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-1168219

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: GENESIS WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY MOD 6 – SECOND SESSION

PANEL:	**ILONA MILLAR** **DR PETER WILLIAMS** **TONY PEARSON**
ASSISTING PANEL:	**CASEY JOSHUA** **STEPHEN BARRY**
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT	**CHRIS RITCHIE** **BIANCA THORNTON** **JEFF PARNELL**
LOCATION:	**IPC OFFICES** **LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET** **SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**
DATE:	**TUESDAY, 17 MARCH 2020**

MS I. MILLAR: Okay. Are you guys all ready? Yes? Okay. For the purposes of the – the transcript, I'm now opening the meeting. Good morning and welcome. Before I begin, um, we would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land upon which we meet, and to pay our respects to their elders past, present and emerging. Um, welcome, and welcome to the meeting today to discuss the proposed modification number 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 operations of some processors. 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, and Casey Joshua and Stephen Barry from the office of the IPC are also in attendance.

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. This meeting is one part of the commission's decision-making process. Um, it's taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its decision. Um, it's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. But if you're asked a question and are not in a position to answer it, um, straight away, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any information, um, to us in writing. And any information that is provided in writing will be placed on the website as well.

Um, as the, um, the meeting is being transcribed, I would ask that, um, all members here today introduce themselves for – before speaking. Um, ideally, if you could do that before each time you speak, um, that will assist with the transcription. Um, and just to avoid speaking on top of each other to ensure the accuracy of the – the transcript. Um, so we will now begin. Um, we circulated a, um, preliminary agenda, um, prior to the – the meeting, which I understand that – that you have. Um, and so I'd now like to invite the department to provide a brief overview of the key issues identified in the assessment report. And I understand you also have a – a presentation, so if you could speak to the – the number of, um, the slides as we – as we work through them for the transcript.

MR C. RITCHIE: Okay. First of all, to introduce myself and my team, my name's Chris Ritchie, and I'm a director of Industry Assessments. And today I have, ah, Bianca Thornton who's on the, er, phone who's phoned in, who has assisted with the assessment of the project, and also the department's, ah, internal noise specialist, Jeff Parnell. First of all, thank you, er, to the commission for inviting us to present our assessment to you. What – what I'll do is I'll run through the broad, ah, focus of our assessment, running through what the project relates to, the submissions that were raised and the key issues that the department considered as part of its assessment of the project. So I'll run through the – the presentation.

So with slide 1, just to set the – the context of where the site's located, and by way of background, I was involved in the original, ah, Dial a Dump project that was approved by the then planning commissioner, I think in about 2009. Contextually, the site is located in what we know now as the Western Sydney Employment Area, and it's marked on that first slide with the heading Regional Context in red. The site is roughly – I think it's about 150 hectares of which the most active component of the project is about 56 hectares. It is located in the Blacktown local government area and is located in close proximity to a number of major motorways.

There are some – a lot of industrial development which I'll touch on in the next few slides around the Western Sydney employment area, and I'll – I'll touch on the evolution of that ah – ah – ah, employment land, ah, in – in some – in some later slides. But access to the site is off Wallgrove Road, and there's also a – an exit off the M7, which you can also get onto Wallgrove Road, and you access the site through what they call Wonderland Drive. The site is surrounded by, ah, a – ah, a number of warehouse distribution and industrial-related activities. The site itself was a former quarry. Like, I understand first operated in the thirties, but we do have some information around it really being a hard rock quarry from the fifties. It operated till about 2005 and was sold to Dial A Dump Industries around that time. There are some residential areas located to the north around 400 metres, and the Erskine Park residential area about 1.25 kilometres to the west.

I'll just run to slide 2. Some of this I probably touched on. And first approval was about 2009, and at that time and it's something just important to highlight, the original application was to receive and handle two million tonnes per annum. And while we describe and get to the slides that talked about the Mod request, that – that hasn't really changed. It's – it's – it's the notion on which that material is dealt with. As mentioned, it was previously operated by Dial A Dump so they went through the application process. They were the, ah, operators of that approval since 2009. And I think it was around September 2019 that it was acquired by Bingo Industries.

Now, Bingo is an applicant that we have dealt with on a number of projects. They've got sites, or applications around St Marys, Minto, er, down south at, ah, Kembla Grange. There's a number of applications that we have dealt with Bingo in the last five or six years, and that's the important point to raise because that will talk to how this particular site will operate in the – in the terms of their broader business operations. The site itself is – has two main components; resource recovery and the disposal of what we call non-protrusible material. So the landfill itself is what we call a class 2 landfill. It's not protrusible waste so it's not waste that comes out of the likes of your red bin. It's more to do with your construction-related building demolition material, or – or construction demolition, or CMD, ah, as we call it.

The original approval, as I mentioned, could receive two million tonnes of which up to 700,000 tonnes would be – would be landfilled. As I mentioned before, the site is located in what we call the Western Sydney employment area, the – or the WSEA as – as we call it. The WSEA has evolved over a number of years and started in the early 2000s with what we call, er, State Environment's – or Planning Policy number

59, and that related to major employment generated employment land; something like that. Over the course of a number of years, there was the, er, Erskine Park employment land. They then joined to call – be called the Western Sydney Employment Hub, and in 2009 with the addition of further land south of the Sydney water pipeline, that grew to what we call the WSEA today.

From a zoned land perspective, it's roughly 2100 hectares of employment land, and we understand it's New South Wales' largest employment land. And my team deal with a number of projects in there as well, a number of business parks, a number of, um, ah, large warehouse distribution facilities, and we're – we're quite familiar with projects in – in the WSEA. There is a notion of extending the WSEA, and a lot of strategic planning is happening around that future extension and how that relates to future aerotropolis, so there is a lot of employment land, a lot of infrastructure works that's happening around the WSEA. Moving to the next slide, slide 3, it shows a bit of a – a map to contextualise that. The purple shows the highlighted, ah, zone part of the WSEA, and where the site 6 within that WSEA. The future extension is primarily to the – the south and the – and – and the southwest.

