

More information:

<http://swstas.com.au>

Fiction	Fact
No need for a C cell in Tasmania has been established	A need was identified in 1991 and has been consistently referred to in a number of reports over a period of more than 20 years
The need for a C cell was identified in 1991 and so this needs to be updated.	The Sustainable Infrastructure Australia report dated 2008 reaffirmed the need.
The 2008 report by Sustainable Infrastructure Australia recommends alternatives to landfilling	This report does in fact include such recommendations but it also says that "Tasmania does not currently have landfilling or processing facilities that are fully compliant with modern best practice standards for 'secure' landfills. Lack of adequate facilities may result in significant costs to Tasmanian businesses and may impede economic expansion of the State's industries.'
The contaminated material going in to the C cell is the most toxic and dangerous waste	Contaminated soil is classified from level 1 up to level 4. The C cell will only accept up to level 3; and only after testing by an independent laboratory and approval by the EPA. It must not be liquid. Or nuclear.
Gas masks and white overalls required	The site operators will not need to wear protective overalls or gas masks. So why would the nearest residents more than 2km away?
The C cell is sitting on an active fault line and is at extreme risk of catastrophic failure	The fault was caused by intrusion of dolerite in the Jurassic and it is extremely stable
The C cell is less than 5m above groundwater	We aren't certain of the exact clearance, and wanted to be conservative, but we now think it will be tens of metres; and it will be definitively determined before construction
A desk top study by the father of a protest group organizer stating that the C cell is in an extremely seismically active area	A scientist with more than 100 hours of geological field mapping and geophysical surveying (of the actual site) undertaken in 1999 and 2012 concluded that the site is extremely stable and suitable for the location of a C cell. More recent work in August 2012 reinforces this finding

<p>A community member claiming (mercury letters) that the council required them to comply with stringent earthquake regulations when they submitted a development application 20 years ago</p>	<p>The council doesn't have, and hasn't had, earthquake regulations as the area is not subject to earthquakes. The individual could be confused with requests for land stability studies, as there is a risk of landslips caused by past land clearing practices</p>
<p>The cell is only 200m from the Carlton River or worse still is actually on the banks of the river</p>	<p>The distance to the river is approximately 1,750m. Distance to an unnamed and normally dry tributary is approximately 750m, but it is the river itself that is referred to</p>
<p>The HDPE liners are fragile and similar to plastic milk bottles; and there is only one of them</p>	<p>The HDPE liners, of which there are two (and there are another 2 clay liners as well) are 2mm thick liners that will remain impermeable for several hundreds of years.</p>
<p>In Germany they require a 2.5mm membrane so why are we so much less</p>	<p>We have 4 layers not just one</p>
<p>The community will bear the cost in the long term</p>	<p>The cell will be paid for by waste producers via a gate fee. The gate fee will include a commercial rate of return that will be available for return to the community. The gate fee will factor in an amount for a trust fund (a legal requirement of our permit) to guarantee that the community is not out of pocket in the future</p>
<p>The cell is environmentally unfriendly because it gives a cheap option to waste producers and does not encourage changes to processes to minimise waste produced</p>	<p>Once the facility is available the EPA will be able to direct waste producers to clean up their acts. Our environment will be better for it. A commercial gate fee will give incentive to waste producers to look at ways to reduce their waste. The Greens support the development.</p>
<p>The Melbourne C cell is 30km from homes but the Copping C cell is only 2.4km</p>	<p>The distance quoted is from the CBD. The cell is in suburbia surrounded by homes no more than 500m away</p>
<p>Climate change has not been taken in to account</p>	<p>It has. Detail is available on request. There is too much for a short presentation</p>
<p>Climate change will mean that the cell will flood because of rising sea levels</p>	<p>The cell is actually located at approximately the 50m contour level so if it floods because of rising sea levels then we are all in big trouble</p>

<p>Climate change will mean that the cell will flood because of increased rain fall</p>	<p>The cell will be capped after 10 -15 years, with the cap including impermeable layers, so that rain will be excluded. The cell will not be significantly affected by any likely increases in temperature arising from climate change. Rainfall is only predicted to increase by around 7% over the next 30 years, and temperature changes are similarly not significant in the context of the liner specifications</p>
<p>Transport of the waste is extremely dangerous</p>	<p>The waste is non-liquid and transporters must be permitted and carry appropriate spill kits. In the event of a spill the material will be shoveled up. There is far greater risk from everyday commodities such as fuel and gas, or even a car accident. This is also the view of the EPA</p>
<p>There is high risk of wind borne contamination</p>	<p>The EPA does not think this is a credible risk. The material will not be fine particulate. We will not off load in high winds. Waste can be dampened. The cell is in a quarry on the side of a hill with the nearest home 2.4km away. We are voluntarily installing depositional monitoring units to prove no wind blown waste leaves the site.</p>
<p>Only minimal statutory consultation was undertaken</p>	<p>In addition to statutory consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SWS sends agendas to adjoining landowners and development of a C cell has been listed for 4 years; - SWS wrote to adjoining landowners a week before the project was advertised offering personal briefings; - SWS printed 500 pamphlets for distribution; - SWS briefed politicians in April (including Morris) and all were supportive. If they had concerns they should have taken them back to their community

There is no social licence	There is no legal requirement for a social licence. The site is not a greenfield site and it can be argued that a licence was obtained in 1998. The C cell is only a relatively minor change in use. The community showed no interest early on
Southern Waste Solutions or the CEO personally; or both; are making multiple millions of dollars from the project with money being the only motive	The owner councils will make a commercial rate of return on the investment
The CIA is probably involved	There is no CIA involvement, and no conspiracy of any kind
Recent roadworks near the site were part of a conspiracy to cow the locals in to submission. The road won't be reinstated until they behave	Road works are not within our sphere of control or influence. We believe that these scheduled road works have now been completed