

This meeting is part of the determination process.

Meeting note taken by: David Koppers	Date: 25MAY18	Time: 1105
---	----------------------	-------------------

Project: Eastern Creek Energy from Waste Project – SSD 6236

Meeting Place: IPCN Office – 201 Elizabeth Street, SYDNEY

Attendees:

IPCN Members:

Robyn Kruk AO (Chair), Peter Duncan AM and Tony Pearson

IPCN Secretariat:

David McNamara – Director

David Koppers – Team Leader

Department & Agencies:

Anthea Sargeant, **DPE**

Chris Ritchie, **DPE**

Sally Munk, **DPE**

Joyanne Manning, **ARUP**

Giles Prowse, **ARUP**

Therese Manning, **EnRisks**

Benjamin Scalley, **NSW HEALTH**

Deanne Pitts, **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

Henry Moore, **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

Natalie Alves, **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

Janelle Pickup, **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

John Klepetko, **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

Stephen Corbett, **NSW HEALTH**

Meeting Purpose: To discuss the applicant's response to the Department's Assessment Report

Meeting Details:

- The Department and Agencies (together "the Department" unless otherwise specified) reviewed the applicant's response to the Department's Assessment Report and stated their view that there was no new information in the response.
- The EfW policy was developed to be supportive of new EfW facilities, with one of its foci on having confidence in how a facility will operate, including confidence in the assessment of emissions and human health impacts. This governed the key components of the policy, being the reference facility, feedstock information and temperatures.
- The Department stated that the requirements in the policy relating to feedstock and the reference facility are important as they give confidence in the assessment of project emissions.
- The Department stated its belief that the operation of the Ferrybridge EfW facility in the UK is significantly different to what is proposed at the project, in particular the significant difference in the project's proposed waste stream to what is utilised by Ferrybridge. This causes uncertainty in the types of emissions created and the ability of the facility to regulate and manage the emissions appropriately.
- Further explanation was provided on the make-up of waste streams and waste types. An example was that paper and cardboard was a waste type and could be found in a variety of waste streams.
- The Department stated that the applicant's proposed waste stream will generally consist of dry materials. Ferrybridge's waste stream generally consists of wetter materials. This impacts on the way materials are burnt. ARUP's report considered this as part of its merit assessment of the project.
- The EfW policy calls up waste streams and not waste types.

- The EPA has stated that it is confident that it knows what is in the approved waste stream for Ferrybridge, however this is not consistent with what is actually being processed.
- The Department considered the EfW policy to be a relevant consideration under section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act.
- The Department stated that European standards require certain non-hazardous waste to be burned at 850°C to deal with, among others, dioxin creation. The EfW Policy requires these wastes to be treated at 1100°C, which impacts on energy recovery. This is a precautionary approach to deal with unexpected contaminants in the waste fuel.
- The Department acknowledged that grate technology is appropriate as the project would need to accommodate variable feedstock. Flue gas treatment systems are generally considered to be relatively agnostic to waste inputs.
- 1 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) of NSW recycled waste is going to Queensland. Queensland is about to introduce a waste levy that will make this commercially unviable. The EPA believes there is sufficient capacity within NSW to deal with this waste staying in NSW. Some will still go to landfill (or EfW facilities), most into recycling streams.
- The Department stated that the changes in China's waste policy and acceptance criteria predominantly affects municipal solid waste (MSW). It does not impact Commercial & Industrial or Construction & Demolition waste to any significant extent. The project is not intended to take MSW.
- Applicant states 61,000 tonnes of separated recyclables from NSW available. ARUP believes is it 41,000 tonnes.
- Department confirmed that floc waste has not been requested to be removed from the project by the applicant despite references to same in the applicant's response to the Department's Assessment Report. Removal of floc waste would remove many unknowns from the project but not all. All modelling assumes floc will be included in the waste stream. 58% of the project's floc waste is fines, which are very light and hard to identify its constituent materials. Generally concentrates problem elements. Floc waste in Germany is used to mix with wet materials such as food wastes as it is light and dry. It does contain explosive properties. Eastern Creek is mostly dry material and details have not been provided by the applicant on how The Next Generation would manage floc waste.
- The Department stated that the emissions modelling prepared for the project incorporated the normal amount of conservatism.
- Enriska clarified that its report contained an assessment of the implied margin of safety to modeling emissions outputs and should not be seen as a necessary or desirable "buffer".
- The Department stated that impacts on the waste hierarchy may occur when C&D wastes from other providers are not sorted as well as at the applicant's Genesis facility.
- The EPA confirmed that it regulates emissions at the point of discharge and not in the ambient environment. Ambient background levels are taken into account by the EPA during modelling.
- The project generates three types of ash. Bottom ash, which falls from the grate, top ash from the boilers, and flue gas treatment residue. Boiler ash might be hazardous depending on source material. Flue ash is hazardous and considered a restricted solid waste – one facility in NSW can accept this waste material. Bottom ash is recycled in Europe.
- The Department stated that it believes that there is a financial incentive to reuse bottom ash and not landfill. Landfilling of ash has not been considered as part of the application.

Meeting closed at: 1250