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-1168214

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

RE: GENESIS WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY MOD 6

PANEL:	**ILONA MILLAR** **DR PETER WILLIAMS** **TONY PEARSON**
ASSISTING PANEL:	**CASEY JOSHUA** **STEVEN BARRY**
COUNCIL:	**DAVID TAYLOR** **CHRIS GORDON** **BRAD SEARLE** **ALLAN YOUNG**
LOCATION:	**IPC OFFICES** **LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET** **SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**
DATE:	**11.49 AM, TUESDAY, 17 MARCH 2020**

MR D. TAYLOR: Um, so, my name's David Taylor and I'm the General Manager of Property and Infrastructure at Bingo Industries. Ah, to my left is Chris Gordon, who's the General Manager of Public and Corporate Affairs. Ah, immediately to my right is Brad Searle, from Arcadis and, on the far end is Allan Young from EMM, not Bingo Industries, as on the agenda.

MS I. MILLAR: Okay.

MR TAYLOR: Allan is actually from EMM.

MS MILLAR: I will just make that change.

MR TAYLOR: Um, just quickly, to explain, ah, EMM, ah, prepared the environmental assessment and also, the response to submissions report.

MS MILLAR: Mmm.

MR TAYLOR: And we also had Arcadis assist us, um, in the review of the response to submissions and the, ah, material which was presented, um, throughout the response to submissions process.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Great. Well, if everyone's ready, um, for the purposes of the transcript, um, the – the meeting is now open. Um, okay. So, good morning and welcome. Um, before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging. Um, welcome to the meeting today to discuss the proposed modification number 6 to the Genesis Waste Management Facility project approval. Um, the proponent, yourselves, Bingo Industries, um, we understand you're seeking to increase the amount of waste going to landfill and to extend the hours of operation of some processes. 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 and joining me are my fellow commissioners, Dr Peter Williams and Tony Pearson.

We have Casey Joshua and Steven Barry from the Office of the IPC also in attendance at this meeting. Um, in the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website. Um, this meeting is one part of the commission's decision-making process. Um, it's taking place at the preliminary stage of the process and will form one of several sources of information upon which we base the decision of the commission. So, during this process, it's important for the commissioners to ask questions of the attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate.

Um, if you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer it straightaway, please feel free to take that on notice and provide additional information in writing

and we'll discuss a process for that at the end of the meeting. Um, any information that is produced in writing will be made available and put on our website as well, as part of that openness and transparency. Um, for the purposes of the transcript, um, I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking each time and for all members to ensure that they don't speak on top of each other to ensure the accuracy of the transcript. So we will now begin. Um, now, I understand you have a PowerPoint presentation, um, so if you're able to walk through and, um, provide an overview of the proposal, um, and your response to the department's assessment and recommendations, that would be a great place to start.

MR TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you very much. Um, we – ah, Bingo Industries, ah, very much appreciates this opportunity to present, ah, the proposal to the Independent Planning Commission. Um - - -

MS C. JOSHUA: Sorry. You'll just have to go on here for now and I'll just try and, get it working.

MR TAYLOR: Okay. Thanks.

MS JOSHUA: It's turned off.

MR S. BARRY: Do you want me to .....?

MS JOSHUA: Do you know how to operate ClickShare? Yeah, please.

MR TAYLOR: Um.

MS JOSHUA: Sorry.

MR BARRY: We can look on that for the time being.

MR TAYLOR: You can look on that? It's okay?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yep.

MR TAYLOR: Um, my name's David Taylor, I'm the General Manager of Property and Infrastructure at Bingo Industries. Um, this morning, we've prepared a presentation which will, um, walk through various issues which has been raised by the commission in the agenda sent prior to this meeting, um, and talk through a number of the key issues, um, in – in response to those questions. Um, first of all, we will talk today, um, we'll give a brief overview of Bingo. Um, Chris Gordon will give a brief overview of Bingo. Um, I will then talk about the overview, um, of modification 6.

Um, and talk about the key, ah, items that we are seeking approval for, ah, then talk about strategic justification, um, and why we believe that this is, ah – this modification is required, talk through some of the key issues and that will address a

number of the key items which were raised in the agenda. Um, we will then discuss the community and stakeholder engagement, which, ah, process we've engaged in throughout this process and then the conclusions as well. So I might hand over to Chris Gordon, um, who will give an introduction to – ah, a quick introduction to Bingo, um, and also, um, give you an understanding of, um, why we actually, um, purchased the asset from Dial A Dump Industries, um, last year.

MR BARRY: Sorry.

MR TAYLOR: It's okay.

MR C. GORDON: It's okay. I can speak to - - -

MR TAYLOR: That's - - -

MR GORDON: - - - without the slides, if you like. It's – should I use this one?

MS MILLAR: It's fine. It can pick up.

MR GORDON: Okay. Ah, Chris Gordon, General Manager Corporate and Public Affairs for Bingo. Um, we're a publicly listed recycling and waste management company. Um, we provide end-to-end solutions across the waste management supply chain and that includes collections, processing, separation, production of recycled products and disposal as well, the landfill.

MR BARRY: ..... Yep. Sorry. .....

MR GORDON: Um, oh, okay. Yeah. Up and running. We're the leading, ah – the leader in the B and D – building and demolition – waste collection in processing space. That includes demolition and construction of residential and commercial building products – ah, projects, ah, and the major infrastructure projects throughout New South Wales and Victoria. We've also got a, ah, rapidly growing presence in the commercial and industrial space, where we collect and process waste from the commercial sector, um, including government and education services as well. Um, we've invested close to a billion dollars over the last three years in advanced recycling assets across New South Wales and Victoria, um, and we now produce industry leading recovery rates for the waste that we process.

Ah, one of the more, ah, exciting things we do is the production of our recycled products, um, and the acquisition of Dial A Dump has allowed us to expand that range of recycled products through, um, different processing that we have, ah, now onsite at Eastern Creek and we've currently got more than 18,000 customers across the two states in which we operate. Just quickly on sustainability, we've stated, um, publicly that we're aiming to make sustainability a clear competitive advantage and it's really central to everything we do. Um, our focus – which is perhaps counterintuitive given that we have a large landfill – but our focus is entirely on the

diversion of waste from landfill and, ah, the Eastern Creek asset is central to that strategy.

So just turning to, ah, slide 5. In August 2018 – so that's about 18 months ago – we announced our intention to acquire Dial A Dump Industries, which is a fully integrated recycling and waste management services provider, operating in the Greater Sydney region. Um, that acquisition was eventually approved by the ACCC in March 2019, so about 12 months ago. That acquisition provided us with, ah, significant post-collection, ah, assets; primarily the asset at Eastern Creek, um, which had a, ah, – has a approved capacity of up to two million tonnes per annum and it's got approximately 15 years of remaining landfill life.

As I've mentioned, that – ah, the Eastern Creek facility has allowed us to expand our range of recycled products. We have – the range is called Eco Product and, ah, the processing out there has now expanded into timber shredding, brick and concrete crushing, scrap steel, recycling garden organics and contaminated soil, ah, and one thing we'd like to make very clear is that the proposed next generation energy from waste facility at Eastern Creek is not part of the acquisition that Bingo made and we don't have any association with that facility.

MR TAYLOR: Okay. Thanks, Chris. Ah, it's David Taylor, ah, speaking again. Ah, moving on to slide 6 and, ah, talking about the overview of the modification 6. Um, modification 6 was originally submitted by Dial A Dump Industries prior to our acquisition, um, however, obviously when we, um, executed the transaction, ah, we took over, um, management and carriage of the modification through to its current position. I think the first key point, ah, to make in relation to modification 6 is that we are not seeking any increase in the original approved consent limit of two million tonnes per annum for the overall site. Um, so the original approval was based on two million tonnes going through the site; this modification does not seek to alter that, um, limit.

