

MEETING NOTES

Subject: Boral Deer Park Community Liaison Committee meeting

Location: Boral Deer Park Quarry Training Room, Riding Boundary Road, Ravenhall

Date & Time: 6 August 2014 – 5pm

Minutes: Paul Jackson, Stakeholder Relations Manager (Southern Region), Boral Property Group from the notes taken by four Boral employees present

Attendees:

1. **Wendy Bitans** – Neighbouring resident
2. **Frances Carabott** – Neighbouring resident
3. **Lorraine Harrison** – Brimbank City Council
4. **Mirjana (Mia) Marevic** – Caroline Springs resident
5. **Mick & Margaret Hewitt** – Caroline Springs residents
6. **Geoff Gilbert** – Department of State Development, Business and Innovation
7. **Steve Finlay** – Melton City Council
8. **Cr Nola Dunn** – Melton City Council
9. **Sam Muscat** – Deer Park resident
10. **Peter Batur** – Hoppers Crossing resident
11. **Sharon Lee** – Taylors Hill resident
12. **Anita Lusetti** – Resident
13. **Marion Martin** – Deer Park resident
14. **Shagun Saini** – Caroline Springs resident
15. **Robert McNaughton** – Neighbouring resident
16. **Tom Meskos** – Deer Park resident
17. **Chris Bydder** – Environment Protection Authority
18. **Lisa McLeod** – Environment Protection Authority
19. **Alistair Nairn** – Environment Protection Authority

Boral personnel:

- **Richard McCarthy** – General Manager, Boral Waste Solutions
- **Jason Parr** – Quarry Manager, Boral Deer Park Quarry
- **Darren Gregory** – Operations Manager, Boral Western Landfill
- **John Stewart** – Compliance Officer (Environmental), Boral Western Landfill
- **David Karstens** – Plant Manager, Boral Deer Park Asphalt
- **Paul Jackson** – Stakeholder Relations Manager (Southern Region), Boral Property Group

Apologies:

- **Joe Carabott** – Neighbouring resident
- **Andrew Antipas** – Local resident and business owner

MEETING NOTES

The following notes are taken from presentations and conversations conducted as part of this community meeting. The content, while representing an accurate summation of proceedings, should not be taken to represent exact dialogue unless specifically minuted as such.

Meeting notes are reviewed at the start of each meeting to identify any items in need of correction.

Meeting opened – approximately 5:05pm

1. Welcome and apologies

Paul Jackson (PJ) welcomed everyone and gave thanks on behalf of Boral for everyone's time. PJ noted there were a number of new attendees in the room and gave a brief explanation of the purpose and function of the CLC.

In doing so, PJ made reference to the CLC's Terms of Reference which had been adopted by the Committee in 2012. Copies were provided to all at the meeting in addition to the agenda and meeting notes from the previous meeting.

PJ then introduced all Boral personnel present including **Richard McCarthy (RMcC)**, General Manager of Boral Waste Solutions; **Darren Gregory (DG)**, Operations Manager at the Boral Western Landfill; **Jason Parr (JP)**, Boral Deer Park Quarry Manager; **David Karstens (DK)**, Boral Deer Park Asphalt Manager; and **John Stewart (JS)**, Compliance Officer with the Western Landfill.

Apologies were offered on behalf of the Boral Deer Park Concrete business which was unable to supply a representative for the session. PJ then asked for any other apologies from community attendees with two recorded.

2. Previous meeting notes and matters arising

PJ then referred the meeting to the notes taken at the 13 March 2014, once again offering apologies for the delay in their issue. Ahead of taking any matters arising, PJ noted several matters for reporting back to attendees.

Attendees were reminded that at the previous meeting, the issue of the recording of non-Boral participant names was raised. As an action, PJ indicated he had written to those who had attended seeking permission for their names to be recorded in future meeting notes as agreed.

Only two responses were received to this request. Accordingly, PJ noted he would be happy to name the two individuals as appropriate, however the remaining attendees would be treated with anonymity.

