

MEETING NOTES (APPROVED 26/11/2015)

Tuesday 29 September 2015 at 5:30pm	Chaired By: Gareth Jones (SITA)
Lucas Heights RRP – New Illawarra Rd, Lucas Heights	Note Taker: Gareth Jones (SITA)

ATTENDEES

SITA Australia / SUEZ environnement

- (PC) – Sydney Landfill Business Manager
- (KR) – Landfill Manager
- (CN) – Project Manager
- (GJ) – Stakeholder Engagement Manager

GHD

- (AH) – Civil Engineer

Sutherland Shire Council

- (SS) – E Ward / Liberal
- (JRD) – E Ward / Liberal
- (ID) – Principal Environmental Scientist

Cronulla Model Aero Club

- (GH)

Menai Wildflower Group (MWG)

- (DP)
- (LH)

Residents

- (DE) – Illawong
- (CE) – Illawong

Apologies

- (MG) – Holsworthy MP
- (GM) – ANSTO
- (JRS) – Menai
- (JRY) – Menai
- (DG) - GHD

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

1 WELCOME AND AGENDA

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
1.1	<p>PC welcomed all present to the meeting. Apologies were noted.</p> <p>PC explained the purpose of the meeting: At the Sutherland Shire Council (SSC) meeting last Monday, a resolution had been made requiring SUEZ to hold a special CRG meeting to allow members to confirm that the issues they had raised have been addressed in the EIS to the satisfaction of SSC's Principal Environmental Scientist (ID).</p> <p><i>Members were provided with the Executive Summary of Volume 1 of the EIS document, which is a summary of Volumes 2 to 6, being the technical studies, along with the final draft of Volume 7 of the EIS - Parkland, Future use and Post Closure Management. The documentation also included the Table of Contents, for illustration of the structure of the EIS report.</i></p>		

2 EIS DISCUSSION

Item	Discussion	Action	Due
2.1	<p>PC explained that SUEZ had sought feedback from members regarding issues which people would like to see addressed. Responses had been received from Menai Wildflower Group and Cronulla Model Aero Club.</p>		

2.2 **Endangered Species – EIS Vol 6**

PC reported that MWG had raised the topic of endangered species, and a detailed biodiversity study is discussed in Volume 6, and also summarised in Chapter 19 of Volume 1. The EIS acknowledges a minor impact on some species, and details a biodiversity offset program. The biodiversity study is one of the larger studies in the technical report – a team of experts had visited the site several times and audited the species present.

ID noted that SSC were fairly happy with that particular study right from the start, as the topic had been covered very well. It had however initially missed aquatic ecology downstream in Mill Creek, and this has now been addressed.

2.3 **Litter, Illegal Dumping & Asbestos – EIS Ch 22 Vol 1; Section 22.3**

PC said that the issues of illegal dumping and asbestos were also raised. SUEZ are involved with litter at various levels: management of litter on-site, managing litter potentially dropped by SUEZ vehicles travelling to and from the site, and monitoring litter along New Illawarra Rd and Heathcote Rd.

PC reported that Gandangara Local Aboriginal Land Council (GLALC) are preparing a grant funding application to the EPA for assistance in managing illegal dumping, and SUEZ will be supporting their works. SUEZ have also made a commitment with SSC to contribute to a litter and illegal dumping fund to be used by SSC to support management works in the Shire – not just the immediate local area. Litter is a social issue as well as an environmental issue, and SUEZ's contribution links in with the State Government's aims to reduce litter.

GH asked how litter will be audited and management measures be evaluated.

DP asked what the feedback mechanism would be.

ID directed GH and DP to the Key Performance Indicators on litter included in the Environmental Management Plan. *These were displayed on a projector screen.*

PC explained that if these KPIs are not met, there are actions and responses that Council can take.

SS explained that SSC would initially issue SUEZ with a cleanup notice, and if the material was not cleaned up Council would clean it up and charge SUEZ for the associated costs.

ID added that this KPI covers litter associated with the transport of waste or waste operations.

DP asked if this KPI applied only on Heathcote Rd and New Illawarra Rd in the immediate area.

PC and ID replied that in relation to this KPI, this is true. For the broader area other programs are in place, including RID squads and EPA activities. No specific measures have been detailed in the EMP regarding broader areas, as this EMP specifically focuses on the waste facility. The litter and dumping fund contributed to by SUEZ will be managed by SSC, and SSC will be able to use it wherever it sees fit.

SS explained that SSC and RMS are both responsible for cleaning up their own areas of influence.

ID added that SUEZ has responsibility for specific defined areas, but outside those areas SUEZ is still a stakeholder. Heathcote Rd is the

priority for the new RID squad. The money SUEZ contributes will go towards the development of specific targets and KPIs involving a range of players.

SS said that SSC feels that asbestos dumping is a community problem, therefore a state issue. SSC are not writing off their responsibility, but the State Government need to come up with a solution.