However, what the proposal does do is, ah, three key items. First of all is to increase the amount of, ah, material that goes into landfill each year from 700,000 tonnes to a million tonnes per annum, excluding the waste from the materials process – processing centres and pre-sort enclosures. The second item is the updating of the current noise limits to ones which are more representative, um, of the current background noise levels, um, around the site as a result of, um, increased economic activity and growth, ah, in that particular region. And the third key item is extending the operation hours, um, for the facility, um, and that ranges, um, across three key different areas. First of all is the recycling processing facilities; 24 hours, seven days a week.

The segregated material area, um, expansion of those timeframes, um, but not – ah, 24 hours Monday to Friday for receival only of waste, um, and we'll talk a little bit more about that in the strategic justification. Crushing and screening, um, not 24 hours but, um, again, expanding the hours from the original. Ah, landfill, we direct by truck down to the landfill, um, changing the hours to 5 am to 9 pm and landfill,

ah, waste via the chute to 24 hours per day, seven days per week. Ah, in terms of the response to, um – our response to the department's assessment and recommendation, um, as – as I mentioned, this process has been going on since early 2018, um, so we're probably two years – two years into a process now of working with the department.

Um, there was obviously some time, ah, in between that when the acquisition was happening, so there was, ah, a bit of a hiatus but, um, we – we believe that we've worked very collaboratively with the department and the EPA in particular, um, in relation to the requests that they've made. Um, we've submitted two response to submission reports, um, in relation to queries raised, um, in relation to the proposal. Um, we have worked, ah, very closely in responding to all of those queries and we've reviewed the assessment report and the proposed, um, consent conditions put forward by the department and we are, um, in support of those proposed consent conditions. Is there any questions in relation to our – the department's assessment?

MR T. PEARSON: Ah, this slide's a useful one, slide 6.

MR TAYLOR: Sure.

MR PEARSON: Ah, would it be possible to resubmit that slide with the existing consent, um, ah, criteria and – and, um, the proposed, um, changes to those criteria?

MR TAYLOR: That's fine.

MR PEARSON: Just for ease of reference - - -

MR TAYLOR: Sure.

MR PEARSON: - - - for our – our stakeholders.

MR TAYLOR: Yep. That's no problem at all. It's, um – the existing hours are a little – they're not quite segregated like that - - -

MR PEARSON: No, I know. Yep. Yep. Yep.

MS MILLAR: No.

MR TAYLOR: - - - but I – it'll just have to summarise a little bit - - -

MR PEARSON: Yep.

MR TAYLOR: - - - to the operations.

MR PEARSON: Yep. I – I know. Yep.

MR TAYLOR: But I can do that, yes. Um, importantly, there's, um, there's no changes to the facility layout proposed under this modification and there's no construction impacts as a result of this particular, ah, proposed modification. Ah, I'd like to move on to, um, the strategic justification of why we believe that this proposal, ah, should be approved. Um, so, just – there's – there's a number of key drivers in the market, um, which are, ah, really, um, driving why we need to have this particular, um, modification. So, first of all, um, we're currently landfilling, ah, very close to our cap of 700,000 tonnes per annum. I think we were, um, less than one per cent under that cap at the end of last year, so the – the demand for landfilling, um, is actually – the pressure we're getting for landfill is – is increasing.

Um, the – one of the key drivers is – is really the introduction of the levy by the Queensland Government, um, which was announced in March, um, and implemented on the 1st of July last year. We've seen – first of all, we've, um, seen, ah, an increase in waste not going to Queensland and, therefore, that's driven the amount of, um, ah, waste coming into our facility. Um, and what that does is we get a lot of, ah, mixed waste, um, and that really, um, goes primarily through our materials processing centre but in addition to that, we're also seeing increased waste from infrastructure projects, um, in terms of contaminated soils and asbestos containing material, which is a direct to landfill waste product.

Um, the – what we're really seeing is that, as much as possible, we are trying to recycle as much material as we can, um, throughout the current facilities that we've got; however, there are materials that are not recyclable that we are, ah, getting pressure for from the market to actually accept, um, into – into the facility. The – the site is very centrally located to probably the fastest growing area in Australia, um, Western Sydney. Um, there is a lot of demand for waste recycling and disposal services in the, um, key market of Western Sydney, um, and, in particular, we're seeing a much more increased demand now for materials being recycled and reused, um, from our facility.

So road base, timber mulches, um, the metals; a lot of the materials that we're recovering, we're seeing a lot more demand for. Um, so the – we're also seeing quite a increase in, obviously, the infrastructure projects. The graph on slide 9, um, and the – the blue section at the bottom is the increase in infrastructure projects just in Sydney and that is just transport projects, so we're not even – in this graph, you can see a very steep climb over the next few years but there's also an increase in investment in social infrastructure in the health and education sectors as well and with current stimulus packages, um, coming to fore, um, and likely to impact on infrastructure, we see even greater demand for recycling and landfill disposal services.

Um, we believe that the – the actual proposal aligns with the, um – the – the Western Sydney Regional Waste Avoidance and Recovery Strategy, um, but it also aligns with the Western City District Plan, which was put forward by the Greater Sydney Commission, um, in terms of the growth of Western Sydney. So we're ideally placed where, um, we're certainly experiencing increased demand and we expect

future demand for, um, recycling and landfill services coming forward. And we are one of the only landfills in the Sydney metro region that can accept, um, asbestos contaminated materials. Obviously, as we start to do a lot more redevelopment in areas where there is asbestos, um – and Western Sydney Airport was a great example; there's a lot of asbestos out there – um, then we – we're well-positioned to accept that waste if we get the limit.

If we don't get the limit, um – the approval, then we can't necessarily cater for all of that demand. Um, the other key factor is that, in the future, um, there is – over the next few years, the actual amount of landfill capacity within the Sydney metro region will be declining. There will be a number of, um – there's – there's a – I will – slide 10 actually identifies a graph which is in one of our response to submission reports and it clearly shows that there is a decline in landfill capacity, um, forecast in the Sydney metro region, um, in the next five to 10 years, so progressively dropping down in capacity, um, in the next five to 10 years.

In terms – just – just finalising on that section before we start talking about some of the key issues. Um, we do see that this, um – as Chris Gordon mentioned in his introduction, our strategy is about diversion of waste from landfill. Um, we are building – ah, under modification 5, there was a pre-sort enclosure approved. That is currently about 60 per cent through construction and will be operational by the end of this year. Um, that increases our recycling capacity in response to demand from the – um, from our customers. What that also does is it increases the amount of residual waste which will be, um, going into the landfill. So, again, with that seven – with that additional recycling capacity and the ability to recycle more, we do actually have an increase in residual waste which does need to go into the landfill to - - -

MR PEARSON: Where's the economic incentive here in terms of if your – if your current approval produces an economic outcome of X - - -

MR TAYLOR: Yes.

MR PEARSON: - - - by changing that mix, does that economic outcome of X improve for Bingo or – or – or decrease?

MR TAYLOR: The actual – the actual economic benefit, um, will only, um, improve through a volume increase. So, if you've got – it doesn't – it doesn't change the economics from - - -

MR PEARSON: So - - -

MR TAYLOR: - - - a – from a processing perspective.

MR PEARSON: Right.