Turning our mind to what the application's seeking, just to remind ourselves, it's looking to increase the amount of material going directly to landfill, which at the moment is about 700,000. Looking to increase that to around a million. They're looking to also change some of the operating hours on site. Um, a lot of that has got to do with, ah, hours of when they can receive material; the hours in which they can put material into landfill. The idea is not to be crushing and grinding during those sensitive hours. Another part of the application is looking at the current noise limits, as we've kind of indicated, and I do have a further slide which does show that. When the consent was granted in 2009 to today, the whole development around the WSEA has significantly changed, and we've brought our noise specialist to – to – to walk us through that perspective of that part of the application.

In terms of why the applicant is seeking the modification, er, there's a lot of, as we know, er, a significant amount of infrastructure development that's occurring at the moment. There's lots of tunnelling; there's lots of redevelopment. Er, a lot of, er, material that comes out of the tunnel has be, er, handled or dealt with in some way, and the site sees themselves as an opportunity to receive that material, particularly of a nighttime when there is less traffic and while that work is occurring at night, because the tunnelling generally occurs all the time and particularly through the night.

MR PARNELL: Yep.

MR RITCHIE: As I mentioned, the site is in the hands of Bingo Industries. They've got a number of resource recovery facilities, so what the facility or the site allows them to do is to deal with disposing of some of their residual materials from their other sites. As part of the infrastructure works that's happening, what they've identified is an increasing need to deal with the likes of asbestos material and contaminated material, which you can't reprocess or recycle. It has to be disposed

of. In the context of that, there is a number of landfills that have closed and a number over the last three years, so landfill capacity is – is – is – is an issue. And the other two main factors that also contributed to the proposal would be the introduction of the Queensland Waste Levy. I understand the majority of waste that was going to Queensland was coming from New South Wales. And, yeah, if the material is not going there to be disposed of, there needs to be disposal facilities or they need to handle more material through sites in New South Wales.

The other element that I have not added to that slide but is part of the broader picture, also relates to dealing with bushfire-affected material. Now, since – certainly since I've come back to work in January, that has been a significant focus of my time and some of my team's time in identifying and being part of a broader government-coordinated committee on how we deal with our waste material that's been, um, generated due to the significant fire events that occurred over Christmas period. And certainly the applicant has raised with us that there is – they're looking to seek to provide some assistance there.

Moving to the next slide is – sort of, zooms into the layout of the site to identify the key – the key components. As I mentioned, the void has – has been there for – for some time and is – was quite large. It's almost like a – if you could imagine an open-cut mine where there's a circulate internal access road, or haul road into the bottom of landfill. There's some surface infrastructure processing that occurs through the likes of the materials processing centre which is quite – is quite a large building. Ah, material comes in there: it's sorted. There's a number of equipment that processes that into various materials which are then just deposited at the rear of the site into different types of grades of material, whether it's timber, rock or sand.

There is what we call the shutes. You've probably heard about the shute. Now, the shute is where you go through a recycling component. There's parts that you can't recycle. It has to be landfilled and a shute allows material to be conveyed from the surface processing site down into the – the void itself. At the moment, my understanding is they achieve – achieve about an 80 per cent resource, ah, recycling recovery. And the residual component being the – the 20 per cent is – is disposed of into the – into the void itself.

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: There has been a recent fire of which I think that shute has been damaged. I'm not quite sure where this replacement component is up to now at this stage.

MR PEARSON: Chris, what year was that photo taken in?

MR RITCHIE: Oh, good question.

MS MILLAR: Yep.

MR RITCHIE: Bianca, who's on the telephone, would you know when that was generated?

MS THORNTON: Um, I can take that under ..... number ..... there, originally lodged there, yeah, in I believe 2018.

MR RITCHIE: So we'll find out and we'll - - -

MR PARNELL: Yeah. Okay.

MR RITCHIE: We'll come back and report - - -

MR PARNELL: Thank you.

MR RITCHIE: - - - to the commission.

MS MILLAR: Yeah. Are you able to comment on which parts of the haul road are sealed and which aren't sealed - - -

MR RITCHIE: I do - - -

MS MILLAR: - - - like, based on that.

MR RITCHIE: Oh, based on my – my memory of being to the site, the access is roughly from this location here. All that there would be sealed. There's a weighbridge roughly - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yep.

MR RITCHIE: - - - here. There would be sealed. I think behind is sealed, and where the haul road wouldn't – not be sealed is probably from here down, I would say.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So – yep.

MR RITCHIE: I know that's a key issue in terms of dust generation, which we'll touch on in our dust overview of our assessment. But generally speaking, from my experience, of the landfills I've been to, I don't recall them being sealed up to the disposal location.

MR PEARSON: Chris, just for the transcript, could you resupply that – that map, and maybe shade a different colour the - - -

MR RITCHIE: Sealed version, yep.

MR PEARSON: The unsealed section of the road - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yeah.

MR PEARSON: - - - so that - - -

MR RITCHIE: Definitely. Yep, no problem.

MR PEARSON: Ah, your memory accords with mine too, I think. So - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yeah. Like, I have – late last year I did go to the bottom of the void and inspected shute, more to do with a – a – another project. But – which I'll touch on more in – in our, er, overview of the ..... It becomes very difficult to seal, given that this is an active deposition and which is rising up the sides of the – the void as they fill. And we do have an image that shows in that space of 10 years, it actually has risen quite – quite a lot. But we'll – we'll highlight the – the different surfaces and provide that back to you.

As I mentioned, WSEA has developed rapidly, particularly since about 2005/2006. And one of the main reasons it's developed so – so – so rapidly has got to do with the availability of large tracks of employment land. But what this land does provide is – which is attractive to various businesses is – is access to – to major highways. So as I mentioned before, you've got the M4 motorway located to the north, and the M7 located to the east, other side. A number of these developments that are located on this plan are – are projects that my team or – or – or the department has dealt with. Some projects include the likes of Costco, Coca Cola, Coles, Toll. There's – there's – there's – almost most businesses would be located in here.

A trend of late is also moving to what we call high base – high bay warehouse design, which is – again, given, er, land can be quite expensive, rather than having – having large footprints from a land-surface point of view looking to go up to maximise, ah, availability. And a lot of those buildings generate significant amounts of traffic. One in particular that I've dealt with in the past, which is a national distribution ..... centre for Coles, generated the likes of 900 trucks a day, so we're talking about large distributions. Importantly, in terms of dealing with weight - - -

MR PEARSON: Sorry, Chris, could I go back to - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yep.

