



Southern Waste Solutions

COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP

MINUTES

21 January 2014

1. Opening

A meeting of the Community Reference Group was held on Tuesday 21 January 2014 at Sorell Council's offices, commencing at 15.30

2. Present

- a) **Present:** Jamie Ward (interest in sustainability and zero waste), Tom Gray (Tasmanian Shellfish Executive Council - TSEC), Max Cunningham (South East Shellfish Growers - SESG), Angela Marsh (Southern Beaches Conservation Society Inc - SBCS), John Wise (Blue Hills Sporting Shooters Club, landfill nearest neighbour), Christine Bell (Southern Waste Solutions - SWS).
- b) **Apologies:** Leigh Arnold (local businessman), Sarah Taylor (concerned and engaged community member).
- c) **In Attendance:** Not applicable.

3. Approval of Agenda

Members added the following items to the agenda:

- a) September minutes in relation to rezoning;
- b) Minute taking;
- c) Expert to attend future meeting to present C cell detailed design and to answer related questions.

4. Previous Minutes

Members adopted the previous minutes as circulated.

5. General Business

- a) **Community queries**
 - (i) None were raised.

b) Updates on actions agreed at previous meetings

- (i) Other potential members of the group are still under consideration [06 August 2013 item 4 h) 5.]
- (ii) A site visit was arranged for 5 February 2014 at 10.00am – CRG members will meet at the gun club.
- (iii) Jamie has not had a discussion with UTas re lack of accredited laboratories in Tasmania [03 September 2013 item 5 c) (ii)]. However he met someone from CSIRO at a tip shop. This person told him that suitable laboratories are readily available in Hobart and will provide a quick turnaround. SWS, TSEC and SESG are keen to pursue this because they are not aware of any such option. Current practices are expensive and take time, with samples having to be sent to mainland laboratories. Jamie undertook to try to find the name of this person to follow up, and to contact Jason Whitehead of Tasmanian Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (DHHS) who is involved with the shellfish industry's current testing practices.
- (iv) Macquarie Point advised Jamie that they definitely had material for the C cell but they do not know quantities at this stage.
- (v) The BLANKET air quality monitoring system was ordered in October 2013 but no response has yet been received from the EPA [15 October 2013 item 5 d)].
- (vi) Outline of Authority reporting mechanism has not been dealt with [15 October 2013 item 5 e) (i)].
- (vii) Soil remediation facility:
SBCS stated that Enviropacific was not involved with the proposal.
SWS advised that the facility was actually the suggestion of Enviropacific and that Enviropacific prepared the Environmental Effects Report (Report) with input and assistance from SWS.

SBCS stated that the Tasmanian Conservation Trust and a local planning person (unnamed) claim that the Report would not meet EPA requirements.

SWS advised that the proposal is not of sufficient significance to require a Development Proposal and Environment Management plan, and that the Report was prepared according to guidelines issued by the EPA (as part of its normal processes) in respect of this particular project. The Report is fully compliant.

SWS also advised that some representations had been received with no matters of substantive concern. The matters will be addressed for the sake of completeness. They include such things as concern about a weed management plan when there is already one in operation; and concern expressed about the facility being open on 3 sides when it is in fact closed on 3 sides (and roofed).

SWS also advised that the facility is designed to take material from small businesses rather than large commercial quantities. It will be used to store material until economic quantities are accumulated for treatment. It is estimated that it will store approximately 1,000 tonnes of material at any time. The ultimate aim is to treat material so it can be used as landfill cover, reducing the volume of actual waste.

c) Other updates, open forum etc

- (i) Jamie expressed concern about a lack of an overarching state wide policy. SWS advised that local government is responsible for disposal of domestic waste. The state is responsible for controlling the treatment, transport and disposal of contaminated material.
- (ii) Jamie raised an example from Ireland where a waste to energy plant was planned and EURO 90 million spent with no plant being built and ongoing legal issues.
- (iii) SBCS again raised the issue of plasma arc furnaces and their availability on warships and potential economies of scale. Jamie raised concerns about such expensive infrastructure and the potential negative effect from the need to keep waste levels up to make the plasma arc operation financially viable. SWS reiterated the fact that its investigations approximately 2 years ago concluded that plasma arc was not economically viable for Copping at that time. SWS advised it is currently considering the matter again because of changes in the cost and scale of the technology, and that the addition of waste from other councils may make such a project viable.