MR TAYLOR: That's what – so there's no - - -

MR PEARSON: So there's no different levies for different - - -

MR TAYLOR: No. No.

MR PEARSON: - - - different mixes?

MR TAYLOR: No. That's right. No.

MS MILLAR: And just on that previous slide - - -

MR TAYLOR: Sorry.

MS MILLAR: - - - with the, um, sort of the imminent landfill closures.

MR TAYLOR: Yes.

MS MILLAR: At the moment, that's modelled on existing capacity - - -

MR TAYLOR: That's correct.

MS MILLAR: - - - for your site, which is 2033?

MR TAYLOR: That's right. Yes.

MS MILLAR: And this would – this modification would potentially bring that forward up to seven years, depending on the demand?

MR TAYLOR: Absolutely. Depending on demand and things like that, but that is correct. Yes. Obviously with a faster filling rate. And, obviously, very dependent on the density of waste that actually goes down into there. Then yes. You could see up to – up to a seven year shortening of that capacity life. Correct.

MS MILLAR: Okay.

MR PEARSON: Waste hierarchy.

MR TAYLOR: Yes. So that was my last point. Was discussion of the waste hierarchy. And that was where I was going with the recycling. The waste hierarchy – obviously, landfill is the very bottom of the waste hierarchy. And our facility at eastern creek is set up to recover as much as possible waste. The new facility, which will be operational later this year, has all of the latest recycling technology contained within that, which – and one of the key things with it – the residual waste that was going to Queensland – there is still actually a lot of recyclable material contained within that waste that's going to landfill now.

So the advanced technology that we're putting into the new facility is able to recycle more of that waste as well. So in terms of diversion, we don't see all of that waste

going directly into our landfill. We put it through our recycling facility first. Recycle as much as possible. Reuse it back into other infrastructure projects or other products. And then only the residual going into the landfill. So this landfill is not for recyclable material that cannot find a home elsewhere. It is for residual rates that cannot be recycled.

DR WILLIAMS: Peter Williams. Sorry, David. Just one question on that, just for clarification. So the increase to a million tonnes per annum to landfill, will that be all from trucks or will be – some of that will be component from the residual recycling, or - - -

MR TAYLOR: It's a combination of both.

DR WILLIAMS: Both.

MR TAYLOR: It is a combination of both from direct to landfill waste, and also some more residual coming out of the new facility as well. Correct. That is correct.

DR WILLIAMS: Right. So when you add both of those together - - -

MR TAYLOR: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: That adds up to the - - -

MR TAYLOR: Correct.

DR WILLIAMS: The million tonne.

MR TAYLOR: That's correct. Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. Sorry.

MR SEARLE: Brad Searle from RK. The only thing to point out there is to Dave's point up front – is that where the – the way the condition is worded is that – so any chute waste that comes via 10PC - - -

MR TAYLOR: That is correct.

MR SEARLE: - - - is excluded from that one million cap.

MR TAYLOR: That's correct.

MR SEARLE: And just to build – because you asked a question about how does the proposal satisfy the waste hierarchy. And to just build on Dave's point. The site contains some of the most advanced resource recovery infrastructure in the State. Dave has alluded to material processing centre one, which is focused on processing CND waste. Currently achieving diversion rates of in the order of 80 per cent, which

is definitely industry leading. The pre-sort enclosure that's currently under construction, which will have a focus on the CNI waste mix. Dry CNI waste mix. Is also likely to go over and above industry norms in terms of what's planned.

MR TAYLOR: But what are the industry norms?

MR SEARLE: Look, in terms of diversion at the moment, I believe that we're currently tracking at 65 per cent across the industry. This will be going probably well north of 70 per cent. CND is about 80 per cent. So – but from our experience of working within the sector, the sort of processing technology and infrastructure that you'll see in NPC1 is definitely market leading. The – I think the other important point to note here is that when we talk about waste that was going to Queensland, that quantum of waste was in the order of a million tonnes. And as that levy continues to drive north of the $75 per tonne that it started at – that more of that waste will continue to flow back to New South Wales.

And we're already seeing that, which heightens the demand and need for the proposal. It's worth mentioning that the New South Wales policy also has a preference for local disposal. Obviously, the EPA came out with ..... principle. There has been some challenges around the implementation of that principle, but, nevertheless, the intent of the policy is for local disposal options. So this proposal provides, I guess, a sustainability benefit in that it – the source of disposal and processing is close to the point of generation. So rather than putting that waste and transporting it either on road or rail further distances away, there's a benefit that comes with that.

And, finally, in terms of the – I guess the – it's worth knowing that even in addition to NPC1 and NPC2 you've got the segregated material area. So there's a whole range of products that are being produced at the site at the moment. Everything from road bows to aggregate to recovered steel. And there is a demand for all of that in terms of the infrastructure wave that Dave talked to as well.

MR TAYLOR: Yes. And – David Taylor here. I think the other key issue is that that actually reduces a requirement on natural resources. And, you know, from a sustainability perspective, limiting the use of natural resources is, obviously, preferable to, you know, continuing to extract natural virgin resources from the ground, and using that. The – we are seeing that natural materials that are used in infrastructure projects are now having to come from further away. So, you know, very much down 200, 250 kilometres away from Sydney, being transported all the way up from highways back to the Sydney project. So we think that's another benefit of being able to reduce that type of traffic, reduce the actual – the – obviously, the carbon footprint of reducing that transport, and – yes. Reason the existing resources that we have at hand.

MR SEARLE: And can you just remind me, how much does the NPC process at the moment?

MR TAYLOR: So the NPC – the current NPC at the moment processes – depending on – depending on the amount – it's about 350,000 tonnes per annum. And, ultimately, the NPC2 or the PSE, as it's referred to, will process at around about the 450,000 tonnes as well. So, in total, we expect to have capacity of around 800,000 tonnes of recycling. And depending on what recovery rates, I think we modelled – in the initial assessment we took a very conservative view on what the recovery rate would be of 30 per cent. Sorry. 70 per cent, leaving a 30 per cent residual, which ended up with a number of 240,000 tonnes.

MR SEARLE: Correct.

MR TAYLOR: Residual through the chute to the actual landfill. And we answer one of your questions about the chute capacity later on in our presentation.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Great.

MR SEARLE: But that also points to Peter's query.

MR TAYLOR: Correct. Correct.

MR SEARLE: So 1.24 million tonnes in total to landfill.

MR TAYLOR: Yes.

MR SEARLE: 1 million tonnes direct to landfill, 240,000 tonnes of - - -

MR TAYLOR: Correct.

MR SEARLE: - - - chute waste.

MR TAYLOR: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So - - -

MR TAYLOR: Yes. That's – yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That ..... as well.

MR TAYLOR: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

MS MILLAR: And then just to walk us through the operations on site - - -

MR TAYLOR: Yes.

MS MILLAR: With the trucks – the material that's going straight to landfill - - -

MR TAYLOR: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Will that come straight into the site and go down to, essentially, the bottom of the pit, or is there a sort of step process in terms of sorting each truck that comes in?

MR TAYLOR: No. I probably could go all the way back to the site picture.

MS MILLAR: That's okay.