It was also noted that due to comments made about the role of CLC attendees during the March meeting, PJ had included a copy of the CLC's Terms of Reference with the sending out of the last meeting notes. The intent was to alleviate any confusion about roles and responsibilities.

PJ then referred back to discussions from the previous meeting in relation to the recording of the notes at CLC meetings. Specifically, the 'tone' of the final meeting notes, the timeliness of their circulation, and the possibility of the provision of an independent note taker were re-raised.

To commence the discussion, PJ asked the regular CLC attendee who originally raised the issues to further elaborate for the benefit of new people in the room. It was explained there was a view the notes were often self-serving to Boral, and glossed over the context and intent of issues discussed.

MEETING NOTES

The attendee mentioned they thought the March meeting notes were an improvement on the previous, but asked what had been done in respect of organising an independent note-taker as was raised at the previous meeting.

PJ acknowledged that while this had been discussed, no actions had yet been taken by the business to arrange this. An undertaking was given to look into this again ahead of the next meeting. He further noted that at the last meeting, the EPA had committed to informing the meeting about whether this was a permit requirement at the Brooklyn landfill facility where a similar CLC is conducted. This information had not yet been provided.

The attendee commented that it might also be worth looking at an independent chairperson, notwithstanding the fact that they were happy with PJ's performance in this role. It was noted that there was evident difficulty with PJ chairing meetings and note-taking which was also affecting the timing of the production of notes.

PJ thanked the attendee for their confidence and explained the lengthy delays were the result of his own personal availability. With the breadth of his role requiring constant re-prioritising, production of meeting notes is often set aside for which he apologised.

Attendees were then asked for any other matters arising. The Brimbank City Council representative attending raised concerns that their input into the March meeting was not specifically captured in the meeting notes.

PJ apologised for this and undertook to rectify this upon a review of the handwritten notes taken at the March meeting. There being no other matters, the meeting progressed into operational business.

NOTE: A subsequent review of the handwritten notes revealed the contribution by the Brimbank City Council had not been separately noted. Accordingly, contact was made directly with Council's representative for clarification.

As a result, Council's representative requested the below be included:

Brimbank City Council representative requested that Boral prepare an Environmental Management Plan for the operation of the landfill which contains best practice targets and timelines to achieve the targets by the next meeting in November 2014.

Brimbank City Council representative also asked if the EPA would take into consideration the existing operation of the Boral landfill when considering the approval of new cells for the landfill which have planning approval under the existing planning permit.

3. Boral operational reports

a) Quarries

PJ then invited JP to present his update on activities at the Boral Deer Park Quarry. JP began by showing the meeting the usual results of blast and dust monitoring completed at the site, with all results once again well inside required limits.

JP also reported on environmental management activities which had taken place in the Northern Grasslands portion of Boral's landholding. For new attendees, it was explained the grasslands are a 90 hectare parcel of land afforded protection under agreement aligned to Federal legislation.

A Weed Management Plan for the grasslands has been developed by Aus Eco Solutions, the contractor engaged by Boral to manage the reserve. Some small burn offs have been undertaken during the past six months in north eastern corner of the plot.

MEETING NOTES

In addition to the grasslands, Boral has engaged a further contractor, Taylors Trees, to manage and control weeds on another 400 hectares of the company's land.

A question was asked about the type of sprays used for aerial weed management. JP explained that the contractor took responsibility for weed management and he was unsure of the specific compound used, however the spray was designed to target specific weed species such as needle grass and artichoke thistle.

A further question was asked about the risks of spreading these type of chemicals about in the air. JP informed attendees that the contractor only conducts aerial spraying in certain wind speed and direction conditions in accordance with safety procedures. Spraying is not permitted at other times.

