



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1173094

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

TELECONFERENCE WITH ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY (EPA)

RE: GENESIS WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY MOD 6 – EPA MEETING

PANEL:

**ILONA MILLAR
DR PETER WILLIAMS
TONY PEARSON**

ASSISTING PANEL:

**CASEY JOSHUA
STEPHEN BARRY**

EPA:

**LARA BARRINGTON
HANNAH ROBERTSON
CARLA THOMAS
ANTHONY SAVAGE
RHYS WATSON
MARK LATAL**

LOCATION:

**IPC OFFICES
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**

DATE:

TUESDAY, 31 MARCH 2020

MS I. MILLAR: Great. Thank you very much. So good morning and welcome. Just to let everyone know that I'm starting the meeting now for the purpose of the transcription services. So good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, and I
5 would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present. Welcome to this teleconference today to discuss the proposed modification 6 to the Genesis Waste Management Facility project approval. The proponent, Bingo Industries, is seeking to increase the amount of waste going to landfill and to extend the hours of operation of some processes.

10 The Genesis Waste Management Facility is located in the Blacktown local government area. My name is Ilona Millar, and I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me are my fellow commissioners, Dr Peter Williams and Tony Pearson. Casey Joshua and Stephen Barry from the office of the IPC are also in attendance. In
15 the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's teleconference is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website. This teleconference is one part of the commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information
20 upon which the commission will base its decision.

It's important for the commissioners to ask questions when we need and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate, but if you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide
25 any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. To ensure the accuracy of the transcript, I request that all members today introduce themselves each time before speaking and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other so that the transcript can be accurately captured.

30 So with that, we will – we will now begin. We have an agenda for this meeting which has identified the questions that are of particular interest to the commission panel members. So if I could now ask the EPA to provide some feedback on the modification and the department's assessment report, and also to some input on the questions in the agenda.

35 MS L. BARRINGTON: This is Lara Barrington speaking. I – I don't have a of the reports that were provided. We – our response is really just being framed in terms of the questions that typically were asked in it. So I'm – we're happy to talk to that, and I'll hand over to Hannah to provide the information about the – the
40 complaints that we've received about the facility. Hannah.

MS H. ROBERTSON: Hi. Hannah here. Yeah. So in the agenda we've received any noise or owner complaints for the facility. So the EPA hasn't ever received a noise report or a complaint for the facility. However, there has been a
45 number of complaints received in relation to odour experienced by members of the public. So previously in 2015, we received an odour complaint and a caller was

affected by a foul type of odour which was subsequently investigated by EPA officers with the facility. We received a further odour report or complaint in 2016 where the caller was affected by a sewer-type odour, and this was followed up with the facility again and investigated by EPA officers that were responsible for the licence.

Then with the recent fire event in February, the EPA received quite a significant number of complaints in relation to odour and smoke being experienced by members of the public. We had a majority that were coming from the Minchinbury area, which is north of the premises. We also had a member of the public in the Eastern Creek area which is north of the premises and Now, these were all pretty similar in nature in that there was an odour being experienced in relation to the fire event and a smoke type of odour as well. So the descriptions of the odour that were being experienced were a burning or a rubber type of smell combined with a chemical type of smell.

So these were also responded to by EPA officers, where we had a conversation with the members of the public and followed up subsequently with the facility as well. Was there any - - -

MR T. PEARSON: Were any of those complaints substantiated in terms of - - -

MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you very much for – for clarifying that.

MS ROBERTSON: No problem. That’s okay.

MR PEARSON: Sorry. Could I – Tony Pearson here. Could I just ask, in terms of those complaints, were any of them substantiated in terms of these things, the responsibility of the applicant?

MS ROBERTSON: So the odour in 2015 was followed up and Genesis responded to the EPA. Because the EPA weren’t at the site at the time of the odour and odour is so subjective, what we do is ask for what activities or operations were happening at the site at the time of the complaint, and what could have possibly been the cause of that. So that one, I know that there was the response from the applicant. However, I – as it wasn’t me as the officer, I don’t know – I don’t think that that was followed up further. But I can take that on notice and – and check up on that one.

