

Minutes

Meeting Date: Monday 2 November 2009

Time: 3.30pm – 5.00 pm

Location: Staff Room, Covenant Christian School, Belrose

Item	Issue	Action	By
	Welcome DW		
1	Minutes and apologies The minutes of the September meeting were approved with amendments Apologies were received from Brett Butler, Janet Fairlie-Cuninghame, Ron and Cynthia Patton, Charles Munro and Elizabeth Riley		
2	Business Arising A member asked to discuss propositions that have resurfaced regarding the future of the 10 Ha site		
3	PPC/RC Finalisation of Process CJ – WSN has incorporated feedback to date from the CAC. Lawyers have advised that an Historical Memorandum is the best way to include the history leading to the establishment of the PPC and RC. It is inappropriate to include the preamble within a legal document RS – the two Historical Memoranda will be referenced in the PPC and the RC A decision was made to invite feedback from members regarding the memoranda, within two weeks from the meeting date A member requested background information regarding the community's agreement that allowed the landfill height increase in exchange for public ownership of the 10Ha site.		
ACTION	A member requested WSN include a paragraph regarding the 10Ha for height increase trade-off. CJ - once feedback has been addressed the documents would go to Council to be signed off, and then lodged with the Land Title Office. If accepted it will go ahead. If it is not accepted and there are any significant changes required WSN will inform the CAC. A member noted that she remains convinced that a PPC would be preferable to a RC on the 10Ha site		
3.1	The Future Use Concept Plan CJ reported that WSN is looking at the future use of the site from technical, safety and environmental perspectives – understanding what passive activities are possible WSN CEO Ken Kanofski is concerned about 3 aspects:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety, technical/maintenance and environmental issues 		

Item	Issue	Action	By
3.2	<p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That if a third party was involved, that group would need to have a significant credentials including insurance • That the community is comfortable with the final decision CJ suggested that the CAC would be canvassed on preferred type of activity, and that could entail a walk-through of the site at the December meeting to consider the options Process after this would be to present a draft Future Use Concept Plan to the group which would illustrate the possibilities A member noted that he felt the enhancement fund should not be touched CJ responded that a budget would be part of the Concept Plan; the costs of the different uses would be shown in the budget A member asked about the nature of the consultation CJ responded that consultation would happen along the way, it was not finalised and that depending on what future uses are possible it could involve wider community consultation after February. A member asked whether there would be a call for Expressions of Interest for future uses CJ responded that once a suitable activity had been identified it could be put out to tender if the future use was suitable. DW noted that the community would have a good opportunity to discuss the option, and once this process was complete, it would be taken forward with Council A member enquired about the timeframe CJ responded that consultation with the CAC would happen until February, and after that, depending on what was proposed, wider community consultation might be considered JP introduced SH who is managing the development of the concept plan and speaking with Council. SH will be attending the December and February meetings DW acknowledged WSN for doing its homework, giving an open forum and designing option based on community feedback </p> <p>Indexation of the Enhancement Fund</p> <p> CJ noted that WSN has a commitment to resolving this problem. A thorough search has not revealed any signed agreement on this but if the 180 000 tonnes of extra landfill proceeds, it will be indexed at \$4.53/tonne and by July 2010 will come to the same figure as the community could have expected if contributions had always been indexed. This would be roughly \$3.49 million dollars, depending on interest rates over this period and how quickly the tonnes are landfilled. Conceptually WSN is trying to deliver the figure that would have been arrived at through future contributions based on the additional 180 000 tonnes. A member requested that the minutes record thanks to WSN for the goodwill in this matter and its attempt to mitigate the impacts of the additional landfill DW wished to record appreciation of JD's continual championing of </p>		

Item	Issue	Action	By
ACTION	<p>this issue</p> <p>A member asked for confirmation that the amount was not going to come from ratepayers</p> <p>CJ responded that it would come out of the gatefee and as such would be WSN's pockets</p> <p>A member asked how this would be secured</p> <p>CJ responded that it would possibly be in the form of a letter from KK to the WSN CAC, should the proposed extra 180 000 tonnes of landfill go ahead</p> <p>A member asked if this was commensurate with other WSN sites</p> <p>DW responded that the fund was only in relation to the Belrose site as a mitigation in response to the proposed extra landfill</p> <p>WSN to ensure a letter from Ken Kanofski to the Belrose CAC confirming the new indexation, in the event that the extra landfill is realised</p>	WSN	When applicable
3.3	<p>The 10 Ha site Management Plan</p> <p>CJ reported that the last Environmental Assessment of this block of land was carried out in 1995 and that a new assessment should be performed to compare the state of the land then and now, enabling a management plan to be delivered that would address what is needed</p> <p>A member noted that the last EA was a biodiversity study and that given that a lot of rubbish would have blown in, the new study would not be along the same lines</p> <p>A member said that a new study would be appropriate.</p> <p>A member asked whether maintenance of the 10Ha site would come from the Enhancement Fund</p> <p>CJ responded that that would be appropriate</p> <p>DW noted that maintenance might only need to be peripheral</p>		
ACTION	<p>WSN to put together timeframe of consultation and assessment process, and dot point summary of scope of study</p> <p>A member asked whether consultation and the cost of the Environmental Assessment of the 10Ha site would come from the Enhancement Fund</p>	WSN	7 December
ACTION	<p>WSN to confirm whether or not cost of Environmental Assessment would come from the Enhancement Fund</p>	WSN	7 December
4	<p>Update on Operational and Environmental Matters</p> <p><i>(copies of the O&E Update were handed out)</i></p> <p>DD reported that the new Odour Management System ('deodoriser') would be commissioned this week</p> <p>A member asked whether smells would change</p> <p>DD responded that the main deodorising unit has a neutral smell but that there are some scents to try out</p> <p>A member asked about energy generation. WSN responded that energy is not used on site, it has to be sold to a commercial operator</p> <p>A member asked whether the whole site will be used for passive</p>		

