOSED**

MEETING CLOSED 11:55AM

## NEXT MEETING

<b>Date:</b>	Thursday 26 November 2015, 5:30pm
<b>Venue:</b>	Club Central Menai – 44-60 Allison Crescent, Menai

## APPENDICES

Appendix	Description	Related Item
A	Environmental Update presented by AP	4.1; 5.1
B	Community Support and Sponsorships Summary presented by GJ	8.3

## ACTIONS OUTSTANDING

Item	Description	Action	Due
4.3	Investigate palm frond acceptance issues and report back to CRG.	PK	Next meeting
5.5	Bring a map of groundwater well locations to CRG meetings.	AP	Next meeting
8.1.1	Prepare A1 montages of final profile as viewed from various locations around LHRRP, including from PT's residence.	PC	Next meeting