The second odour complaint in 2016 that EPA attended the site and also, like, witnessed and – and smelled a similar odour. So I know that was followed up with the applicant. And then the fire odour complaints that we’ve received, we – we went out in the area in the days following the fire incident, but we were – there was an EPA officer at the site on the time of the fire, on – on the after hours service, and so I know that these were also followed up with the facility just in terms of – of further actions that we’ve had them undertake in relation to air monitoring and thermal imaging and stuff like that, so - - -

MR PEARSON: Thank you.

MS ROBERTSON: You're welcome.

5 MS BARRINGTON: This is - - -

MS MILLAR: Thank you for that.

10 MS BARRINGTON: - - - Lara Barrington. Sorry. Can I - - -

MS MILLAR: Sorry, Lara.

15 MS BARRINGTON: - - - can I just add – yes. Thank you. I just want to add there to that, the – the two complaints in 2015, 2016 were not the current applicant. They were – the facility was being run by the previous operator. So we can't sort of – we can – we can say that yes, we received those complaints, but we can't attribute those to the current operator, being Bingo. However, the fire incident did occur on the 1st of February and that was under Bingo's occupation and management of the site.

20 MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you. That – that – that's – that's noted. If we can perhaps move on to the – the next question that we had in respect of the – the noise associated with the proposed development. The – the question asks for the further information from the EPA with regards to the noise generation levels anticipated by the proponent and the recommended noise limits from the EPA and the industrial
25 noise policy. In particular, we were keen to understand what information has informed the formulation of the draft conditions related to noise that are proposed in the proposed instrument of modification, and in that context, how has the EPA considered and responded to the noise levels proposed by the applicant?

30 MR M. LATAL: It's Mark Latal here. In response to the first question about what information has informed the formulation of those draft conditions, I – I just want to draw the panel's attention to the noise limits that are in the draft instrument of modification. Those are not the most current ones. They've been updated. I
35 forwarded – or Lara Barrington forwarded an email to Bianca about the updated noise limits. Do you have those?

MS C. JOSHUA: It's Casey Joshua here. We don't have any of that updated information from the department yet, but we are expecting a package of further information to be provided in the next day or two, and I believe that part of that
40 package will be some updated wording for the noise conditions and some updated information in that regard.

MR LATAL: Okay. Well, it's Mark Latal again. In that – in that case, the noise limits for the Minchinbury residents remain the same. The noise limits for Erskine
45 Park have increased slightly, which reflects the application of a 2-decibel low-frequency noise modifying factor that was done in the revised response to submissions report, and those revised noise conditions will come to you as – as

Casey mentioned, soon. So nonetheless, in response to that question, EPA's recommended noise conditions have been taken from the proponent's predictions of their operational noise, which is in that revised response to submissions report, to assess noise from the proposal.

5

The proponent monitored the contemporary background noise level receivers. They used those results, together with the 59 zone 1 optimum noise level goals to derive noise criteria that are specific to this project. The proponent then put together a noise model of the proposed operations using appropriate input data, appropriate calculation techniques, and made appropriate and conservative assumptions about their operation on the site. The predictions from that model were found to be within the project's specific noise criteria. EPA then took the highest of those predicted noise levels, which still met the criteria, and applied them as recommended noise levels.

10

15

We do this to ensure that the proponent adopts best practice techniques to make sure they achieve the level of performance that they presented in the report. In response to the question about how the EPA has considered the noise levels that were proposed by the applicant, we reviewed the results of the noise measurements that were carried out by the proponent. We reviewed the process of formulating the project-specific noise criteria that the proponent has appropriately and thoroughly carried out the noise modelling and prediction and that they've assessed the predictions against the criteria correctly.

20

25

We have requested further information where – where we needed to to ensure that the noise impacts from the proposal are properly identified. As I mentioned above, we then set recommended noise conditions to ensure that the proponent achieves their predicted level of performance.

30

MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you. So Peter or Tony, do you have any further questions or – or clarifications in respect of that?

MR PEARSON: Not from me, Ilona. Tony Pearson.