MR TAYLOR: But, generally, trucks enter the site. They come down to the main way bridge centre where they're inspected visually. So there's a number of overhead cameras that inspect the actual loads, so we can make sure that there's, you know, nothing in there that shouldn't be going down there. Depending on the load, it then depends which way that particular load – if it's a mixed waste load that has recyclable material in it, then it will go to the materials processing centre. The load will be tipped into the materials processing centre, sorted through the, um, plant equipment. Residual goes via the weighbridge scales and chute down to the landfill. If it's a – an actual contaminated soil or it's an asbestos-containing material waste, then there's a – normally a certificate that comes with that, and that goes directly down into the landfill itself. Down there, tips it off in the landfill, gets compacted, and then the truck comes back up through a wheel wash, back over the weighbridge, and then out of the site. So that's the two different operations it does depending on what's actually in – in the load itself.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Yeah.

MS MILLAR: And then those receival – receivals, ah, that are going direct to landfill, they would be constrained by the hours of operation that are proposed through the – the proposal and, um, conditions.

MR TAYLOR: That's correct. That's right. That's right. So there is those new hours - - -

MS MILLAR: Yeah.

MR TAYLOR: - - - that are restricting actual waste going down into the landfill/

MS MILLAR: Landfill.

MR TAYLOR: And we'll talk a little bit more - - -

MS MILLAR: Yeah. Okay.

MR TAYLOR: - - - next thing about some of the traffic discussions and things like that.

MR A. YOUNG: Dave – Alan Young here, ma'am. Just – just to add one more thing while we're on that topic of – um, of the market and so forth. For – other than there being a – a ne – a financial benefit to the business in terms of resale of recyclable material, what they – what they basically own is airspace – you know, void – and that has a limited life and a limited value. So the incentive for the company is to not have low-value tenants, if you like, occupying that space, and a low-value tenant would be the by-product of the recycling.

MR TAYLOR: Mmm.

MR YOUNG: You get a bigger return with a high-value tenant like asbestos, contaminated waste and so forth, if that's – there – so there's an incentive for Bingo to not simply throw things down the chute - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmm.

MR TAYLOR: Yes.

MR YOUNG: - - - because that's occupying a limited resource in there. They would be better off taking as much as possible out of that as a recyclable before doing that, because that's simply occupying - - -

MR TAYLOR: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Mmm.

MR YOUNG: - - - as a tenant, if you like, the space down below.

MR TAYLOR: Okay. Um, it's – it's David Taylor here again. I think we'd like to move on now to some of the key issues.

MS MILLAR: Mmm.

MR TAYLOR: And a number of the questions which you've raised in your agenda will be – we'll respond to those, um, in each of these three key areas. Um, these – these three key areas we're talking about are traffic, um, noise and air quality. Um, and then we'll talk about the chute operation and also some community issues after this. But first of all, we wanted to talk through, um, traffic. Um, we note in the assessment report that, um, traffic has not been identified as a key issue, but we believe that, um, for – um, for completeness, we would present and talk about traffic issues today. The – the original consent, um, was obviously modelled, from a traffic perspective, on 2 million tonnes.

MS MILLAR: Can we go back one there.

MR TAYLOR: Sorry. Did I jump one, did I? Sorry. The original consent – sli – I'm up to slide 12 now. The original consent assessed traffic impacts of the

maximum waste, of being 2 million tonnes, and we're not proposing to increase that. So that's the first key point. Um, we're currently operating at around about two-thirds capacity of that 2 million tonnes per annum. That's total waste into the facility. And that equates to around about 700 trucks per day – truck movements per day, so that's in and out.

The additional annual tonnages to landfill, we believe, in discussions with our customers who are – are demanding this additional landfill material, is that – because they're coming from large infrastructure projects and they're quite constrained in when they can move their spoil and soils from those projects because of traffic impacts and so on and so on, we believe that, um, a large majority of the additional waste that would come into the landfill will actually be in the shoulders in the – in the evenings and the early mornings. Um, so we – we don't see any real impact, ah – ah, through the daytime. However, we did receive some questions around traffic in relation to res – um, submissions made.

MS MILLAR: Yeah.

MR TAYLOR: Um, so we undertook further modelling, um, in terms of, ah, preparing our response to submission. And to give you a bit of an idea of scale, um, assuming that we did eventually get to the 2 million tonne gate limit, um, then that would equate to roughly an additional 490 movements per day on the current level of operations. Um, interestingly, if – if the – if the current – the 700,000 tonnes effectively places a limit on traffic – and I don't think that was ever intended, but because you obviously can't take more than 700,000 in, it creates a – an – an artificial limit on – on the particular, ah, traffic that can actually go down there.

Um, we do believe that, um, if the – if the limit is not increased, we do believe that there will be wider traffic, um, impacts, um, with waste moving around the actual local, regional and, potentially, interstate network as waste starts to move to find, ah, different locations because we have hit our limit. Um, but most importantly, the – the modelling which we did, um, did not, ah, under that worst-case scenario, the – the 2 million tonnes per annum, um, did not have any, ah, major impact on the surrounding road network, um, ah, in terms of safety or congestion, all those types of things. And there's just a small table on the right of slide 13, um, just looks at the level of service of key intersections, um, and things like that. So, um, that was really what we wanted to just put forward around traffic.

MS MILLAR: Mitigation.

MR TAYLOR: Ah, there was a mitigation – sorry. Ah, sorry. Just back to slide 13. Um, in terms of a – from a safety perspective, one of the key issues raised by Blacktown City Council was around, um, safety of the entrances, um, and, um, one of the commitments made was to limit parking on the entrances – ah, to either side of the entrances in order to ensure that, um, those site distances were improved and – and not impacting on safety of – of road users.

MS MILLAR: Do you get any queuing with your trucks? Or are they staggered enough to have a free flow through the – the site?

MR TAYLOR: They're – they're generally staggered throughout the day. What – what we do have is we have a contraflow system on the weighbridges. So we've got four weighbridges down on the entrance. Um, we can use those in different dir – so if we've got a – if we do have some queuing and we do get some queuing back up to – up the main road, we can open up three weighbridges for entry and then one for actually exit. So we can – we've got some operational flexibility to try and deal with any particular queuing that we may have. Within – the queuing actually happens within the site.

MS MILLAR: Okay.

MR TAYLOR: Okay. Is – this – this will sort of touch on some of the issues raised in your agenda around noise and main sources of noise and things like that. But I think one of the – there has obviously been – since the original approval and consent was made, um, there's obviously been a lot of development, ah, throughout the Western Sydney employment lands. Um, there's obviously been a lot of, ah, increased traffic over time, ah, along the M4 Motorway. The motorway has been expanded, um, recently, um, as part of the expansion of the M4 Motorway. Um, so what we're actually seeing is that the background noise levels over time have actually increased, um, um, above what is actually set as the noise limits in the – in the current, ah, project approval.

Um, obviously that makes it difficult for people to comply with that. It makes difficult for regulators to, ah, measure what is actually going on, um, and – and it's difficult for residents to understand what's actually the – the – what is an exceedance over a – a – a – an acceptable noise limit. Um, so the – the actual noise impact assessment, um, it summarised all of the operational noise sources, and we'll talk a little bit about that in a second. Um, but one thing that we – um, we did do, um, at the request of the, ah, Department of Planning and EPA, was that we – we did further site – um, site attended measurements in October last year, and that was really to verify the assumptions of background noise levels, um, under the actual, um, assessment models that were built.

Um, importantly, the operational noise levels, um, they're not – um, the modelling suggests that they are not predicted to exceed the project noise levels, um, and therefore not generate intrusive noise impacts, um, with no noise impacts on surrounding residential receivers. Now, you did talk about – in your particular item here, about what are the main sources of noise emanating from the waste management facility, um, and whether it's processing, chute operations, or trucks. Um, in general – in general, there's three main – there's a number of sources of – of noise. Um, obviously, the materials processing centre. Um, there's the crushing and screening area. And then there's the general movement of trucks, um, around the particular site. Now, currently, um, there is construction onsite as well of the new, ah, approved building under modification 5, so there are some – currently some

additional noise impacts which were – obviously, were assessed at that time, um, on the – on the site as at today. Um, but in a general operational process, they are the three main sources of – um, of noise that emanate from the site. I'm not sure if Brad or Allan would like to add any additional comment.