MR PEARSON: - - - that slide. So the – the developments in the site vicinity, what are the hours of operations for those, um, those, um, ah, industrial sites that might have high truck movements.

MR RITCHIE: A lot of them would be 24-hour.

MR PEARSON: Would they?

MR RITCHIE: Yep. In terms of the ones that we have dealt with, we can provide some more information and come back.

MR PEARSON: That would be great, actually.

MR RITCHIE: Yep. Yeah.

MR PEARSON: Thank you.

MR RITCHIE: So some of the sites that we've dealt with, more – more down here, you've got your DHL, your freight logistics, your national distribution centre is roughly here. You just can't quite see it on the map. A lot of these buildings would be, um, you know, for distribution purposes would be – would be 24-hour, but we – we can provide some more details in terms of the projects that we've dealt with. Moving to waste broadly - - -

MS MILLAR: Yeah.

MR RITCHIE: - - - from a government waste point of view, we do have the WARR strategy, the waste, avoidance, resource recovery criteria that looks to continue to keep materials in the marketplace to ensure we maximise as much as possible the opportunities to recover and reuse materials. In terms of the project itself, they're in terms of what's disposed of. It's material that's not recyclable or recover – recoverable. Ah, there's materials that, you know, um, are – are contaminated that limits the opportunities to – to – to handle that, particularly asbestos material. Ah, in terms of, er, the broader business operation, as I mentioned, the idea of the – of the disposal is to take residuals from Bingo's other operations.

In terms of the change to the amount of material being landfilled, it's likely to shorten the lifespan of the overall facility by seven years. When it was originally approved based on potential materials received, it would have a life of around 45 to 65 years at the time it was approved. And the idea on the original approval is to utilise the quarry void to compact and fill that with the view to potentially using the surface area, once it was finished, and that is something we'll have to check and monitor as we go. Given the nature of the application, the department did exhibit the proposal. We received quite a lot of submissions and I think from my experience, I'll touch on I think why that's occurred, and I think that's two reasons.

The – the main reason would have been around this time was a – a – another project located nearby at the site, which is the energy from waste facility which generated a significant amount of community, media and other interests. And I think what it did is it highlighted that there is a waste site located here, and I think that's reflected in the – the – the – the – the style of issues raised in submissions, which we'll touch on. And the other issue I think would have been around some nighttime. There was some sensitiveness around having activities through the night. Noise was a key issue for a lot of those submitters, and also for Blacktown Council which is why they

objected as well. So we received around 70 – 70 submissions; around 62 of those objected.

Going to the next line is a bit of a breakdown, which is in our report on the types of issues that were raised. And as you can see, a – the second highest amount of response to the exhibition related to the energy from waste proposal. So there were concerns about the relationship and the association of the project where ..... from waste. So the project is not directly related to the energy from us. They're not the same applicant. And as I've – would be publicly known that project was recommended for refusal, and that's now currently in – in the court.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry - - -

MS THORNTON: Oh.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - Chris. Sorry, just at the moment – I'm sorry, Peter Williams. Um, where it's got compliance and – and the EFW ..... can you explain what their compliance, ah, it means, please. Um, has there been any issues of compliance, or is it just concerns of not ..... normal compliance?

MR RITCHIE: So from – so Chris from planning. From, ah, historical perspective, there has been some previous compliance issues. I can provide some more information around that. Um, I might ask Bianca to run through, er, some of the points that were raised about compliance, Bianca. Would you - - -

MS THORNTON: Um, yep. Er, one of the submissions made reference to ..... being, I guess, un – untrustworthy operator, and they talk about asbestos, where is. I believe there is, um, an issue in the past which got into the media about, um, some of the staff processing asbestos waste, which is not meant to happen, so it's got to track ..... one example.

MR RITCHIE: But as I – Chris again from planning. As I mentioned, we'll provide some more – some more information. So other issues raised were around traffic, odour and air quality. Um, and in terms of our assessment, as I mentioned, we did really focus on particularly traffic and – oh, and – sorry – noise and air.

DR WILLIAMS: So is there a reason why compliance and EFW proposal has been grouped, given that they're probably separate issues.

MR RITCHIE: Bianca, is there a reason why we joined that together?

MS THORNTON: Yeah. So we joined those together because the submissions that talked about compliance often linked it to the – a different waste proposal. Um, and they kind of put their argument together as a package of briefly that, an energy from waste proposal and how they'd just won, um, I guess, having that refusal, and tying to link that to paint a picture of the proponent being a bad operator, essentially.

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah. So we – we could have essentially replaced that with two bar charts; one compliance, 37 per cent; one energy from waste proposal, 37 per cent.

MR RITCHIE: Essentially.

MS THORNTON: Yep.

MR RITCHIE: And I think as I mentioned about the heightened community concern about the energy from waste, a lot of the flavour in the submissions was ..... from waste so it should be refused. The person that declined it, applicant, has a bad reputation., "This is a bad project." So it's – it's to – sometimes a bit challenging to try and - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

MR RITCHIE: - - - uncouple it. In terms of the community response, we did get a response back from the applicant. We did go back and forth on a number of occasions. In particular, we had a adjacent landowner who threw various experts representing themselves – provided us with a number of submissions. Each particular time we were asking their proponent to respond and address to ..... those submissions. Each time we did liaise with the – the EPA, particularly because they again focused on noise and dust, and when we touch on particularly the – the noise outcomes of our assessment, which I'll – I'll pass on to – to Jeff at the time, we'll run through some of the information and request that we made of the applicant to address the concerns that were raised.

Now, focusing on the first of probably, er, the – the two key issues, and that's around air quality - - -

MS MILLAR: Yep.

MR RITCHIE: - - - in terms of air quality, we – we do make sure we do work closely with, er, the – the EPA. In – in terms of the site itself, in order to operate, it needs a – a development consent but can currently – it needs to have a environment protection licence from the EPA. In terms of our assessment, whether it's the original proposal or any particular chains that might affect the consent or the licence, we do make sure we work closely with the EPA to ensure that their issues are satisfactorily addressed as part of our consideration of the project.