35

DR P. WILLIAMS: Ilona. Ilona? Ilona, can you hear me?

MS MILLAR: Yes. I can hear you.

40

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, Ilona. It's Peter Williams. Sorry. I don't know what's happened here. I think those updated noise level figures that – that Mark was just referring to, I think we might have had some discussions with the department on those – at our meeting as well, so I think they might be the same set of figures

45

MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you for that. Tony, I'm assuming no further questions from you with respect to noise?

MR PEARSON: Sorry. I – I did – I did acknowledge that. No – no further questions from me, but maybe the connection wasn't great. So yes, no – no further questions from me.

5 MS MILLAR: Okay. Great. Thanks. Thanks, Tony. I'll then move on to the – the next issue that we were seeking further clarification on. So on page 30 of the department's assessment report, it talks about the EPA recommended the proponent to investigate additional proactive emission control measures such as sealing the haul road within the quarry We were hoping that the EPA could provide some advice
10 regarding the extent to which sealing the haul roads would be expected to reduce the PM2.5 concentration and whether there are other mitigation measures that may be suitable.

MR R. WATSON: Yes. It's Rhys Watson here. I can talk to this point. So in
15 regards to the first part of the question there about seeking some advice on the extent that sealing the haul roads is – is expected to reduce the PM2.5 concentration. So in regard to that question, the EPA can't really specifically quantify the reductions and predicted offsite concentrations that sealing the haul roads may have. It is – we – we kind of think that it's unlikely that, you know, analysis of expected reductions will
20 change the conclusion of the air assessment. As such, the EPA's advice around this is that the proponent and the applicant should implement all reasonable and feasible proactive and reactive mitigation measures.

And the reason why we can't sort of advise around the expected offsite
25 concentrations is that the – the proponent and the consultant are sort of best placed to provide that additional the holders of the air dispersion modelling that was conducted, and so they would be able to analyse that further if the commission wanted to investigate that a little bit more. However, the – the EPA can provide some advice around what reductions, generally speaking, haul roads can reduce
30 PM2.5 emissions, and so talking to that point, we think that, you know, a well-maintained paved road could reduce PM2.5 emissions by 90 per cent or greater when compared with an uncontrolled paved road.

PM2.5 emissions from a well-maintained paved road could be kind of comparable to
35 a road where there's a high degree of wet suppression being implemented. The assessment for the modification for the Genesis project incorporated a high degree of wet suppression. The actual difference between any theoretical paved road and unpaved road calculations is almost entirely dependent on the exact implementation of those management practices, which we can't really verify on a theoretical basis.
40 Obviously, when you're implementing a management measure on a paved or unpaved it has to be sort of thought about, if you're applying wet suppression, how often you're supplying it – providing it, are you being quite – are they implementing some good due diligence on that aspect, and compared to a paved road, are you maintaining it, are you keeping it well-cleaned.

45 So the actual theoretical analysis of it is highly dependent on the actual implementation. Speaking to the other part of the question, were there any other

mitigations that could be suitable for the premises and the project. So thinking about this question, there's kind of some of the dominant sources assessed within the impact – their quality impact assessment for the proposal. Now, the two highest PM2.5 emission sources are wheel-generated dust, which accounts for about 18 per cent of the total PM2.5 emissions. The other dominant source is sort of – is non-road diesel combustion, which accounts for about 34 per cent of PM2.5 emissions.

So they're the two biggest assessed omission sources in the impact assessment. So using those two – that – that piece of information, we think that investigation into diesel combustion emissions could also be considered as part of requiring all reasonable and feasible proactive and reactive management measures. The other point that I guess I could draw the – the commission – the commission to is that we don't think some of the additional analysis is going to change the conclusion of the assessment, and that's because there's predicted PM2.5 exceedances on an annual basis from the impact assessment.

Now, that – those exceedances are due to existing background. So that is without a site – a contribution from the premises itself, so without taking any contribution from the premises, the ambient air quality already exceeds our impact assessment criteria for PM2.5 on an annual basis. Now, the EPA's sort of guiding principle when there's elevated background concentrations is to implement, you know, best practice mitigation to prevent minimised emissions as far as practicable, which I've kind of alluded to in some of the points above.