Item	Issue	Action	By
4.1	<p>recreation CJ answered that the future concept plan would include the whole site, but that the site has steep sides and infrastructure that make some areas particularly tricky A member asked whether the capping will remain the responsibility of WSN post-closure CN responded that post-closure care of a closed site it would typically be the responsibility of WSN for a period of approximately thirty years. This included capping, four years after closure (for clarity, the repair of damage to capping caused by future use activities would be the responsibility of either the CEF or the third party group conducting the activity) MK reported back on Surface Water Monitoring and Dust Deposition. Noted that there have been 5 odour complaints since 7 August. DD pointed out that the deodoriser will take the human element out of the situation and may eventuate in better odour management.</p> <p>Community Feedback</p> <p>CN asked whether the CAC wants the graphic descriptions of odour complaints included in the Odour Monitoring in future. DW pointed out that it enables community members to identify their own comment. A member confirmed that it is good to have. A member noted that it made the process as transparent as possible and that it would be good if other organisations did the same A member asked whether it is better to call the EPA or WSN for a quick response to odour problems CJ responded that it is definitely better to call WSN as it removes another stage in the process and we can respond more quickly.</p> <p>Bushfire Management Plan Update</p> <p>DD led the group through the Plan, which was updated in February 2009. The Plan works in conjunction with the site Emergency Response Plan and will be submitted to, and reviewed by, the local branch of the Rural Fire Service. The Plan involves fuel reduction activities and WSN is looking at a mow and slash program. DD reiterated that no WSN employees are to put themselves at risk, instead the fire warden is to be notified. Out of hours, security is to notify emergency services, and the WSN contact. A member asked what the smallest number of employees is on site during the height of the holidays DD responded that there is a team of 6 during operating hours DW enquired if that was on public holidays as well DD that there are people on site every day – 3 on site, 3 in the office. Hours are different but they are on site. On Sundays there are 2 on site – however limited to opening hours. Member asked how 2 people could cope if a fire broke out DD responded that WSN employees are not trained fire-fighters and that emergency services would be called A member asked about the possibility of local residents assisting in</p>		

Item	Issue	Action	By
	fighting fires DW answered that this could have legal implications and that emergency services have a strict protocol PR noted that there will be new protocols in place shortly which will coordinate the whole of Australia. These will not be in place until the end of November		
6	WNS Governance Updates		
6.1	The Belrose Enhancement Fund The balance as at the end of October 2009 in the Belrose Enhancement Fund is \$2,200,345		
6.2	Sustainability Reference Group Update Nothing new to report		
7	Actions Management of the third area. This will be identified as the Transfer Station from now on. It is covered in every meeting in the Operations and Environmental Update section. DW – in recognising that the Transfer Station will remain operational the CAC would like to know what the future management strategy is going to be. This could be addressed in the Future Concept Plan		
ACTION	WSN to include updates on management of the Transfer Station under a standing heading in the Operations and Environment Update Report	WSN	For the next meeting onwards
	PREVIOUS ACTION CLOSED OFF Map delineating the areas under discussion The maps were shown at this meeting ACTION CLOSED OFF DECCW representative to forward any relevant information to <i>the National Parks and Wildlife Services?</i> A member asked whether it would be worthwhile to reapproach the NPWS with a view to this body managing or buying the 10Ha site A member noted that the NPWS should be approached once the EA has been done A member asked whether the 10Ha site could be visited during the site visit, but was informed that it could only be viewed from a low-flying helicopter WSN to send written responses addressing individual issues to each CAC member who sent in a submission ACTION CLOSED OFF		

Next meeting:	SITE TOUR - Monday 7 December at 3.30pm Meeting at 4.30 – 5.30 pm
	PLEASE WEAR STURDY CLOSED SHOES, LONG SLEEVED TOPS AND HATS
Venue :	Covenant Christian School, Belrose

Item	Action summary		
3	WSN to consider including a paragraph regarding the 10Ha for height increase trade-off in the historical memorandum	WSN	7 December
3	CAC members to provide feedback regarding the PPC and RC memoranda, within two weeks from the meeting date	CAC	19 December
3.2	WSN to issue a letter from Ken Kanofski to the Belrose CAC confirming the new indexation, in the event that the extra landfill is realised	WSN	No set timeframe
3.3	WSN to put together timeframe of consultation and Environmental Assessment process, and dot point summary of scope of study	WSN	7 December
	WSN to confirm whether or not cost of Environmental Assessment would come from the Enhancement Fund	WSN	7 December
4.1	Response regarding community notification in the event of fire	WSN	7 December
7	WSN to include the usual updates on management of the Transfer Station under a standing heading in the Operations and Environment Update Report	WSN	For the next meeting onwards
7	Follow up on suggestion to re-approach NPWS re: taking over 10ha	WSN	After environmental assessment