Importantly, again, just – just pointing out the project, it's not seeking to receive more material. It's the way in which that material - - -

MS MILLAR: Yep.

MR RITCHIE: Material is handled ..... and – and – and dealt with. The key changes I mentioned relates to the increase in material that will be put directly to

landfill – directly to the landfill. Er, in – in terms of air quality, the key issues that we do look at is around particulate matter, er, around dust deposition and around PM – what we call PM10 and PM2.5 particles. There was a detailed air quality assessment that – that was provided in response to some issues raised. We did go back and forth asking for more information. And as we outlined our assessment report and as we'll see on the next line, which does show some of the results of that, they're – they're essentially – in terms of the air quality assessment has shown that there, er, is a, ah, ah, an elevated level of – of background dust in – in the area, and that's – this is generally known within Western Sydney. It does have an elevated level of, ah, um, air quality issues.

In – in terms of the assessment itself, one of the key things is – is we look for is to ensure that the model that they do is – is quite realistic and has a conservative nature to it, so it looks at the worst case, so what is a worst case scenario. So in terms of the – the conservative nature of the model, what it did assume in that model would – was a maximum one millions tonnes going to landfill. What it assumed too was less resource recovery so, actually, more material also going to landfill by the shute – to ensure that that analysis gave – represented a worse case. And as we've touched on before, what that air quality assessment did identify was that one of the key dust generators from the project is the haul road into landfill itself.

So this is a table on the next line that does illustrate the, er, contribution or increment that the Mod is likely to add. Ah, the table itself shows two components: the short-term 24 hour, where there's an episode or something, ah, from a dust generation ..... over a short period of time, and also what is the annual average over a, ah – a12 month period – and, as you can see, there is, ah, an elevated, ah, level that's already in existence – and, particularly from an annual contribution, the Mod's really adding only a slight amount. A couple of figures in the next slide just illustrates that performance, and the contour there shows the 24 hour average in the context of the site and the surrounding receivers – and the next one, being an annual average. Here we're focusing on 2.5.

So, in short, as I've mentioned, the background is quite elevated. What the applicant did indicate is, in terms of the modelling itself, one of the key contributors is the location of the site in a context of the broader WSEA, but also, ah, the motorway is a contributor, um -and, in terms of some issues during the background analysis, there were some other, ah, factors in terms of hazard reduction and bushfire activity – and, as I mentioned, one of the contributors – or the main contributor is ..... road. In terms of what we looked at doing – and one of the key things we want to focus on is - - -

MR PEARSON: Sorry. Could you go back, sorry?

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR PEARSON: ..... wanted to pick up on – so bushfire and hazard reduction, it's, um – it's possible that those particular contributors, um, might not be experienced every year.

MR RITCHIE: That's right.

MR PEARSON: So the background - - -

MR RITCHIE: That's right.

MR PEARSON: - - - levels would be elevated on the basis that those impacts might be seen as – certainly not one-off, but not regular events. So that – am I reading this correctly, that therefore the increase would be greater, if you like, in a year where the bushfire and hazard reduction impacts aren't being experienced?

MR RITCHIE: I think what it's showing is that there might – in terms of the background being as high as it is, there could have been some contributor as to why that was shown as being higher. It may not be as high as that, but during the course of the modelling period, or the sampling period, there were some ..... or extra components that would have potentially driven it up a bit more.

MR PEARSON: So the projects - - -

MS MILLAR: But the incremental - - -

MR PEARSON: Sorry.

MS MILLAR: I was going to say, but the slide showing the incremental increase, that incremental amount wouldn't change. It's just the background that would change.

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

MS MILLAR: So - - -

MR RITCHIE: Which – where I was getting to, in terms of what we would then look at, is we're focusing on trying to ensure that the incremental is managed as best we can – and, in terms of what we have recommended, is – the key – the key for the operation of this site is around ensuring that the chute operates properly, because we want to use that as much as we can. What they do have is a detailed air quality plan in existence, in the consent, but we're looking to update that to utilise – particularly in the proximity of those sensitive receivers and nearby neighbours, repositioning some of that real-time monitoring to allow you to respond better to the 24 hour incidents where you might have something that happens in a short-term, that you can probably manage more effectively if you have a appropriately located real-time monitoring – and the EPA were supportive of updating that management plan to look at repositioning that real-time monitoring, particularly on the northern boundary where there is a receiver that's quite close, and ensuring that appropriate trigger levels are also there.

One of the things I just want to highlight is that the EPA did mention in our last correspondence that they should look to seal the ..... road. Now, we did raise that with the applicant and the applicant did mention that there were some difficulties and constraints in doing that, in terms of, ah, the practicality of doing it, um, the challenges in putting it in place. So what the department thought might be a better approach is to actually step back and look at the site more holistically and not focus on one particular source.

So what we've recommended is that we get an independent person – an expert to come in and look at the whole site – the whole site's operation. Its whole management regime, looking at all potential sources – and in wording that particular condition we said, "Including looking at options to seal the ..... so we didn't want to just focus on one option. We'd rather look at a broader picture, to look at whether there's, ah, a number of things that can be done that can provide a more broader sitewide benefit – because one of the things that's difficult, ah, to contextualise is actually the scale of the site. It's actually quite a large site. So we've made sure that that audit's done. As I mentioned, it is done independently – and ensuring that the EPA is consulted as part of that as well.

MS MILLAR: Just a question on the, sort of, possible mitigative measures. Um, is there scope for, um, a second chute that's taking material that's not from the resource recovery operations, or would that be an option or - - -

MR RITCHIE: So Chris from planning. From an operational point of view, I'm not sure I can properly answer that. So the way I understand the chute would work would be there is, ah, a level of processing. The materials that are recoverable are sent to the rear, out the back of the building, and material that can't be recovered will be, ah, deposited somewhere, where it's loaded into the chute or the conveyor, which is then led down the chute. It is a question I can probably take away on notice and come back to you. It probably would mean having two loading facilities, with two conveyors, and then having, ah, an extra infrastructure to facilitate the chute - - -

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - but we can take that away and come back.

MR PEARSON: What were the difficulties in sealing the ..... road?

