

## Woodlawn Eco-Precinct Community Liaison Committee Meeting Minutes

<b>Date</b>	Thursday 22 February 2023	<b>Time</b>	5:00pm to 7.00pm
<b>Coordinator</b>	Justin Houghton, Site Manager, Woodlawn Eco Precinct	<b>Location</b>	Woodlawn Conference Room 619 Collector Road, Tarago

### Committee List ✓

Name	Present	Name	Present
Justin Houghton (JH) (Veolia)		Wayne Baynham (WB) (Community Rep)-	
Cr Andy Wood (AW) (GMC Councillor)		Mark Quinlan (MQ) (Community Rep)	
Fiona Jeffery (FJ) (Community Rep)	✓	Dr Samantha Johnson (SJ) (Community Rep)	✓
Cr John Preston (JP) (QPRC Councillor)	✓		
Kym Wake (KW) (Community Rep)	✓		

### Visitors List ✓

Name	Present	Name	Present
Scott Martin (SM) (GMC Director Planning & Environment) - Invited Visitor	✓	Kathryn Whitfield (KLW) (Veolia ARC Project Director)	✓
Alvin Stone (AS) (Veolia Manager Public Relations)	✓	Jamie Seaton (JS) (CLC Facilitator)	✓
Raymond Choy (RC) (Veolia Environment Manager)	✓	Lee Smith (LS) (Veolia Project Team)	✓

**Minutes**

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction and welcome</b>
1.1	Meeting opened with a Welcome to Country and CLC members were welcomed to the CLC meeting.
1.2	<p>Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SJ: Advice provided by committee members should focus on outcomes preferred by the community, what Veolia does with the advice is its concern</li> <li>● JS: Suggested this idea does not align well with the charter adopted by the committee</li> <li>● RC: Veolia are responsible for complex operations on site, so there is a need to convey technical information and provide rationale for decisions made by the business</li> <li>● FJ: There are a lot of engineers in the community that would like to hear technical information about Veolia’s operations.</li> <li>● SJ: An engineering open day could be appealing interactive for those wanting to deeply understand the operations here.</li> <li>● JP: Note that the slide should display an “acknowledgement to country” not a “welcome to country”.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b>
2.1	Apologies noted (refer committee list on previous page of these minutes).
<b>3</b>	<b>Actions from previous meeting</b>
3.1	<p>1) Update community on H2S study in the Tarago Times. RC stated it would be explained in presentation</p> <p>2) Veolia to investigate “snap send solve” app. SM: Goulburn Mulwaree Council IT people can assist with setup advice</p> <p>3) Veolia to source a suitably qualified CLC meeting facilitator: complete.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>ARC Project Update</b>
4.1	<p>KLW provided an update on the ARC project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● KW: If the IPC decision rejects the planning application, can Veolia reconsider it and resubmit a modified planning application?</li> <li>● KLW: Yes that is an option.</li> <li>● FJ: Does the IPC give feedback or just convey its decision?</li> <li>● KLW: It gives 'feedback' which is essentially a gap analysis by the government departments to establish any missing information.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K LW: Does the committee have any feedback on engagement activities?</li> <li>• K W: Email is the preferred communication method for him personally.</li> <li>• F J and S J: Town hall community session would be a good event. Discussion around the previous events held at the town hall with A0 boards and technical experts in attendance for the community to ask questions.</li> <li>• F J: Want to be able to hear other people’s questions.</li> <li>• J P: Prompted the committee to consider the preference of the broader community.</li> <li>• K W: Asked if a visit to a UK ARC facility is feasible if residents are over there and already in the area.</li> <li>• K LW: Confirmed it is feasible. Tours occur all the time.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>Eco-Precinct Operational Update</b>
5.1	<p>RC provided an operational update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S J: raised the need to address non-compliance reports at the facility. With a site as large and complex aren’t some non-compliances expected, and its important they are communicated and whats being done.</li> <li>• J P: Veolia hasn't met compliance targets overtime, so trust has been eroded and that is Veolia’s hill to climb.</li> <li>• R C: The EPA has commented on the audit report and asked for a meeting with the auditor prior to receiving the report. Veolia supports this.</li> <li>• K W: If there are non-compliances the community want to know what they are, how Veolia is dealing with it, and how many leaking containers have been reported</li> <li>• R C: Container quantity is a QoN: 100 new containers arrived in procurement activities since November last year.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the recent results of testing, 50 new containers are being ordered in February in the course of replenishment activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S M: The scale of departures from regulations is important, noting the facility is a very large operation.</li> <li>• F J: Still a credible risk as Veolia wants to move hazardous waste from the ARC offsite through these roads.</li> <li>• K W: no hazardous wastes will be transported offsite from the proposed ARC development.</li> <li>• K LW: confirmed K W statement as correct.</li> <li>• R C: Stated that the Spring Farm option was withdrawn as a result of community feedback.</li> </ul> <p><u>Ops 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nil</li> </ul> <p><u>Ops 3</u></p>

- KW: need to correct the date to '24.
- SM: This data seems to demonstrate some improvement.