MS MILLAR: Yes. Thank – thank you very much for – for that. Peter or Tony, do you have any follow-up questions with respect to the PM2.5 concentrations?

MR PEARSON: Ilona – sorry, Peter. You go.

DR WILLIAMS: No. It's all right. No. Go on.

MR PEARSON: I was just going to say – confirm that I have no – no follow-up questions.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry. Sorry, Ilona. Just two questions, if I may. Sorry, Rhys. It's Peter Williams here. Did – did you say that the – that a high degree of wet suppression might achieve the same outcome as well-maintained paved road?

MR WATSON: Yes. I did say that they could – they could be quite comparable. You've got to kind of recognise that when you're estimating these fugitive emissions, there's a – there's an inherent uncertainty with some of the assumptions that come into it. So while it might be quite comparable, the actual on the ground comparison might be quite different because it might be a lot easier to maintain a paved road compared to maintaining wet suppression at all times to a high degree, especially, you know, thinking about having the water onsite, you know, that might run out, of if you have breakdown on certain, you know, wet suppression sprinklers

or trucks and things like that. It might be a lot harder to maintain that as far as – compared with a paved road.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

5

MR A. SAVAGE: Hi - - -

DR WILLIAMS: No. Thank you. That's – that's - - -

10 MR SAVAGE: - - - it's Anthony Savage.

DR WILLIAMS: - - -

MR SAVAGE: Sorry.

15

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR SAVAGE: It's Anthony Savage. If I – if I can just reinforce Rhys's point on this, and – and maybe just term it slightly differently. What we're talking about here, if you like, is the difference between an engineering control and a management measure. Obviously, you've got greater certainty around the outcome if you implement an engineering control, like a paved road, than you do if you've got a management measure that requires ongoing sort of maintenance and implementation. So while theoretically, you may be able to achieve a high level of control efficiency on an unpaved road, you've got greater certainty around the emission performance and the control efficiency if you put in the engineering control and paved it.

20

25

DR WILLIAMS: Great. Thanks, Anthony. No. That – and Rhys, that clarifies that point for me. Thank you. Just the other point. Also it was mentioned too, Rhys, about – I understand you saying that the largest single source of PM2 emissions are the diesel combustion emissions. Is there any suggestions about how that might be controlled or regulated or reduced?

30

MR WATSON: I think as part of thinking about the diesel stuff, there might be options there as part of doing some further investigative work about what that actual non-road equipment is. I mean, obviously the – the easiest way to reduce that is to eliminate it, you know, by having, like, non – non-diesel combustion equipment and other things like conveyors or whatnot, recognising that that might not also be achievable. The other option is to reduce your diesel use as far as practicable, so optimise a bit of your operations so that you're not unwittingly, you know, idling equipment and such. I think those are some of the mechanisms.

35

40

The other options that could be considered is, you know, replacing some of the diesel equipment, if it's older, with newer pieces of equipment what achieve better emissions performance.

45

DR WILLIAMS: Great. Okay. Great. Thanks, Rhys. Thanks, Ilona. That's – that's all from me. Thank you.

5 MS MILLAR: Okay. Thanks. Thanks very much. I just have one further follow-up question with respect to sealing of – of these haul roads. In your experience, are there any other landfill sites that would have a haul road going down to the bottom of the pit that was – was fully sealed, or is that not practical in the – the context of the – the operations and the changes to the – the – the formation of these – these facilities?

10 MR WATSON: I can't directly draw an – my experience from other landfill sites. Lara or Carla might best be able to answer if there's any other sites that have that. But I can say that there could possibly be some engineering constraints with having that sort of sealing. Perhaps the – the – you know, that can't be implemented for practical or engineering reasons. So I don't know if Lara or Carla have any points on
15 other landfills that they might regulate that implement toll roads.

