

This meeting is part of the determination process.

Meeting note taken by: Matthew Todd-Jones

Date: 12 APRIL 2018

Time: 1430

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

Matthew Todd-Jones – Senior Planning Officer

Department & Agencies:

Anthea Sargeant, **DPE**

Chris Ritchie, **DPE**

Sally Munk, **DPE**

Patrick Copas, **DPE**

Joyanne Manning, **ARUP**

Giles Prowse, **ARUP**

Therese Manning, **EnRisks**

Deanne Pitts, **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

Henry Moore, **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

John Klepetko, **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

Natalie Alves, **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

Janelle Pickup, **ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

Benjamin Scalley, **NSW HEALTH**

Stephen Corbett, **NSW HEALTH**

Meeting Purpose: To discuss the Department's Assessment Report

The Department and Agencies stated that:

Background

- Expert advice was sought on the proposed technology to be used for the facility and the impacts on human health and air quality. The Department stated that these experts had been assisting it throughout its assessment process.
- There is an existing non-putrescible landfill at the Genesis facility adjacent to the site.
- The development application was first exhibited in 2015. This was to thermally treat 1.35 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) of residual waste.
- The applicant amended its development application after the response to submissions. The project is now proposed to thermally treat up to 552,500 tpa of residual waste, which would generate enough electricity to power 100,000 homes.
- Waste will be transported via a conveyor under the existing industrial estate road from existing facility opposite the project site.
- The project would provide 500 construction jobs and that construction will be over 3 years. During the operations phase of the project will provide 55 jobs.
- There would be prominent views of the project from Erskine Park.
- The shutdown of the facility due to any spikes in emissions would be automatic.

- There had been a NSW Parliamentary Inquiry into the waste industry in New South Wales, with particular reference to energy from waste. The Department noted that 36 recommendations had been made by the parliamentary committee, including recommendations relating to the proposed facility.

Consultation

- It received 29 objections to the development during its first exhibition.
- There had been a lot of community interest from their second round of exhibition, with just 963 objections to the project received.
- The risk to human health was the biggest issue raised by the community.
- The local Councils, NSW Department of Health and the Environment Protection Authority have objected to the project throughout the assessment process.
- The neighbouring landowner, Jacfin, has objected to the project.
- There has been a lack of community consultation from the applicant.

Assessment

- Shredder floc, which is proposed to be included within the project's waste stream, is potentially hazardous.
- The European Union's Industrial Emissions Directive air emission limits are more stringent than the NSW Protection of the Environment Operations limits.
- There are 6 schools and 6 childcare facilities within 3 kilometres of the project site.
- The EPA's EfW policy has been around for 4 years and is the EPA's key reference point for EfW projects.
- The project doesn't meet the requirements of this policy, including the reference facility criteria. This is because the fuel mix of the reference facility (Ferrybridge in the UK) is significantly different to the proposed waste fuel at the project. This ultimately presents uncertainty to the EPA and the community as to whether the proposed facility will be able to operate within limits.
- The applicant used an EU IED operating scenario that represents best international practice. However, the ability to achieve these limits is uncertain as the reference facility isn't treating a similar waste source under the EfW policy.
- The technology can co-exist in major cities and there are international examples.
- Table 7 of Arup's report looks at the applicant's assumptions. The applicant hasn't seen Arup's response to its assumptions.
- The EfW policy does not allow for energy recovery of potentially hazardous waste.
- Energy from waste is at the lower end of the waste hierarchy, with other methods above this, including recycling.
- EnRisks is not sure if the calculations used in the modelling from the applicant will reflect what the facility will end up like.
- There needs to be confidence in what the impacts of the project might be.
- The magnitude of potential exposure to harmful emissions is a concern.

Conclusions

- The project doesn't comply with the EPA's EfW policy.
- There is currently not sufficient confidence in the waste stream and its likely emission impacts.
- There is significant opposition to the project.
- The project is within close proximity to sensitive receivers and is not in the public interest.

Meeting closed at: 1715