MR RITCHIE: I think, from ..... because it's always operational. The – the level of the – the cell floor itself would be changing. I would say that you – to make it as effective as possible you would need a grid at the bottom, maybe a grid at the top, in order to prevent dust to be continually deposited onto the ..... road. Um, the applicant – we did ask the applicant – and maybe, Bianca, some other difficulties? I know we did talk to their representative as well.

MS THORNTON: Yes, ah, I spoke to, um, to Bingo about potentially sealing that ..... road and they, essentially, said it would be very costly as the – the shape of a

landfill changes over time – and the time that would take away from operations while they seal that road.

MR RITCHIE: And also, I think, in our discussions, is that the landfill's constantly changing – and, as I mentioned before, I've been to a number of landfills. I don't recall one that has been sealed, but to function properly we need to manage the traction of dust onto that, from both sides. The top and the bottom.

MR PEARSON: So it's not just a case of that unsealed road that you had going around the top of the pit and snaking around down the right, into the pit. That road doesn't just recede. Your – those roads change, do they, in terms of their location? It's not just a recession of that road back up to the top.

MR RITCHIE: It's – I would say it's a recession of that road.

MR PEARSON: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: Yeah. Yeah. But the key for our recommended condition ..... we're not ruling it out.

MR PEARSON: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: We're saying, look, let's look at everything. Let's look at your stockpiles at the rear. Let's look at your processing. Let's look at how you deposit material. One of the things - - -

MR PEARSON: Would – sorry.

MR RITCHIE: - - - that the applicant has mentioned is that they're confident that they can add more mitigation to the ..... road to reduce ..... contribution – I think by 90 per cent, I think I read somewhere.

MR PEARSON: Would sealing that road eliminate the contribution of the project to the background PM2.5 levels?

MR RITCHIE: I probably have to defer and take that back to the EPA.

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR PEARSON: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: I dare say, as a key contributor, then it potentially could reduce their increment.

MR PEARSON: Could you take that on notice?

MR RITCHIE: I'll take that on notice.

MR PEARSON: Thank you.

MR RITCHIE: So maybe what I'll do now is I'll move into the realm of noise, as the next key issue – and I'll hand over to Jeff to walk us through that, if that's okay?

MR PARNELL: Sure, um, okay. Jeff Parnell from planning. Um, so on the first slide here, where we're talking about what the proponent's done – and, no doubt, you would know that, that they produced a, um, a noise impact assessment and it demonstrated that the, um, the current levels in the area are quite high – and that's, um, um, of no surprise to anybody, given the amount of traffic that's in the area, um – and this current modification, um, aims to align those noise limits consistent with the current noise policies. Having said that, um, they're not looking to this – they're not looking to update from the industrial noise policy which came out in 2000 and lasted to 2017. Um, since then we've got a new document, which is the noise policy for industry. Um, they haven't looked, because of the process and the transitional arrangements of that.

They've – they're looking to continue on under the industrial noise policy – which in most cases is probably more stringent than what the newer document is – but, having said that, it – the similarities between the two documents, particularly in what the planning – the planning scheme and the noise policies look to protect, which is the ..... the area, they're the same between the two documents. Um, so in these two slides here – and you may want to talk a little bit more about what – Chris, er, what's happened in the area, but we can certainly see the difference between 2009 and 10 years later, ah, in the growth of industrial facilities, um, particularly to the, um – that's the north and the east, isn't it?

MR RITCHIE: Yep.

MR PARNELL: And, um – and – and this is what we would expect. The noise policies, both the current one and the previous one, contemplate these industrial estates, um, being further developed – and that's why both of those policies use a two criteria approach of setting, ah, an intrusive criteria, ah, as well as, ah, an overall, um, catchall, which is the ..... noise levels, which are really what the planning scheme looks to, um, set for the area once it's fully occupied.

Did you want to talk about anything else there?

MR RITCHIE: No.

MR PARNELL: Um, with the – with the M4 and the M7, you can – both of these roads have required ..... the, um, construction of noise barriers along them. Houses, um, behind those noise barriers would be experiencing levels, um, in excess of probably 55 decibels at night, and certainly 60 decibels during the day, otherwise they ..... have had barriers there.

DR WILLIAMS: So ..... so, with the barriers, ah, the noise levels are 55 DBA at night.

MR PARNELL: You could kind of assume that's what the barriers would have been designed to achieve - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR PARNELL: - - - when they were first .....

DR WILLIAMS: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: So – Chris from planning. I'll just probably point out quickly, in terms of the quarry void and – from an infrastructure point of view, when – when they would have been ..... resource – one thing that probably is a bit hard to see on an aerial is the significant bunding that's through here. So they are roughly, I think, 10 metres high. I know when you're travelling down the M4, heading west towards the mountains, it's very difficult to really see much through here, but a steep green hill – which is, basically, the ..... that would have been formed as part of that extraction of the resource at the time.

MR PARNELL: Um, so as the result of the department's – some of the department's, um, inquiries and – and also the submissions, the proponent, ah, conducted additional noise monitoring and they addressed some specific issues that had been – been raised in the submissions. Um, the EPA has, um, um, concurred with – with those, ah, responses. Ah, they have developed a set of noise limits based on the predicted values. Um, now, this is a unique thing, in that they don't set the limits that they're actually entitled to. If – if a proponent predicts that they come – they come in well-under the limits that they're entitled to the EPA tends to like to hold them to those predicted limits. So EPA's limits, um, are substantially, in this case, less than what the proponent would normally be entitled to.

Having said that, um, I think that there has been a, um – a small issue in the noise levels that have been predicted, um, that have been set by the EPA. I don't think they actually referred to the most recent, ah, noise report that was provided by the proponent.

MR RITCHIE: So – Chris from planning. We – we will talk to the EPA about that. We think that there's a more recent report we need them to - - -

MR PARNELL: Yep.

MR RITCHIE: - - - to look at – and, I think, in the ballpark, we're looking at maybe the criteria changing by two – two decibels. So - - -

MR PARNELL: By two decibels, to – to Erskine Park.

MR RITCHIE: So we'll – we'll confirm that and come back through the IPC.

MR PARNELL: Um, but it's not a – it doesn't present any kind of problem and it's well within the limits that they – the proponent would be entitled to under the noise policy for industry or the industrial noise policy. Um, moving along, the – the new noise limits. Um, nothing – nothing particularly spectacular about these. This is one of the lower risk projects that I would ever come across my desk. Um, the facility is located appropriately, in the right zones. It's – it's a long way from residential properties. Um, it's – it's – as I say, it is one of the lower, ah, risk projects that I would – I would get to see. Um, is that about it?