MS BARRINGTON: Hi. Yes. Look, it's Lara Barrington here. I – look, I – from the – look, I just deal with the – the – some of the Sydney-based landfills and most of them are not constructed like this where it's a quarry which had an extremely deep
20 excavation to fill that needed to have this – this through sort of road going into it. Most of them are actually cells that are just dug physically for that purpose, so it's sort of – it's sort of a different setup here. There might be other ones, maybe more regionally, but I'm not aware of them and they don't come to us. So if there's any way it might be something, yes, like, like, that's a broader question that we might
25 have to take on notice if that's something you're particularly interested in. I could put that question to – like our landfill experts to see if there are any other sites that he's aware of.

MR SAVAGE: Anthony Savage. Just quickly if I may, I'm not specifically of
30 landfill sites that have sealed haul roads within a pit in terms of the question around feasibility, that's a matter for the proponent. The EPA doesn't have the expertise to advise to advise on the engineering feasibility of sealing infrastructure within a pit.

35 MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that. In that case, I will move on to the next question that we posed in the agenda, which relates to the department's recommended condition 37A which requires the proponent to prepare a site-wide air quality audit to the satisfaction of the planning secretary within six months of the approval. We would appreciate any views that the EPA has on this condition, for
40 example, is it a typical approach is it an effective tool in terms of air quality management. You know, has this type of approached been used in other circumstances and has it proved effective?

45 MR WATSON: Yes. Hey, it's Rhys Watson here again. I will begin talking to this question. So just thinking about the first part of the question is it a typical approach and is it an effective tool in terms of air quality management. So I think audits in a broad sense are a common practice and, you know, regardless of environmental

media they can be an effective tool. And this is an example in part of the EPA's true framework for licensed premises that we actually – EPA tells – conducts audits on premises base or industry-wide sectors. We think that, you know, audits can be effective when they're sort of conducted on a periodic basis by sort of appropriate independent personnel. So they can be effective tools in identifying industry best practice measures for the site being audited.

They can identify where a particular premises is not achieving best practice and where they're not minimising or preventing emissions as far as practical. It can identify gaps in the implemented management or control regimes and strategies. And they can identify the works needed to achieve best practice, including any improved implementation of management or engineering controls. So I think talking to other parts of the questions and looking at, you know, the recommended – the specifics – the specificities of recommendation question 37, 37A, I would think, broadly speaking, the EPA would be quite supportive an air quality audit as a condition of the consent.

I kind of think that parts of the condition could be slightly better positioned, for example, part G of that condition requires, you know, identification of any additional any limits be exceeded. Now, the EPA do not regularly set ambient air limits in environment protection licences, and the reason for that is that compliance in an ambient air cannot be easily demonstrated for regulatory purposes. Rather, the EPA regulatory framework requires that sort of emissions be prevented and minimised as far as practical in line with parts of the POEO Act, like section 128 part (2). As such, you know, this condition could sort of be position to require the identification of operational areas not achieving best practice.

It could then sort of decide – you know, provide advice around the best practice measures that could be implemented where it's found that the audit identifies areas that aren't in line with best practice, or that aren't in line with, you know, minimising emissions as far as practicable. Also think, you know, talking to some of the with some of the discussions on the point before about haul loads and diesel emissions. Part – a component of that condition requires the sealing of haul roads be further investigated in conjunction with what the haul roads, diesel and – diesel use and non-road diesel combustion equipment could also be included as part of that condition.

The above sort of examples would assist in the condition aligned with some of the EPA's literature guidance around where there's elevated background concentrations, as we were talking to before that all reasonable and feasible measures to prevent minimise emission as far as practical should be implemented. Now, talking to, I guess, examples of the approach as worked, I kind of eluded to before that the EPA has its own audits that, you know, kind of examples that could be thought about in that context. I guess, if there's – if the commission was after some examples of audits that were conducted under condition of consent, then perhaps it's best to direct that to the Department of Planning as they're better positioned to answer that, because we're the holders of the

As far as – if some examples that the EPA has conducted through licenses or other frameworks, we could definitely pull the take – take that question on notice to get some more specific examples. However, there’s one example which might be useful and the discussion is that the Dust Stop Program that was undertaken for New
5 South Wales coal mines, which wasn’t necessarily called an audit as such, but achieved the same function that an audit might be, and that would be around – that was around identifying the largest emission sources identifying specific best practice mitigation measures that could be implemented on those larger sources and the emission reductions that could be achieved through the implementation of those best
10 practice mitigation measures. So it would be – it would – that sort of example achieves the same function that the audit and, certainly, the condition – what I would think condition 37A is sort of looking to achieve.