MR SEARLE: Sure. Um, so it's – it – Brad Searle from Arcadis. Ah, look, it – it is worth noting that when we worked through this process that there was certainly more scrutiny that was put on the modelling, um, um, with DPIEs noise expert and EPA, as Dave's alluded to. Um, that basically resulted in attended noise monitoring for all of the key plant onsite. Um, so everything from MPC to dozers to front-end loaders to crushers and cro – screeners, compactors, conveyors, trucks: the – the whole – the whole lot. Um, and I think the benefit that – that that gives us is – is that we know that we've got a very, um, accurate model, um, because that's – that's fairly atypical in terms of having that kind of request, and – and the reason why that request came was partly, um, from when the original noise inventory had been constructed and some concerns that things might have shifted over time.

Um, the – I guess the other key thing to note here is – is that on this site, there are currently no noise-related complaints or issues with regard to both the – the – the consent and the environmental protection licence. There – as part of the original approval, there is a – a 10-metre high amenity berm that runs around the site, so that's obviously a key mitigant. Um, in terms of the way this site has been laid out, um, and – and planned, a lot of the noise-generating activities are – are located with good separation from sensitive receiver location areas like Minchinbury.

On top of that, if you look at the orientation of the site, so you'll have the noise bunds that run around the perimeter, but then there's a second line of defence in terms of the M4, which is a fairly significant noise-generating source within and of itself. There are obviously traffic controls and speed restrictions on the site. There is a noise management plan that's on the site that sits on the site. And then on top of that there is a fairly rigorous process, I guess, that Bingo have in place internally, and then there's an external process. So as far as the internal process, Bingo has an environmental management system. It's ISO 14001 2015 certified

What – the way that that translates, it includes the operations at Easter Creek within that in terms of key impacts and aspects. But the system is audited, it's subject to surveillance audits every six months and then independent external audits every three years. And then on top of that, the consent itself is subject to an independent external audit every three years. Again, I'm not aware of any material issues being raised with regard to noise. I guess on top of all of that, apart from the noise limits that are being proposed that have been agreed with the EPA, Bingo has agreed to the post-commissioning noise report which I think needs to take place within six months of an approval, and should approval be given, that that – that Bingo have committed to undertaking that within six months to validate, I guess, everything that's been put forward in the assessment process.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, Brad, just to – Peter Williams – just to confirm that also, that the – so the chute is not a major source of noise emanating from the site at all?

MR SEARLE: No. Look, compared to the items that Dave spoke to, no. It's – you know, as Dave mentioned, trucks, NPC, crashes and screeners would be more material noise sources than the chute operating.

MR TAYLOR: It's David Taylor here. The actual chute is covered, and the – it's got a cover over it. And when it actually deposits the waste, it actually is down in the actual hole itself and it's quite close to the ground. So you actually don't get too much noise coming from the actual chute. And the conveyor and the chute, it's a - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you.

MR YOUNG: Allan Young from EMM. Just wanted to add that while individually some of these – some of the plant – for example, a crushing and screening item, or a truck might have a certain level of noise emission, it's the culmination – like, the – the aggregate of all the trucks that's making the trucks the – the main – the main issue there. So it's the – simply the volume of trucks on – onsite at whatever they – whatever noise they emanate. So it's – it's – if you looked at it saying which plant produces ..... you would have a different answer. But what's the – what's the – what's the aggregate source of – of noise for, say, uh, residents in Minchinbury or er – Erskine Park. The answer would be trucks.

MS MILLAR: And with those, um, truck noise impacts, one of the concerns that's been raised in a number of submissions is the – the impact during the – the night-time period when - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MS MILLAR: - - - particularly between - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MS MILLAR: - - - 10 pm and - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MS MILLAR: - - - sort of 5 am. Um, in terms of sort of things like reversing beepers, those types of intrusive noise elements, is there, um, any measures that can be taken to – to mitigate that or is it just that separation bund cu – cumulative?

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MS MILLAR: Or is it that masks out effectively?

MR TAYLOR: It's David Taylor here. I think there's a couple of things. First of all, the, um, the consent only looks at, um, the – the hours - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmm.

MR TAYLOR: - - - um, for depositing into the landfill, um, and talking about trucks, um, is, um – just need to check to make sure – I've got my notes – yep. So the – the landfill direct by truck is only limited to 5 am - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmm.

MR TAYLOR: - - - to 9 pm, um, is probably the first point there, so we've tried to alleviate, um, obviously those concerns, um, with that. Secondly, I think because, um, we – we try to limit reversing as much as possible, um, onsite, because obviously we don't like people reversing around.

MS MILLAR: Mmm.

MR TAYLOR: The way the operations is set up is – is virtually in a one-way system. Um, and if – if there is reversing in those – in those kind of shoulder times, outside, you know – after 6 – 6 pm - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmm.

MR TAYLOR: - - - um, it is way down in the hole, um, when they're reversing back on to the tip face - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmm.

MR TAYLOR: - - - um, and doing that type of thing. So it's quite – certainly, um, audible – audible reversing, uh, critical for safety and safety – apart from sustainability - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmm.

MR TAYLOR: - - - is our – is our number one, um, uh, focus for the business, so, um, it's not like we can, uh - - -

MS MILLAR: Yeah .....

MR TAYLOR: - - - take that away. Um, but it – it is limited to actually down in the – um, as much as possible. And li – limiting reversing and down in the hole.

MS MILLAR: The hole.

MR SEARLE: Um, Brad – Brad from Arcadis. The – the only thing to just build on Dave's point i – there is – is that there are already – there's a whole range of controls

built into the existing concern and operation of the site. And – and – and I guess the, um, the finding from the noise expert is those controls are doing a good job. Um, there are – there's traffic controls in place around speed restrictions, um, on the site, um, which is – which is – it's obviously, um, very helpful. Um, we did – through the RTS process, we were asked to look at sleep disturbance and – um, and – and that – and those sorts of issues. And again, um, the modelling found that there be no material impacts from the proposal in that regard.

MR TAYLOR: Okay. Um, moving on to slide 15, um, and really talking about the air quality issues, um, this is obviously – was quite, um – wa – was raised a number of times by a number of parties, um, in this – during the submissions process. Um, and we engaged quite extensively with the Department of Planning and also the EPA on reviewing the – the model results. And we undertook further modelling, um, to – to demonstrate a range of different scenarios, um, for, um, the potential for air quality. Um, what we did was – as part of the response to submissions, we – we looked at a number of different scenarios, in terms of volume of waste that could be going down into the landfill on a daily basis. Um, the volume of waste into the landfill each day does vary. It does depend on, um, a whole range of market factors. Um, but the typical day that we see is around about 2740 tonnes, um, down into the hole, uh, on a daily basis. Um, theoretically, that could get up to 4000 tonnes a day.