MR RITCHIE: Yes. So one of the – Chris again, from planning. One of the key things that we've asked the applicant to do as part of our recommending conditions – and that's in response to – to council's request, is doing a post-commissioning validation to ensure that, in terms of what they've predicted or – or modelled – ensuring that, from a actual generation point of view, is consistent with that and complies with the relevant criteria. If issues do, ah, pop up then the applicant is required to provide, ah, contingencies on how those issues will be addressed, to ensure the compliance with the criteria – criteria are achieved – and the only other thing to probably add is that, from a noise base and point of view, one of the key, if not the key, contributor – and Jeff can confirm, of noise, more broadly, in this location is the significant scale of traffic on those nearby motorways.

So, from a noise generation point of view, particularly over the course of the last 10 ..... years, is that traffic would have increased the overall background of noise experience for community members that reside in that location.

DR WILLIAMS: So, Jeff, um, some of the concerns we've heard is that, um, noise generation between 10 pm and 7 am, ah, particularly around trucks reversing and that beeping sound – that safety beeping sound could be audible, um, in residential locations to the north and to the west. Um, it sounds like – and we don't want to put words in your mouth, but is it your view that that would not be the case?

MR PARNELL: That's – my view is that that wouldn't be the case at all.

MS MILLAR: Would there be any other contributors to intrusive noise, um, as part of the – the operations, you know, if, um, there were deliveries that were, you know, noisy? I understand that, you know, the intention is for that to be enclosed, but, um, would that type of noise travel, you know, the – those distances, in those, sort of, late night background noise conditions?

MR PARNELL: It would be possible, if you were outside of your dwelling, that you would be able to possibly, under the right conditions, listening very carefully, identify, um, the facility. It wouldn't be obvious that the facility was making any

noise, under those conditions. Ah, the – the levels that the EPA is suggesting – and – and we'll talk to them about those levels - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR PARNELL: - - - but we – we concur with the methodology, that the EPA has used, um – will be delivering performance-based levels that are significantly below what the industrial noise policy - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR PARNELL: - - - would recommend for that facility.

DR WILLIAMS: So, Jeff - - -

MR PARNELL: Wholly and solely – sorry, on the basis that, um, they can actually meet -meet much better levels – and they've predicted that they will.

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR PARNELL: Even including, um, penalties for low frequency noise.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, Jeff. Peter Williams. Um, what's a major source of noise – will be the major source of noise once this is operational? Ah, would it be the processing itself? The chute operations? The trucks? And does the modelling include the noise from the chute as well?

MR PARNELL: Ah, the modelling does include, um, all the major sources onsite. Typically, um – typically, it's mobile fleet that is usually the most obvious. Um, it – it tends to, with – particularly with open-cut mines and – and, maybe, trucks driving up, um, ramps, ah, such as – such as we've got here. It tends to be – it tends to be those – those mobile fleet, um, that are the most audible. The processing plants and the operations that are – are more, ah, continuous tend to just, um, mix in, um, and just be a general continual that – that doesn't rise above the – the ambient kind of urban traffic hum of the area. So it's – it's mainly the, um – the – the mobile fleet that I would be most concerned about – and, in that respect, um – and it was raised in some of the submissions. I have looked at the sound ..... levels that were used in the modelling.

DR WILLIAMS: Mmhmm.

MR PARNELL: Um, I asked the noise consultant to actually go and make some measurements, where possible, of – of the actual equipment that they've got onsite - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Mmm.

MR PARNELL: - - - and it all comes in – pretty much in the expectations of – of what I would expect.

DR WILLIAMS: Does the modelling include ..... ah, inversions as well?

MR PARNELL: Yes, it does. Inversions tend to be, um, a feature that doesn't really come into play until you get 500 metres to a kilometre away.

DR WILLIAMS: Mmhmm.

MR PARNELL: Ah, it's – it's more a question if you – if you look at some open-cut mines that we have, say, in the Hunter - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR PARNELL: - - - where receivers are three and four kilometres away. It's under those cases where inversions can enhance noise, ah, significantly. Ah, it's less of an issue, um, in ..... circumstances – and in many – if it was to occur you would find, particularly over at Erskine Park, which is the – probably, if you would say anything, it's the more sensitive of those areas. It would also – those particular nights would also have the – the effect of enhancing road traffic noise at the same time. So although the noise might be enhanced, um, the road traffic noise would also go up.

DR WILLIAMS: ..... yes.

MR PARNELL: So it would – it would continue to probably provide - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR PARNELL: - - - a similar masking effect.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

Sorry. Ilona, could I ask - - -

MS MILLAR: Yes. Absolutely.

DR WILLIAMS: If that's all right? Yes.

MR PARNELL: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Um, just condition 38. Ah, um, Jeff – ah, Chris. Um - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .....

DR WILLIAMS: - - - could you explain why we have the – the "NA" there, please? Ah - - -

MR RITCHIE: Um, to be honest, I would recommend the – the LEQ period is an average over, um – at night.

DR WILLIAMS: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: It's an average over nine hours – and, um, I actually don't know why the EPA included that - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - because the controlling, more stringent - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - criteria will be the LEQ 15 minute period.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .....

MR RITCHIE: I will ask the EPA why they included that - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - but, um, the answer, ah, for that is I believe it was because it's, um – it's been influenced, um – oh, they've included it because it – the intrusive noise criteria – the 15 minute criterion, um, is – is the lower - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - and it's, um – it's not necessary to – to calculate out the – the whole night time.

DR WILLIAMS: The whole night time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, right, mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: Whereas, in the one above - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

MR RITCHIE: - - - um, the – numerically, a 44 in a 15 minute period - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .....

MR RITCHIE: - - - um, is – is equivalent, um, or higher than 41 - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Mmm.

MS MILLAR: .....

MR RITCHIE: - - - in a period sense.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: So they're around about similar.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: Um, there's about a three decibel conversion between a 15 minute and a - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

MR RITCHIE: - - - and a nine hour night.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

MR RITCHIE: So, um, they're both numbers, but numerically they mean different things - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - but they're about the same.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: Um, whereas, in the other case, the 37 is by far and away the more stringent criteria .....