15 MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you for that. That’s very helpful. Tony or Peter, do you have any follow up questions in respect of the audit?

MR PEARSON: Tony. Yes. So, yes, so, look, just one question from me: do you anticipate any concerns, given what’s happening at the moment with the
20 Coronavirus, do you anticipate any concerns in terms of when you might want to schedule the audit and whether the audit is accurately capturing what might be regarded as normal sort of baseline levels sort of emission and, then, I guess, the follow up to that question is, do you see any benefits in repeating the audit, given the long-dated nature of the project approval?

25 MR WATSON: In regards to the Coronavirus, yes, I just think that’s just something that will have to be managed obviously, yes, timing around that may need to be thought about in the longer sense. I guess I won’t specify any timeframes. It’s a little bit uncertain times. Around, you know, the frequency of the audits, audits can be, you know, conducted once-off, but, as you’re saying, you know, probably
30 frequent implementation of audit is probably a best strategy here. It not only identifies the upfront sort of options for minimising and preventing, but it also puts an ongoing responsibility to ensure that any mitigation measures are actually – be due diligently implemented and also that there’s an avenue there for continuous improvement. So doing a once-off audit in the first year and then subsequently a
35 periodic period after that. If there’s new technologies or new options that could be implemented, the audit gives a framework for there – for them to be identified and potentially implemented. So I think, you know, an ongoing frequency might be the best avenue here.

40 DR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Thank you for that. Rhys, it’s Peter Williams here again. Thanks very much that explanation of condition 37A. That was very helpful. You’ve mentioned a few points about how parts that might be amended, I think section G, for example, so it’s more – it’s easy in terms of enforcement and
45 compliance. Also some possible suggestions about including provisions about the haul road sealing and diesel emissions. I guess, as a panel, we might – will have to consider those and I presume, at first instance, get back to the department about how those conditions – condition 3A might – 37A might be amended. But we possibly

may also need to get back to the EPA just to – to see the practicalities of any changes we might make of that particular condition as well.

5 MR WATSON: Yes. Rhys Watson here. Sure. We can take further questions on notice and provide additional assistance where – where we feel there's a need.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes. Great. Thanks, Rhys. Thank you very much.

10 MS MILLAR: Great. Look, I think that would be – be very helpful because we – you know, if we are looking at these conditions in the context of the – the EPA's general guidelines, it would be helpful to make sure that we're making sure that they're consistent in that respect. Now, I have no further questions from – from my side. I will just sort of ask whether there's anything else from the – Peter or Tony or the office.

15 MR PEARSON: Ilona, just confirming from me that no further questions, and obviously just wanted to pass on my appreciation to the EPA representatives for making themselves available and for the information they've provided.

20 DR WILLIAMS: It's Peter Williams here. Thanks once again. I'll just reiterate Tony's remarks. It's been very helpful to get the input from the EPA, and we appreciate the – the time you've spent with us in the teleconference. Thank you very much.

25 MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you. Casey?

MS JOSHUA: Yes. Casey Joshua here. Thank you to everyone from the EPA for making yourselves available for this discussion. It has been very helpful. I would like to just reiterate that I noted two questions pending on notice. Maybe if the panel
30 could clarify whether I'm correct in this, but the first question was that the EPA could advise if they're aware of any landfill facilities that have sealed haul roads if that's something that might be able to be provided for our consideration. And also, in regards to condition 37A, is it possible to get an indication of – some suggestions about the way that those parts of condition 37A could be amended from the EPA's
35 perspective, that we could then consider and put forward to the department.

That might be easier than asking the department to then – to then contact the EPA. I'm not sure what the best process for that would be. But is that something that you would be willing to provide?