PC reported that SUEZ has been involved with the State Government's Household Asbestos Disposal Scheme, which allows for specific contractors to deal with small volumes of asbestos from household generation (small renovations, etc.) and bring it to SUEZ facilities for a lower disposal fee and a waiving of the landfill levy. This trial was to conclude in July but has now been extended to December. The EPA approached SUEZ for assistance in the trial scheme.

KR added that legislation has recently changed, to the effect that asbestos and tyres will now be tracked. All asbestos must be removed by a licensed contractor. This is an effort to eliminate dumping.

GH said that he would like to see targets for specific litter quantities or a reduction in litter by a specific percentage. There should be a survey of the current situation, a plan for improving this, and a way of measuring progress against the targets set.

SS suggested that the current process involved assessing the number of calls received by SSC and/or SUEZ and the response to those calls. If calls were not dealt with, KPIs would not be met – if the litter isn't picked up within 2 days, Council will pick it up and charge SUEZ. SSC need a plan for managing litter in the broader community, which is not the business of a private industry.

ID added that the litter KPIs in the EMP are specific because they are limited to the areas of SUEZ responsibility.

SS added that the RID squad also have other KPIs they must meet.

2.4 ***Future Use***

PC noted that GH had raised the issue of current consent conditions in relation to future use of the site.

GH said that the \$100m contribution to SSC isn't enough to offset the delay in providing community facilities, which he believed was to happen on a staged basis beginning in 2015.

PC replied that the current consent states land would not become available to the community until 2025. The concept of land becoming available in 2015 is not part of the current consent or EIS. A staged land release may have been part of earlier reports from the Commission of Inquiry reports, but the outcome of those reports was the EIS and the current consent, which allows operations to 2025. The proposal extends this to 2037.

GH said he had put forward alternative solutions in his submission.

PC replied that the solutions suggested can't be dealt with in this EIS, as the areas involved are not part of SUEZ land.

SS noted that when the Ridge sporting fields were constructed, there had been no agreement for early release of land, but because of operational progress, parts of the site were able to be released early. The athletics track was constructed 5 years early.

ID added that the two soccer fields at the end of the access road were also developed earlier than expected.

ID explained that the 1999 consent provided for an opportunity for a staged handback, at the discretion of SSC and ANSTO, but no requirement or compulsion that a staged handback must occur.

2.5 ***Allocation of Community Contribution***

PC noted that GH had also raised the issue of the allocation of the \$100m community contribution. GH's comments have now been included in the minutes to the SSC meeting last week, to the effect that a minimum of 20% of the funds are to be used within 7.5km of the facility. This was already in SSC minutes, but it is now also included in the Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA), which will form a central part of the agreement between SSC, SUEZ and the Department of Planning & Environment (DPE). This will bring further regulatory commitment to the EIS. There may be further discussion around where funds should be spent, and this is an issue for SSC and the community, but a figure of \$20m+ within 7.5km is now locked into the VPA.

ID explained that the 7.5km radius covers Menai, Barden Ridge and Sandy Point, but Sutherland is just beyond that distance.

SS reminded CRG members that the funds were to be used only for new capital works – not general roads and maintenance costs.

GH stated that he believed that if every waste truck in Sydney will come through this Ward, the local residents will have to deal with it, and \$20m in exchange is a bad deal for residents.

SS and PC replied that it is not true that every rubbish truck in Sydney will have to come through the area.

SS explained the process by which the \$100m contribution and \$20m allocation to Menai had been negotiated. While the rest of the contribution would not be spent directly within the Menai area, Menai residents would still benefit from the use of the improvements enabled in other areas.

GH suggested that the \$20m figure, given that the GLALC development could proceed in the near future, needs to be increased.

SS explained that there are 15 Councillors representing the Shire, and the E Ward Councillors have just 3 votes out of those 15. To have more money allocated would be impossible. \$20m was the best that could be done for the residents in E Ward. We need to look at this realistically. SS understands GH's argument, but GH needs to look at the bigger picture.

SS and JRD encouraged GH to lobby Councillors in his own Ward to give up some of their share of the money to E ward.

2.6 ***Traffic Impacts – Appendix D, Volume 2; Chapter 9***

DP noted that JRY at a previous meeting had been concerned about the traffic impacts on Alford's Point Road and the Menai Road and Bangor Bypass intersections. Has the EIS addressed all of JRY's comments?

PC replied that traffic was also a key topic in GH's submission. The Traffic section assessed the generation of traffic from the proposed development, along with the traffic volumes approved under the 1999 consent.

AH explained that the specialist traffic study is contained in Appendix D in Vol 2, and also referenced in Chapter 9.

PC reported that the conclusion of the traffic study is that there will be less traffic generated from proposed expansion than what was modelled in the 1999 EIS. The study specifically examined the Heathcote Rd/New Illawarra Rd and New Illawarra Rd/Little Forest Rd intersections. It has been confirmed that only 4% of vehicles on New Illawarra Rd would be accessing the site as of 2027, when all operations could be proceeding at full capacity. The growth in activities was expected to be in the range of 1.4-1.8%. Compared to overall expected traffic growth, this proposal will have low impact.