DR WILLIAMS: Mmm, mmm, thanks. Sorry, just the other question, um, and it's very much related to – I – I – I – I, you know, note that the – what you said about the noise levels that the project's likely to ..... well below the – the industrial noise policy and -but that – and that's the level that, um, the EPA is seeking to impose in the, ah, condition. Um, I'm just trying to reconcile all the various noise tables in the assessment report with the table in the conditions of consent, and I'm just trying to reconcile the fact the fact that, ah, what are the – the existing noise levels, perhaps, in each of these criteria – what's proposed by the – by the – by the applicant – and, I presume, what's proposed by the applicant is identical to what's on here, or is there a difference? I'm just trying to get a – what are the differences between those particular three aspects?

MR RITCHIE: The – the applicant has calculated, in accordance with the noise policy, the noise levels that – that, um, they are entitled to - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR RITCHIE: - - - and those noise levels are somewhat higher than the noise levels here.

DR WILLIAMS: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: And the reason being is – is that although the industrial noise policy does not say, um, that you have to - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - ..... lower levels. it says calculate the levels through this process – and that's what the applicant has done. However, it ..... been EPA policy that if your predictions are lower than what you're entitled to - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - um, they tend to just want to give you what you've predicted you can meet.

DR WILLIAMS: Right. So that's – that's closer to the – the predicted, um, noise levels - - -

MR RITCHIE: These levels reflected here will be the – consistent with the highest levels that are predicted, ah, in either of those two noise catchments.

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR RITCHIE: They're the highest levels. In most cases receivers in those two areas, um, will be less than those - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

MR RITCHIE: - - - but – and under the worst circumstances of adverse meteorology - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - that is the highest levels that – that the proponent has predicted they will be.

MR PARNELL: ..... but just well within the industrial noise policy.

MR RITCHIE: Yeah. For example, um, the – the Erskine Park site, which is – is 37 decibels, um, I think they're entitlement might be 41 or 42, but they've only predicted that they will be 37. So the EPA has recommended that we set levels of 37 rather than give them - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Sure.

MR RITCHIE: - - - more head room of 41 – which they don't need.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: And overall, in the whole scheme of things, once the whole, um – the – the whole industrial estate is – is occupied, um, that may give, um, the ability for a nosier industry to take up some of that - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MR RITCHIE: - - - additional room that's left headroom at the top - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Sure. Okay ..... thank you.

MR RITCHIE: - - - of which there is – sorry. Chris from planning.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry. Thank you.

MR RITCHIE: Of which there is a resource recovery facility proposed, just to the immediate south of the site.

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: But, in response to the question that you have, we'll come back with a simple explanation of what's there now, what's proposed, what does the policy allow, just to try and give that contextualised in a simple format.

MS MILLAR: Yeah, that would be very helpful - - -

MR PEARSON: Yeah, it would be helpful .....

MS MILLAR: - - - with a – a table - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yep.

MS MILLAR: - - - or something like that, uh, to just - - -

MR PEARSON: Yeah .....

MS MILLAR: - - - lay that out.

MR RITCHIE: ..... mmm, but I would say – and you can get this from the noise - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Thanks, Chris.

MR RITCHIE: - - - um – the noise impact assessment, that, if you look at the notes of when attended monitoring was done, in most cases the site was inaudible – and that's consistent with my dealings many years ago, when most people, um, in, ah, those ..... of Erskine Park and, um, to the north, they actually didn't realise that there was an operation there – which has been there since the 1950s.

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR RITCHIE: So you can – you can hear it, but you have to try.

DR WILLIAMS: Sure.

MS MILLAR: Okay. And that is then still the same when we're talking about those, um, night time, um, key intrusiveness periods.

MR RITCHIE: Particularly so now that, um – the increase in traffic noise in – in around those areas. The area is quite dominated by traffic. Obviously, Erskine Park is - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Mmm, mmm, mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - substantially quieter than – than it is up to – Minchinbury?

MR PARNELL: Yep.

MR RITCHIE: Minchinbury. But, um, it's still relatively quiet and I would hazard that, yes, you may be able to hear it outside, but I would not think that you ever be able to hear it if you were inside at night, would be – be my – my guess, for most residences.

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR RITCHIE: So Chris again, from planning. We'll just quickly touch on some broader other issues – and, in terms of, ah, traffic coming to the site, um – as I mentioned before, in terms of the amount of material coming to the site, that's not necessarily, ah, changing, um, but what may change is the amount of material transported through the – the night time period – and we will respond with some details on what sort of broader operations occur in the WSEA, but from a traffic generation point of view, given its location being within a large employment, ah, industrial precinct, we don't see that the traffic coming of a night time would be, ah, a significant issue – and – and ideally, in these situations, you do want to get this traffic off the road, through the evening, anyway, to, ah, lessen the impact on, ah, the general peak traffic periods.

Odour – as I mentioned before, it's not a protrusible landfill. So we don't see there being a significant, ah, increase in odour. The ..... and general performance and management of the site, ah, we're comfortable that that can continue to be met, um – and that concludes our presentation from our assessment point of view.

MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you, Chris. Um, you've certainly touched on a number of the questions that we had flagged, I think, in the preliminary, um, agenda. One area we haven't touched on is whether there was any consultation with the New South Wales Health – Health, during the modification request. Um, yes, was – was there any communication with them and have they provided any advice or inputs with respect to the air quality impacts?

MR RITCHIE: So – Chris from planning. My – my understanding is we did not directly consult with Health on this project. From a general engagement point of view, when – for my style of projects, I would talk to New South Wales Health when there is a key emission issue, such as, ah, energy from waste project. On that sector, we do coordinate our assessment, as a group, with the EPA, with Health and ourselves, because there are potential issues around human health risks that we need to look at. From a project that may, ah, have internalised health related issues for employees - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - we definitely do consult with Health on those types of projects – and that includes projects that might deal with smelting - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - or dealing with metals, for instance, but generally speaking we don't necessarily talk to Health with these types of projects. Now, I did have a conversation with Health, after I saw this question, ah, recently, and their position is that they like to be engaged on a case by case basis. So, if the IPC would like me to, I can go and ask them for a specific comment on this particular modification.