Um, uh, there's obviously operational limitations in terms of trucks going down into the hole, um, uh, tipping – so there's a capacity issue. And then the absolute worst case, which is, you know, if you took the one million tonnes and you literally divided it by the number of days operation, is 5400 tonnes. So that's our – that worst case is, uh – is – is really a theoretical basis. And it's not something – you know, very, very – I don't think – I think it's very rare, um, that we would ever get 5000 tonnes, uh, in the hole on a daily basis. However, um, that – that's the first point. So we modelled those different, uh, scenarios. Um, again, I think similar to the noise, um, the increased, um, activity, um, in the actual area, increased traffic, um, has – has led to general increases in background, um – uh, background levels of PM10 and PM2.5. Um, and there's – um, the actual background monitoring data does show, um, exceedances of those two measures, um, throughout the year. Um - - -

MR PEARSON: For peak emissions.

MR TAYLOR: For peak emissions. Correct. Um, in terms of those di – those three different scenarios, um, we don't expect, um – certainly there could be one day per year out of the whole year where we might get a – a worst case of 5000 tonnes per day, maybe one day a year. Um, the theoretical, um, potentially are five to 10 days throughout the year, um, in terms of, uh, what particular volume would go down into the hole. Um, however, the modelling we've taken is, um, assuming the full one million goes into the hole.

Uh, in terms of impact from – from that modelling, from an air – um, air quality perspective, um, we didn't find that the – the PM10 concentrations – um, they complied with all the relevant criteria at all receptor locations. The cumulative a –

annual average, uh, TSP or total suspended particles, uh, concentrations, uh, complied with the relevant criteria at all receptors. Um, and predicted dust deposition levels also complied. Um, uh, the – it's – the PM2.5 modelling, um, showed that, um, on a – for one to two days throughout the year, um, there would be some potential, um, elevated levels of PM2.5 above the relevant criteria. And I'll talk about that, um, but that's also in the context of PM2.5, um, already exceeded from a background perspective. So in general, um, the disposal of waste does not significantly alter the potential for exceedance of those 24-hour averages, PM10 or PM2.5 criteria. Um - - -

MR PEARSON: What – what's the – onsite – what's the largest onsite source for PM2.5 emissions? Is it the haul road? Is it the MPC?

MR TAYLOR: It's – it's – the – the MPC is actually enclosed. Um, so the actual PM2.5 that would emanate from that is actually probably fairly low. Um, if the – I'm pretty sure the modelling does show that the PM2.5, um – the most generation source is the haul road itself.

MR PEARSON: That's right.

MR TAYLOR: Um, just responding to one of the questions, um, raised in the agenda around the sealing of the haul road, um, and whether it was considered and why it wasn't pursued. So, um, certainly, um, considered as an option. Um, however, the actual sealing of the haul road does create, uh, a number of issues for us. First of all, from an operational perspective, um, yeah, obviously the landfill is changing and filling all the time, so you're actually, um, uh – by sealing that actual road and that's – depending what sealing means, um, is – is an interesting discussion just in itself. But, um, you know, you're – you're – over time, you're – you're constantly changing that haul road to respond to different – how the landfill has been filled. So you're constantly - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .....

MR TAYLOR: You have to rip it up ..... each time.

MR PEARSON: So that haul road is being relocated, is it?

MR TAYLOR: It does – it's not re - - -

MR PEARSON: Is – is the map we saw from the Department that had the haul road currently traversing the northern boundary, coming down the eastern boundary and into the pit - - -

MR TAYLOR: That's correct.

MR PEARSON: So that – that – that road as currently configured would move from time to time?

MR TAYLOR: Eventually, yes. Because obviously we're – depending on our landfill - - -

MR PEARSON: Does rec - - -

MR TAYLOR: Depending on our – where our landfill – where – which part of the landfill we're filling, um, then we would have to move it to get to different areas of the landfill. That's right.

MR PEARSON: Do – do you have a – do you have a map or – with mining projects you often will see the – the haulage ramps change over a 30 year project and they have – they have that sort of sequence well in advance. Do you have that sort of information?

MR TAYLOR: We – no. We don't have that level of detail planned at this point in time. No.

MR PEARSON: What would be the cost - - -

MR SEARLE: .....

MR PEARSON: - - - of sealing – sorry.

MR SEARLE: Can – can I – if I could just – it's Brad Searle from Arcadis. So one of the things that I think is really important to – to point to here is, um, that we work through – so there was fairly extensive consultation with the EPA, including face-to-face meetings on this issue. Um, and that started with, you know, at these peak day emission type scenarios that we looked at, and how that fed into the modelling. Um, and then basically where we got to was the point that, you know, to Dave's – Dave's point there in the earlier slide, that, um, that there weren't going to be any material impacts that were being po – posed on sensitive receivers, um, even under a peak day operating scenario.

Notwithstanding that, we – we have a whole bunch of controls already on place – on the site which we can talk to. Um, and then we also agree that there – there will be certain situations where, um, we will need to utilise reactive measures, um, in response to weather conditions, which is obviously a key driver for dust. So there's – there will be – there's monitors, um, at the site boundary. There's a weather station on the site. There's a – there's a whole sort of continuous environment monitoring, um, set-up on the site to be able to respond, um, uh, to particular weather events. Um, in terms of the modelling that went in – uh, so in terms of, yeah, I guess, the key control factors that went in, um, there's – there's a number of controls on the existing haul road. So there's obviously the water car and being able to water that. Um, we're getting sort of 75 per cent control efficiencies on that front. Um, we've got vehicle speed reduction. That – that yielded in the order of 40 – 40 – 44 per cent and then there's the windbreaks itself, as you – as you descend down and into the – the

pit, which – which yields 30 per cent. But in the aggregate, those control efficiencies are yielding in the order of 90 per cent.

Um, where we landed on – on – on – so in – in light of all of that, plus the existing controls on the site, of which there are a number, we – we landed on the premise that it wouldn't be reasonable or feasible to go and seal the haul road. Um, we're not aware of any other precedents where, um, haul roads on – to – to the bases of landfills had been sealed, um, with concrete. Um, and we're not – I guess our – our experts are of the view that that necessarily wouldn't be an effective strategy in actually reducing dust emissions because there would be a whole bunch of other operational challenges and problems, um, that would come into play with sealing a haul road, such as, um, you know, having to, ah, include wheel washers and things like that, um, at the top of the – the pit.

MR PEARSON: Or at the bottom first.

MR PEARSON: And at – and at the bottom and so – so – and – and the efficacy of some of those controls – you know, there's plenty of challenges on – on that front. So – so it was a – so I guess where we landed was it was a combination of, um, there is an air quality management plan on the site that will be – that we have agreed that that will be updated. Um, there is a whole range of controls that sit within that plan, um, and then on top of that, there was the reactive measures that were agreed to, um, in – in collaboration with the EPA.

DR WILLIAMS: So – sorry, Peter Williams again. So that was in – basically where it was left with the EPA, they were happy with these proposals?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So they were but they – they basically – so we – we landed – so they were certainly happy with the reactive measures.

DR WILLIAMS: All right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You'll see in the report that they had had asked us to still consider - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: - - - the sealing on the haul road. That's there, um, and in the documentation and certainly it was considered but I think where we landed was it wasn't reasonable or feasible or sort of pragmatic measure and that – felt that once we'd agreed to the reactive measures, on top of all the other existing measures on the site, um, for mitigating dust-related emissions and given that, look, the – from a compliance perspective there are no material air quality compliance issues currently associated with site operations.

MR TAYLOR: And there's no community complaints. We'll talk about that shortly. Sorry, David Taylor. But there are – there are no, um, air quality issues,

um, complaints that have been made, um, from any – any surrounding receptors that are registered on the complaints register.

MS MILLAR: And we do have a – a question here just about the full suite of noise and dust mitigation measures that could apply to the site. Are there any others that, um, we haven't discussed here that, you know, have been considered and discounted or, you know, on whatever basis?