Ops 4

- KW: Pleased by data given recent wet weather.

Ops 5

- Nil

Ops 6

- SM and KW: More good news – less cars on the road and less emissions.
- SM: Does increased gas capture correlate to less complaints?
- RC: Bioreactor landfill is the main odour source identified by the auditor over the years. The gas capture does occur from the landfill area.

Ops 7

- FJ and SM: Is ED3N1 a significant odour source and does increased gas correlate to complaints?
- RC: Potentially yes, but the auditors advice would confirm it. Follow up sampling will occur following implementation of their recommended measures.
- KW: Technical information from auditors needs to be provided in Plain-English.
- RC indicated summarizing the audits including satisfactory vs unsatisfactory items, with completed recommendations and to-be completing recommendations thoroughly described in next CLC. Discussed that Veolia is looking to do benchscale trials following auditor recommendation for chemical treatment of leachate.
- FJ: Asked RC to explain completed items on the slide.
- RC: Some of the pending odour challenges identified in the initial Independent Odour Audit Sampling undertaken in 2023 included the dam system, ED3N, having a higher than normal odouress potential. The recommended aerators were installed. Follow-up testing identified that the dam would benefit from further aerators, and the auditors also recommended we undertake the necessary bench-scale testing to understand if chemicals could be added to the dam to accelerate oxidation during unforeseen circumstances. The addition of chemicals would require multiple regulatory approvals.
- SM: Is Veolia is permitted to floc (referring to in-situ chemical dosing of water to improve it's quality).
- RC: No. We need to undertake the trials to support that, and both the auditor and Veolia recognise in these circumstances that having an approved dosing strategy could be very useful. Veolia to engage the trials throughout 2024 in a lab.

Ops 8

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KW: Is the data bar colour correct?</li> <li>• RC: No, needs to be fixed - will be corrected in minuted presentation sent out. (Has been corrected)</li> </ul> <p><u>Ops 9</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nil</li> </ul>
<b>6</b>	<b>Environmental update</b>
6.1	<p>RC provided environmental update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JS: Asked the committee if they want to have this section of the slide pack presented, acknowledging time constraints?</li> <li>• JP: Preferred only outstanding matters to be presented.</li> <li>• RC: There are 3 outstanding matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ EPL Variations: plain-English record of data to be provided going forward</li> <li>○ Regulatory enforcements: plain-English record of data to be provided going forward</li> <li>○ Gas characterisations map: altered H2S data review locations identified. Only the Showground and Rec sensor was moved, at the request of the show society, to accommodate the horse floats.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• KW: Regarding the EPL variation, Veolia needs to adopt better language in the records so as not to appear being dismissive of complainants.</li> <li>• RC: Noted that in future we will refer to wind direction being towards the complainant or not only.</li> </ul>
<b>7</b>	<b>Community Q&amp;A</b>
7.1	<p><u>Publication of meeting minutes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FJ: Written responses prevent discussion, supported time dedicated to discussing community queries in the committee meeting is important.</li> <li>• FJ: Delay to publish the previous minutes from the last meeting was excessive.</li> <li>• KW: Is there approvals process applicable to publication of the minutes?</li> <li>• KLW: Yes, management approval is required then there is a web upload process via the media team.</li> <li>• SJ: Community trust is affected if there is a delay publishing the minutes.</li> <li>• FJ: Suggested one week for Veolia and one week for the committee.</li> <li>• RC: Requested that all recipients in the email correspondence “reply all” in regards to meeting minute feedback, so that everyone can see each others input</li> </ul>
7.2	<p><u>Container leak incident</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FJ: Identified leak at some time between the previous CLC meeting and this CLC meeting.</li> <li>• RC: The EPA received the complaint initially and it was forwarded one week later to Veolia. Staff performed testing on the container and an investigation indicated there was no broken</li> </ul>