PC noted that looking at the New Illawarra Rd/Little Forest Rd intersection specifically, a commitment had been made to undertake further independent traffic studies in 2020 and 2025. The EIS basically says that this intersection works fine for now, but should be assessed again later.

SS reported that SSC had argued for this study to be done today, but that Roads & Maritime Services (RMS) had said that was not necessary.

ID added that the EMPs have KPIs based on certain delay times which must not be exceeded in 2020 and 2025. If these are exceeded certain actions have to be taken.

ID added that SSC had checked with RMS that their projected growth figures included developments such as GLALC.

PC added that the traffic study had been updated when the GLALC development was approved.

SS said that other developments may also take place in the future, but the modelling is based on what we know now.

PC added that the traffic impacts have been assessed assuming the worst case scenario, when all of the facilities would be operating at full capacity. If a reduction in the amount of waste going to landfill occurs, as per State Government targets, we won't receive as much as we've modelled.

AH explained that the modelling is based on peak hour in the one worst case year.

DP said he would examine how traffic impacts on the Bangor Bypass intersection are addressed in the EIS, as raised by JRY.

PC reported that SUEZ have offered to meet with JRY separately regarding her concerns, as she couldn't be here tonight. As yet JRY has not responded to the invitation.

2.7 GH said that the challenge for the CRG is that they haven't seen the traffic study. When comments had been provided previously, the responses had been that the issues were covered in certain appendices, which were not yet available for viewing.

PC acknowledged this situation, and said that the comment at the time was that the documents would all be publicly available once placed on exhibition on the DPE website. Volume 1 and the Executive Summary are both now very different to what was provided to the CRG several months ago. The CRG has had a significant impact on the document, the issues addressed and the outcomes of the proposal. All concerns raised to date have been addressed in the EIS. We can't guarantee they have been addressed to everyone's satisfaction, but they have been addressed.

2.8 SS said that if we were to look at the old tip site and think about all the concerns we had in 1984, it was never as bad as we thought it would be. The truth is we would rather the tip wasn't here, but the community also

recognise that if we are to let it get out of our control (which we didn't, as Council took a partnership approach), there is no doubt that the State Government would have made it a State Significant Development and taken it out of Council control. Considering the Council resolution to hold this meeting before Council would be prepared to sign off the EIS, it's clear that Council considers the CRG to be a very important part of the process.

JR added that the resolution he had put up was for the CRG to be informed and have the opportunity to raise any outstanding issues, which would need to be addressed to the satisfaction of ID. Then the process and public scrutiny begins. The notion that it's a "done deal" is not true.

AH added that this is Phase 1 of the process.

JRD said it is almost impossible to capture every single concern before an EIS exhibition commences, but that SSC believes that 95% of the community's concerns have been addressed.

ID added that as part of the documentation review he has been undertaking, he has gone through and ensured all concerns raised have been addressed somewhere. Some things in appendices are now also referred to in the body of the EIS with references to the appendices, to help people find the information more easily. The structure of the documents has changed in this way because of CRG feedback.

2.9 ***Community Consultation – Chapter 3, Volume 2***

PC noted that the Community Consultation Plan is in Chapter 3. Once the DA is signed off by Council and ANSTO, it will be submitted to DPE, who will release it for public consultation. During this period, SUEZ will advertise in local newspapers, send out 10,000 flyers to local residents, and have a static display at Menai Marketplace manned on several occasions during peak periods. SUEZ are also looking at having a static unmanned display at two other locations yet to be confirmed, which also advertise the manned display at Menai Marketplace. The 1800 hotline will also continue to operate, along with the dedicated web page. SUEZ will be seeking input and engagement, and individuals can respond to DPE, who will collate all submissions, including those from other government agencies, and provide a report to SUEZ requiring them to address any outstanding issues. Until SSC have signed off on all processes, the documentation cannot be put forward.

SS added that consultation during the exhibition period will be wide, and Councillors will be out spruiking, as they live in area and are affected.

ID said there are some things that have been noted regarding the previous consultation, for example some residents had missed the mailout – and the consultation plan includes safeguards which will help to ensure that the consultation proceeds more smoothly during exhibition period.

2.10 PC asked if there were any other topics of interest to point out in the Executive Summary for now.

GH asked if the submissions provided for this meeting would be captured and included with the notes.

PC said that this would be the case.

ID added that submissions from the community will also be reproduced in the documentation in the Community Consultation section (Chapter 3 of Volume 1, and Volume 2).

PC clarified that the submission provided by GH for this meeting isn't included in the EIS, but that no new topics were raised in this particular submission which haven't already been included in other submissions.

- 2.11 GH asked if the CRG will be notified when the DA is submitted.
- PC confirmed that the CRG will be advised when the DA is submitted, and DPE will advertise when the exhibition period commences. All of the consultation we talk about is what we're doing over and above what DPE have to do.
- GJ added that SUEZ will also notify CRG members when exhibition commences.
-

MEETING CLOSED 6:55PM

NEXT MEETING

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