MR PARNELL: We'll take that on notice, I think, yep - - -

MR RITCHIE: All right.

MS MILLAR: Notice, mmhmm.

MR PEARSON: - - - and come back to you.

MS MILLAR: Okay, um – now, we briefly touched on the operating profile of the chute. Um, has much consideration been given to how that profile and operation will – in terms of operation, will change as a result of this, um, and it's capacity to potentially handle additional volumes?

MR RITCHIE: Um, I'll ask Bianca – Chris again, from planning, to jump in as well, but I – my understanding is I don't see the, um – a lot of change in terms of the operation of the chute, um, bearing in mind that the primary change with the application is putting more material directly to the landfill - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - but in the context of the ..... road being identified as a key, ah, generator of air, we note that the continued function and use of that chute is important to minimise the reliance, um, on the ..... road – and what we've for in the conditions is more, again, an update in terms of ensuring that the chute is maintained and operated to its best, um, efficiency and ability. Um, Bianca, is there anything else that you want to add on – add to that?

MS THORNTON: Um, you summarised it well. We didn't anticipate any change ..... its, um – especially because ..... the additional waste would be .....

MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you for that. Um, now, just in terms of the, um, assessment report, um, table 3 talks, um – so this is on page 17 of the assessment report. Um, talks about the landfill receiving material via truck, and the proposed hours of operation being 5 am to 9 pm. Um, then in the paragraph underneath that table, headed: Project proponent justification, um, it talks about the, um, proponent requesting extension to operational hours, ah – operational hours, to allow the acceptance of waste from night time roadworks and other large scale infrastructure projects. Um, is – I'm just – just to clarify ..... the proponent is not seeking to, um, receive material, via truck, to the landfill, outside of those 5 am to 9 pm hours, is that correct, or are they looking to extend that?

MR RITCHIE: Ah, Chris from planning. Bianca, can you clarify that?

MS THORNTON: Yep. So night time works, um – material that would be received isn't necessarily ..... landfill material. It might be material that's going to the MPC or – so that's the material processing centre, or to the segregated waste area, um, where it might be stored and then later sent to landfill, or it would be processed – and then the residuals would either go down the chute, to the landfill, or be crushed ..... later on, during the hours in which you're allowed to do that.

MS MILLAR: Okay. So - - -

DR WILLIAMS: So – so material will be received at the landfill, by the chute ..... hours, but – but not – but not by truck?

MS THORNTON: Ah, yes.

DR WILLIAMS: That's .....

MS MILLAR: Yes, okay.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry. Thanks.

MS MILLAR: No. That's good ..... thanks – thanks, Peter.

MR RITCHIE: I did have a - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .....

MR RITCHIE: I did have a photo of the chute, on my phone, if you want to have a look -and I can send that separately as well, just to contextualise - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - from a noise point of view and proximity to – I did have a video, but I have deleted it, but - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Mmm.

MR RITCHIE: And, as you can see, from a – what goes down there. It's not, like, heavy fractions.

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: It's a lot lighter than, um - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: - - - you may suspect - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MR RITCHIE: - - - and the actual distance it's going to the base of the - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .....

MR RITCHIE: - - - is not very – it's not very high; if that makes sense?

DR WILLIAMS: So the PM2.5 impacts will all occur, um, between 7 am and 10 pm. The contribution – the extra contribution of PM2.5 will only occur between 7 am and 10 pm.

MR RITCHIE: I think, as a – Chris from planning. I probably have to take that away. I – I'm not sure I can be that specific about what's going to contribute ..... I think it's from a more, er, broader site point of view, um - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. And when the applicant says the ..... road is being used 24/7, listening to now it sounds to me like the ..... road is not being used between 10 pm and 7 am.

MR RITCHIE: And I'm sure that's right. Bianca?

MS THORNTON: Yeah, um, in terms of what they're approved to do and what they've asked for this Mod ..... be using the ..... shouldn't be using the ..... roads, unless there just relocating equipment. That's my only guess for that.

MR RITCHIE: But my – what I – what I would offer is that we all come back and - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yep.

MR RITCHIE: - - - probably, articulate that in a bit more detail - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: - - - in terms of those hours and what activities will occur when.

MS MILLAR: Yep, okay, and we can raise that with the applicant - - -

MR RITCHIE: Mmm.

MS MILLAR: - - - when we meet - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

MS MILLAR: - - - with them, as well. Um, now, I think that covers all of the questions that I had on my list. Peter? Tony?

DR WILLIAMS: Just one other question. Chris, you're talking about the, um – the whole idea of sealing the road – and, presumably, asphalt or something like that. Um, is there any consideration of some alternative? Some binding agent or – to - - -

MR RITCHIE: Um, I mean, the other option would be concreting - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR RITCHIE: - - - the site, but from a ..... alternate point of view, I'll have to - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MR RITCHIE: - - - probably, take that away.

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MR RITCHIE: Um, and one of the keys in terms of, um, sealing the site would be the ability to sweep it up or – or keep it wet.

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: So there might be benefits in terms of some type of sealing versus – versus others, but - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - as I said before, the applicant has said there's – there quite confident that they will have some innovation to really - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: - - - reduce that.

DR WILLIAMS: Yep.

MR RITCHIE: Um, and, ideally, that – as part of that independent audit, by getting someone, fresh in, who's independent from the site - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

MR RITCHIE: - - - to look at everything. So, to me, it probably is something that's not off the table, looking at other options or sealing the site – and if you notice, in the consent, it's something we did say: For example, options to seal the site - - -

MS MILLAR: Mmhmm.

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR RITCHIE: - - - or seal the ..... road.

DR WILLIAMS: Right, okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks.

MS MILLAR: Tony, anything further?

MR PARNELL: ..... I'm fine. Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Look, um, thank you – thank you very much, to – to you all, for joining us today and providing us with that very very useful walk through the assessment report. Um, so, from here, I understand that there are a few areas that the

department will come back to us with, um, some further information – and we look forward to receiving that. Um, and, with that, I will close the meeting. Um, so, for the purposes of the transcript, the meeting is now closed.

ADJOURNED **[11.21 am]**