	<p>seal. This was reported to the EPA and Veolia understands it was rainwater based on the video. The complaint and the associated report has not been made public.</p>
<p>7.3</p>	<p><u>EPA risk rating</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FJ: Queried the EPA risk rating rise reported in the Tarago Times.</li> <li>• RC: QoN - has been discussed with relevant teams and response added to Q&amp;A and associated document on the website</li> </ul>
<p>7.4</p>	<p><u>Independent odour audit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FJ: When will the independent odour audit of 2023 be released?</li> <li>• RC: It has been submitted to the EPA and DPE and Veolia is waiting feedback. In the interim, the company has progressed with implementing their recommendations. Actions related to a legacy dam, ED3N, are on the Odour Management slide. We will tabulate all action completion status on next CLC.</li> </ul>
<p>7.5</p>	<p><u>Heavy vehicles</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JP: Is it true that the company has extended transport hours?</li> <li>• RC: There are three sites and each has a licence and operating consent. These caused administrative confusion in regards to some public holidays needing permission on one license but not another. Confirmed that there is no change to operating hours and the number of trucks on the road at night remains the same.</li> <li>• FJ: What is the number of heavy vehicles permitted?</li> <li>• KW: There was a traffic study completed previously that identified the number of trucks using various roads in the LGA. Are those numbers available?</li> <li>• RC: QoN. A link to the traffic study have been provided in the Q+A document.</li> </ul>
<p>7.6</p>	<p><u>Driver behaviour</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JP: Queried the recent public allegations about poor heavy vehicle driver behaviour.</li> <li>• RC: Understands if it is coming from Canberra, likely to be a vehicle owned and operated by a third-party. The responsibility of the community is to report this to police.</li> </ul>
<p>7.7</p>	<p><u>Response to submissions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FJ: Why does it take 6 months for the DPE to complete the RTS review?</li> <li>• KLW: 6 months is an estimate.</li> <li>• FJ: Why is this the case when Veolia operates 60+ facilities globally?</li> <li>• KLW: NSW planning legislation applies to the RTS process so foreign facilities do not have a bearing on the RTS duration.</li> <li>• FJ: The resulting perception is that the community is disadvantaged. It has a short time to review planning documents and make a submission whereas DPE and Veolia have a much</li> </ul>

	longer time.
7.8	<p><u>ARC correspondence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KW: What is the email address for the ARC?</li> <li>• KLW: ARC@veolia.com</li> </ul>
7.9	<p><u>Pit depth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KW: How long can the void be used at its current rate of fill, and how long it could be used with diverting the waste from landfill to the ARC?</li> <li>• KLW: This is not readily known and the answer would be subjective</li> <li>• RC: An educated guess is being prepared and will be included in the written response to questions and distribution.</li> </ul>
7.10	<p><u>Gas emissions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FJ: Can Veolia provide an estimate of gas volumes subject to flaring?</li> <li>• RC: Data is commercial in confidence.</li> <li>• FJ: Does Veolia have enough engines installed based on the fact that the engine count is less than half what was planned for this stage of development (based on the original planning documentation)?</li> <li>• RC: EPA study estimated how many additional engines can operate</li> <li>• FJ: Logically, Veolia will do what is cheapest (i.e. flare instead of purchasing engines).</li> <li>• RC: Cheapest option is not necessarily the preferred option, there are a range of factors to consider.</li> </ul>
7.11	<p><u>Circular economy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JP: What is Veolia currently doing to foster a circular economy in Sydney?</li> <li>• FJ: Does the company track the origin of waste it receives?</li> <li>• KLW: The data required by regulations is collected and reported to regulators as required.</li> </ul>
<b>8</b>	<b>Meeting Closed</b>
8.1	Meeting closed at 7pm. Next meeting date to be confirmed by chair via email.

**Action List**

Item	Action	Assigned to
1	ACTION: Amend welcome to country.	Veolia
2	ACTION: Communicate how many leaking containers have been reported as non-compliances.	Veolia

## Veolia Community Liaison Committee Meeting Minutes

---

3	ACTION: Correct date in the water management diagram (i.e to correct year -2024).	Veolia
4	ACTION: Bar chart colours on slide 20 need to be corrected.	Veolia
5	ACTION: Review risk rating rise reported in the Tarago Times and confirm accuracy.	Veolia
6	ACTION: Seek to identify past traffic study that identified the number of trucks using various roads in the LGA. If found, confirm truck numbers.	Veolia
7	ACTION: Confirm if Veolia tracks the origin of waste it receives.	Veolia