MR SEARLE: Sure. So Brad Searle from Arcadis. Maybe just to talk to some of the sort of extensive – we talked about noise measures. So talking to air.

MS MILLAR: Air.

MR SEARLE: Um, so obviously the enclosure of the material processing centre and the pre-sort enclosure in and of itself is a very good form of mitigation to dust-related emissions. Um, and that aligns with sort of best practice initiatives in the sector. Um, there's misting sprays that are operated within those sheds, um, to dampen material as it's sorted and – and being loaded, um, to – to the hopper. Um, majority of the travel routes on site are sealed, um, and obviously with the exception being the haul route into the pit. Um, the – there's water sprays on the mobile crusher and shredder.

There's a water truck that operates on the unsealed haul road and into the pit, um, within the landfill and on the paved roads as needed. So again, that – that's also supported by that real-time, um, environmental monitoring setup that I talk to. Ah, there's a speed limit of 40 kilometres per hour for unsealed, um, haul road and into the pit. Um, there's a water cannon operating from within the pit, um, and there's obviously an established earth bund that's along the northern boundary, ah, which is also a useful mitigant. Um, and there's a fixed water spray system that operates across the access roadway. And then on top of that, there are, um, dust gauges on – on the site boundary.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's correct.

MS MILLAR: But are there other, um, sort of methods that could be used to deliver, ah, material to – to the landfill? For example, you know, a second chute or something like that? That would – something like that, potentially limit, um, you know, dust emissions because of fewer vehicle movements.

MR TAYLOR: Ah, it's David Taylor. Um, that's probably not really practical, um, to be honest, and from a, ah, cost-benefit analysis perspective. Um, the – the material, um, that does come out that is going direct to landfill at the moment is – is, um, particularly direct to landfill, is bulk in nature. Um, there would have to be significant infrastructure built, um, for instance, for tipping of that waste, um, at – at an upper level, um, and then transferring it down via a – a – a chute similar type of, ah, operation, ah, to go – go down into the landfill. I think the other issue is that the type of material, being soils, um, asbestos and things like that, it is much better to

control that type of thing down at the face rather than actually, um, having it into the chute, landing on – on the ground and pluming. Um, we – we wouldn't – we wouldn't suggest that that's, ah, an ideal outcome, um, for our – for our staff - - -

MS MILLAR: Yep.

MR TAYLOR: - - - or for, um, any particular, um - - -

MS MILLAR: Yep.

MR TAYLOR: - - - surrounding receptors.

MR SEARLE: It's Brad Searle from Arcadis. The only other point to note is that Bingo have, ah, made a concession for any of the residual waste coming from the pre-sorting closure to go via the chute - - -

MR TAYLOR: Correct.

MR SEARLE: - - - and into the landfill so that certainly has been built into - - -

MR TAYLOR: Yeah. Correct.

MR SEARLE: - - - operation.

MR TAYLOR: That's right. Yep.

MR PEARSON: Um - - -

MS MILLAR: Yep. No go – go ahead, please.

MR PEARSON: So you talked about operational challenges. You mentioned that wheel washers were one of those. Although I understand you do use wheel washers at one end of the road so it would be installing a wheel washer at the other end of the road; is that right?

MR TAYLOR: Yeah, so it's David Taylor here. That's correct. Yeah, if you were – if you were looking at that type of scenario, then you would have to install a wheel wash mechanism at the bottom of the landfill. Um, that actually creates a number of issues. First of all, a drainage issue. Um, how do you deal with the water that's within that wheel wash? Um, all those types of things. That – that haul road is already, um, you know, the water cart moving up and down that, um, is already being used. Ah, but the wheel wash at the top is really – um, it's the additional infrastructure to install the wheel wash. It's not just the wheel wash itself. It's the whole - - -

MR PEARSON: Okay.

MR TAYLOR: - - - drainage and water treatment.

MR PEARSON: Are there other operational challenges beyond that?

MR SEARLE: Um, it's Brad Searle from Arcadis. So I guess one of the other points that – that we noted is just in, um, terms of the – the – the base in terms of what you build this road. You'd be forever, forever repairing it and upgrading it just by virtue of the nature of the, um, underling geology there and the steepness of it. Um, so there'd be a fairly significant – not just a significant capex, um, you know, outlay, but a significant opex outlay, um, um, in terms of maintaining it, um, and – and one of the benefits of the gravel road, it's flexibility to move to the ground is – it's – that's soft or unstable. So – which is building on what Dave was saying earlier.

MR PEARSON: And you've touched on capex and opex. Do you have an estimate of what those types of numbers might look like?

MR SEARLE: Ah we could certainly provide those – those numbers. I don't have them to hand.

MR TAYLOR: Um, yes, David Taylor here. Um, we don't – we don't have – and it – it obviously depends on the specification of what sealing actually means. Sealing could mean a very basic chip seal versus fully paved concrete. Now, fully paved concrete is a very, very expensive option. Um, if you're using a chip seal which breaks down quite quickly and therefore leads to a higher opex. So there's, obviously, different capex/opex playoffs that you're looking at. Um, but we could certainly provide some type of estimate, um, and it depends the extent – um, is it – how far do you go down? Is it to the base of the landfill? Um, you know, that – defining that scope is actually bit of a challenge as well and then do we also then have to consider the number of times we have to change it over the time of the landfill and what that cost is? Do we do a discounted cash flow, like, over the next 10 years or something like that? So – but we could come up with an estimate.

MR PEARSON: Okay.

MR TAYLOR: Okay. Um, so we've talked through the air quality, ah, mitigation issues so, um – I'll – I'll proceed to – one of the other questions which was raised was around the – the chute operating profile. Um, so earlier I talked about the – the volume that was assumed, um, going down through the chute, um, and the – what's interesting is that the – the limiting, um, factor on how much you can send down the chute is not the chute itself. It's actually the weighing scales. So every – every waste that we send down to the landfill via the chute has to be weighed, um, on a – on an automatic weighing scale system. That – that is actually the, ah, key restraining factor on how much that can process. Um, that's currently processing 30 tonnes per hour, um, through that particular scales, ah, from the existing facility. Um, when you model that and you take it up to the 24/7 operation, um, and then you assume some downtime for maintenance and things like that, then we roughly get to

circa – it's 249,660 tonnes per annum through the chute based on that particular modelling.

Now, earlier I mentioned that the modelling that we've prepared for residual waste coming from both the facilities, because it obviously takes both of them, is sitting at 240,000. That's based on a conservative 70 per cent recovery rate. Obviously, as the recovery rate goes up there's less going through the actual chute so therefore that gives another – um, a bit of extra capacity and redundancy for the chute capacity. So just to summarise in answer to the question, we believe that the chute capacity and the weighing scales have sufficient capacity to actually, um, accept the waste coming through it, um, based on a very conservative modelling scenario.

MR PEARSON: We understand from the department that that chute is currently not in operation at the moment.

MR TAYLOR: Ah, that is incorrect.

MR PEARSON: Right. So there was a fire; is that right? And - - -

MR TAYLOR: There was a fire.

MR PEARSON: Right.

MR TAYLOR: But it is now operational.

MR PEARSON: Okay. And how long was it not operational for?

MR TAYLOR: One week.

MR PEARSON: Okay.

MR TAYLOR: I correct myself. It was two weeks.

MR PEARSON: Okay.

MR TAYLOR: Sorry, it was two weeks.