d) Additional agenda items

- (i) The minutes from September were again discussed in relation to rezoning. These minutes were previously amended to deal with concerns expressed by SBCS at the subsequent meeting. SBCS states that it has concerns about the rezoning, but agrees that SWS has no say in or control over the matter. SWS advised that SBCS was asked some time ago to outline concerns in relation to this matter by email so that they could be addressed with the Environmental Defenders Office (EDO) and not take

up the Group's time. SBCS does not want to meet with SWS and the EDO.

SWS advised SBCS that concern had been expressed about this issue wasting the Group members' time, particularly given the circumstances where neither SWS nor the Group had any say in the matter.

SWS further advised that the section of the minutes dealing with this issue were referred to the nominee of the State Planning Commission who attended the meeting to answer SBCS' concerns.

SBCS again requested that 'a proviso' be attached to the minutes of the October meeting. A related document prepared by SBCS was tabled and circulated. Members of the Group expressed concern that the content of the tabled document was not discussed at the meeting and so should not be included.*

It was agreed that the minutes of the October meeting would be amended again to make it clear that SBCS disagrees with the advice given by the State Planning Commission's nominated representative in relation to this matter.

- (ii) SWS and SBCS both raised the issue of meeting minutes. SWS reminded members that minutes are always sent out as draft, and that suggested factual amendments are actively sought. SBCS requested an independent minute taker, expressing the opinion that the Group is currently biased towards SWS. SWS pointed out that a majority of members have the final say over the content of the minutes and that the Group includes only one representative of SWS. SBCS suggested that an SWS Administrative Assistant could take the minutes. SWS pointed out that there is no such employee. It was also pointed out that the Group is not meant to be adversarial, rather it is meant to be a conduit for a two way information flow between the community and SWS. The Group agreed that the current arrangements are satisfactory, and agreed to provide any suggested amendments as soon as possible after draft minutes are received to facilitate a final copy being presented to the subsequent meeting. SBCS requested that meetings be recorded. The Group had no objection to SBCS doing this.
- (iii) The members of the Group welcomed the attendance of an expert to address the detailed design of the C cell at its next meeting.

e) Actions for next meeting

- Members consider other group participants 5 b) (i)
- Jamie to approach UTas re lack of laboratories 5 b) (iii)
- Jamie to follow up CSIRO re claims of suitable laboratories in Tas 5 b) (iii)
- Jamie to follow up Tas Shellfish Quality Assurance Program (DHHS) Jason Whitehead 5 b) (iii)
- BLANKET monitoring system 5 b) (v)
- SWS Authority reporting mechanisms on web 5 b) (vi)
- Again amend October minutes 5 d) (i)
- Invite expert re C cell detailed design 5 d) (iii)

f) Next meeting

Members agreed unanimously that future meetings be held on a quarterly basis.

Tuesday **8 April 3.30** pm at Sorell Council Chambers.

g) Meeting close

4.30 pm.

**PLEASE REMEMBER SITE VISIT 5 FEBRUARY
10.00AM - MEET AT GUN CLUB. WEAR
CLOSED TOE SHOES AND BRING HIGH VIZ
VEST IF YOU HAVE ONE.**

*Minutes are issued in draft format. SBCS has provided strong comment on this matter. These comments were not made at the meeting so cannot form part of the minutes. SBCS continues to request that a 'a proviso' be attached to the October minutes despite the agreement by all other members present at the January (and October) meeting that it should not be because its contents were not discussed at the relevant meeting. SBCS also proposes that not attaching 'a proviso' indicates that SWS is 'afraid that if the Minutes are recalled in future they may reflect badly on you. I can only suppose this to be the case.'