40 MR WATSON: Yes. Rhys Watson here. I'm happy to assist in providing some suggestions around condition 37A.

45 MS JOSHUA: Thank you. That would be wonderful.

MS BARRINGTON: Hi, and it's Lara Barrington. Yes. I have a question about landfills with sealed haul roads. So is – are there – what particular information – identifying them is one thing. But if there are some, what particular questions do you have around that infrastructure?

5

MS JOSHUA: I think it would just be for the commission to get a sense of whether that is a practice that is undertaken for similar types of facilities, note that the filling of a quarry void is unusual circumstances.

10 MR PEARSON: Casey, I guess – I guess it would speak to the – the impact of – of that activity. So if that activity is leading to any discernible or detectable changes in emissions levels by virtue of the – the dust contribution from the haul road, so – look, it may not be possible to get to that level of information, but – but I guess if we could have a look at that in the first instance and to see whether there are any
15 conclusions that can be drawn around sealing the – the activity of sealing the haul roads and what benefit might come from that.

MS BARRINGTON: Yes. This is Lara. I'm happy to try and obtain that information to see whether it's impractical or not.

20

MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you. That would be much appreciated. Now, I'll just ask, are there any further comments or final matters that anyone from the EPA would like to – to raise on this call or - - -

25 MR LATAL: It's Mark Latal here. I've noticed that – I know we've gone past noise, but there was a third question that had been asked on the agenda in regards to noise about whether is likely to be a difference between the anticipated levels or the proposed modification and the maximum levels that were set out in the proposed conditions. I didn't get around to answering that. In response to that, I – I would say
30 that the anticipated noise levels that have been set as limits should be achieved if the proponent adopts their best practice methods to make sure they're operating in a proper and efficient manner and that their plant and equipment is performing at the noise levels that they've set out in their assessment.

35 I also understand that draft conditions have been included by planning their 38B and 38C for the proponent to prepare a post-commissioning noise report to validate the predictions in the noise assessment, and also then for any exceedance of the noise limits to be addressed by noise mitigation and management measures. So this should provide an additional layer of accountability to the proponent and protection for the
40 community to make sure that the noise levels are in fact as predicted in the assessment. So I just wanted to round that off to make sure that I didn't leave anything unturned.

45 MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you very much for – for that, Mark. That's – that's very, very helpful. And I – I noticed that we – we did sort of go over that question. In that respect, I'll just – just give Tony and Peter the opportunity, if – if you had

anything else in respect to that sort of noise question that you wanted to come back to.

MR PEARSON: Not – not from me, Ilona. Thank you.

5

DR WILLIAMS: I just wanted to – to confirm, what that means, Mark, is that the – the anticipated noise level from the project once it's operational will still be anticipated to be well below the proposed conditions.

10 MR LATAL: Yes. They – they will be anticipated to be below the project-specific noise criteria, and – and in most cases, they should be below the actual noise limits because they've made a number of conservative decisions in their modelling such as all of the noise equipment operating simultaneously, which is probably unlikely to happen in practice.

15

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes.

MR LATAL: And that's also borne out in the noise monitoring and compliance measurements that – that typically, that noise from the site isn't audible.

20

DR WILLIAMS: Right. Good. Good. No. Thanks for going back over that, Mark. That's very helpful. Thank you.

MR LATAL: No problem.

25

MS MILLAR: Okay. Well, in that case, if there's – if there's nothing further to – to raise, I'd just like to again on behalf of the panel and the office thank everyone on the call today from the EPA for your – your time and your very, very sort of helpful answers to the questions we've put. As Casey mentioned, there are a couple of points that we will, you know, look to hopefully receive some further information from you in respect of the questions on notice. As I said in my opening, this is sort of still a part of our fact finding and discovery exercise in assessing this – this application, and you know, we will take into consideration all of the matters that have been presented in this meeting along with the information that we received through our other avenues for gathering information as we perform the determination.

30

35

So thank you. Thank you once again, and with that, I will close the meeting. So for the purposes of transcript, that should be the end. Thanks.

40

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[10.19 am]