MR PEARSON: What happens then? So what happens to the material that's being accrued in the MPC? How is it then transported from the MPC to the – to the pit?

MR TAYLOR: Ah, it's David Taylor. Um, that was actually transported via dump truck. So it was stored within the facility and then temporarily moved down into the landfill pit via dump truck.

MS MILLAR: So in terms of capacity for stockpiling in that situation where the chute is not operational for maintenance or other reasons, ah, you continue to move the waste down to the landfill to keep the flow, as opposed to stockpiling.

MR TAYLOR: Yeah, we try to avoid stockpiling, um, ah, waste within the facility itself. Um, so in those rare occasions, um, in the – in the minimal hours that we do have to have some maintenance, um, we will – we will let it build up to a – a – a safe level. Um, but once it becomes unsafe, then we'll start moving it down, um, into the actual landfill. Obviously, when it was down for the period of time that the fire was impacted we obviously had to employ the – the dump trucks to move the waste down to the landfill. Okay. So that's, ah, the chute operating profile. Um, the last section that we'd like to talk about is around community and stakeholder engagement and the process that we've been through. Um, I think it's important to note that, um, to date, um, the – all of the agencies, um, that we've, ah, discussed with and consulted with, um, are – are all – ah, basically come up with consent conditions that we're comfortable with, um, in terms of dealing and mitigating the environmental – ah, the minimal environmental impacts.

So, um, we've obviously followed the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act requirements, um, of consultation through the exhibition period. Um, we've met with the – with the council on numerous occasions. Obviously, we received the 70 submissions from the community, um, and also government agencies. Um, post-exhibition, um, we – one of the first things that we did following the acquisition of Dial A Dump was go and meet with, ah, Blacktown City Council, um, and discuss the proposal with them, um, and discuss Bingo's intentions going forward. Um, we then had an extensive engagement period post the response to submissions report with the Department of Planning and the EPA, um, in particular, in relation to the noise and air quality issues, um, that were raised in the response to submissions.

So, um, it's additional monitoring – additional assessment, I should say, and, um, the – all of the public, um, authorities have provided their community, um, and input into the – to the proposed conditions of consent. So it's taken a long time. Um, there were, um, I have to say, some quite frustrating times, um, but, um, we – we stuck at it and worked collaboratively with the department and the EPA to address the concerns that were being raised, um, and – and really worked with them to come up with a solution which we both thought were, um, (a) minimising the, um, potential impacts of the proposal and (b) that, um, we could live with operationally. Um, in terms of community complaints, um, the – we do have a, ah, a publicly available complaints registered which is on the Dial A Dump Industries website.

Um, that's updated every month, um, with records of, um, what complaints have been made. Um, the – since – since the actual, ah, facility opened in January 2010, um, there's been two – two noise-related incidents, ah, or complaints, um, the last one being in February 2011. Um, so, um, that's an indication of the issue around noise. There has been five odour-related, um, complaints that have been raised. Um, investigations have found that they haven't emanated from our facility. Um, it's important to note that our facility is not a – a putrescible facility and therefore there's

limited – ah, there's no organics to create, ah, the odour. Um, so that's – that's on the odour side. Um, but we have no – no complaints registered, um, about, um, dust on the actual, um, on the actual complaints register. So, um, we hope that that responds to the question which you raised, um, in the – in the agenda item. Ah, does anyone else have any – Chris, anything else about the engagement process?

MR GORDON: No, I think it was very thorough and I think we – every concern that was raised has been addressed to the satisfaction of each stakeholder that raised it so - - -

MR PEARSON: It's not been possible to resolve the objection from Blacktown Council?

MR TAYLOR: Ah, which objection was that?

MR PEARSON: So – so they've raised, obviously, an objection to the project on the basis of, predominantly, noise and we heard them from this morning that some of their concerns around noise related to trucks, vehicle movements, the – the beeping – reverse beeping and so on on the site, the – the – the reversing noise that you make – trucks make when you - - -

MR TAYLOR: Yep.

MR PEARSON: Um, ah, so my understanding is that – that objection's been maintained and I guess my question was whether that – that objection's been, um, been able to be resolved. It sounds like it hasn't, but, um - - -

MR TAYLOR: Well, I mean, we believe that through the proposed conditions of consent that it has been - - -

MR PEARSON: Right.

MR TAYLOR: - - - that it has been resolved.

MR PEARSON: Okay.

MR TAYLOR: Blacktown City Council may take a different view to that, which, um, is obviously their prerogative, um, but we believe that, um, through the current proposed conditions of consent that we've addressed that issue.

MR SEARLE: It's Brad Searle from Arcadis. So just – I think the – the environmental assessment and both, you know, the original noise impact assessment report, but then all the additional work that's been done, um, you know, demonstrates that the proposal's not having any material impacts from a noise perspective. Um, and – and notwithstanding that, there's still been some additional, um, conditions that Bingo have agreed to. Um, you know, I mentioned earlier the, um, agreement to do a – a noise study within six months to verify all of those modelling results, but – but

look, there are – to – to your point about Blacktown Council, if those were material issues, well, one would think that – that, you know, that we'd be receiving complaints on a fairly regular basis with, you know, operation of the site and that's just not – that's just not coming through and what is being seen here is, I guess, very consistent with our – with our – our modelling findings.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Peter, any further questions?

DR WILLIAMS: No. I think I'm fine. Thanks, Ilona. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Tony? Okay. Great. Well, look - - -

MR PEARSON: Thank you.

MS MILLAR: - - - thank you very much for – for your time and for your – your presentation today. It's been very, very helpful. Sorry, we've got one more point.

MR YOUNG: Sorry, sorry to interrupt you.

MS MILLAR: Yep.

MR YOUNG: While that last discussion was happening I – it's Alan Young, EMM. Just back to the question of the haul road and the wheel wash, my thought was that the wheel wash has to be on a level area and the haul road is inclined so you would have to put that in the actual fill area of the – which seems a little impractical that you're occupying an area that's fill and it is being filled actively so just another consideration I'd thought of as a – as a – as – as a sort of practical consideration for that issue. Sorry to interrupt you.

MS MILLAR: Yep, no. Okay. Thank you for that. We'll take that point. Um, okay. Great. Look, um, in terms of follow-up actions, as I said at the – the opening, this is the sort of early stage of our, um, consideration of – of the matter. You know, we – we will have the – the public meeting in a couple of weeks' time and then, you know, we'll review any additional material that is provided, um, from both the – the department, yourselves if there's any further information that – that you will be providing to – in respect of those matters on notice, um, and the council and then, um, following the – the public meeting, the members of the public also have a prescribed period of time in which to put additional information if they would like.

Um, so, um, we're working to – to a – a timeframe to try and wrap up our determination as efficiently as possible, um, but if, um, we need additional information, we'll come back and – and obviously ask for that as – as we go through this process. Um, but again, thank you very much for your time today and Casey will be in touch with any specific items that we'd be seeking further clarification from you.

MR TAYLOR: Okay. Great. Ah, so it's – it's David Taylor here. Um, we'd just like to thank you for the opportunity to, ah, present, um, our – our – our, um, our position in relation to the modification. Um, I – I do believe that we are having a site visit, um, in a couple of weeks following the actual, um, community meeting so, um, I look forward to seeing you all there. I'll be at the site visit. Um, probably along with Chris and a couple of the operational guys to take you around the site. So we look forward to hosting you on-site.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Great.

MR TAYLOR: Thank you very much.

MR PEARSON: Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you very much. So for the purpose of the transcript, the meeting is now closed.

RECORDING CONCLUDED **[1.05 pm]**