Completing his presentation, JP mentioned that quarry deliveries to the Regional Rail Link Project had been completed; that crushing had been brought back to two nine-hour shifts, five days a week; fencing and buffer work in the south western corner of the site had been undertaken; and that site employee numbers were now at 51 Boral staff and 45 truck drivers.

JP also made reference to the proposal for the quarry's plant replacement program being at a concept stage. This included the determination of the new plant's location within the site to align with its specific requirements.

An attendee asked about quarry development and future progress in the south western sector of the Boral site. JP explained the quarry in that section was approaching its 'terminal' or final face.

A further attendee referred to a request previously made in respect to the CLC being shown a detailed diagram of the current pit, indicating the excavations completed to date, the depth of the quarry void at various parts, and so on. The diagram should show the areas which are fully completed and which will be developed in future.

In regard to future quarry development, JP mentioned the details were vague as planning is continuous and dependant on variables such as quality of rock, market demand and so on.

He confirmed, however, that the operations do not extract to the approved licenced depth due to the presence of ground water. This meant the average depth of the completed parts of the quarry pit is 10 to 13 metres. In terms of the water table, this is two to three metres above water table.

The breadth of the quarry is defined by the existing Work Authority boundaries.

It was clarified that what is sought by the CLC is a figure which simply documents the fully completed part of the quarry, the areas that are currently under progress, and where the future remaining area of extraction is situated.

JP replied by explaining that the variability of the rock quality has resulting effects on future extraction planning.

Another attendee asked whether any studies had been completed on where the water table begins under the surface.

JP responded by advising that as the water table is sited between the basalt flows, the level has variances. It was then asked what was the highest level at which the table started, whether any data was available on the levels and whether that data was public.

JP advised that the level was at a few metres below the surface at the quarry office, but completely different at the opposite end of the site. Boral has commissioned various studies over the years on the water table from consultants – JP said a check would need to be made with Boral management as to whether these studies were available for wider distribution.

MEETING NOTES

b) Asphalt

PJ then asked DK to present his update on behalf of the Boral Deer Park Asphalt operation.

DK ran attendees through various jobs which the site was supplying at present, as well as some of the statistics about the site's output and hours worked. He also mentioned that a new plant was being considered for the current financial year, with confirmation expected by Christmas.

DK then informed attendees of Boral's recent focus upon safety at the intersection of Riding Boundary and Christies Roads following the truncation of the former by the Regional Rail Link. A number of serious incidents have taken place at the new intersection since its opening.

Attendees were informed that at the design stage, Boral had made a submission to both the Regional Rail Link Project and VicRoads about the inadequacy of the layout for the type and number of vehicles accessing Boral's operations.

Since the occurrence of the incidents, Boral had commenced undertaking of improvement actions within its own lands to help improve visibility which is at the basis of most of the current issues. It had also sought assistance from various authorities with corrective measures at the junction.

An attendee asked how many accidents had occurred since the new arrangements were introduced. DK responded that two serious crashes had taken place at the intersection, and that Boral knew of further incidents on the Deer Park Bypass.

DK added that the waste vehicles involved in both of the Riding Boundary-Christies Road incidents were not at fault in either crash.

c) Landfill

DG was then invited by PJ to present his report from the Boral Western Landfill. DG began by informing attendees that the construction of segment 1 in cell 2M was now complete and awaiting the outcomes of the EPA review of the audit report. Segment 2 will be completed in late 2014.

Grass plantings on the cap have established well since March and tenders for the final Stage 2 capping have now been prepared for release. A tender for the site's new leachate management pond will also be released soon following a review of the pond design.

DG also told the meeting of the automation of the weighbridge at the Landfill, which had removed queuing out onto Christies Road. Asphaltting of the existing site entrance and a new light vehicle entry have also been completed since the previous meeting.

DG then overviewed incidences of litter escapes which had occurred on two separate occasions in July as a result of high winds. In the first incident, on 24 July, some 800 metres of the 6m litter catch fence had been damaged. Litter crews were deployed to the east and south of the site for clean up.

A second incident occurred on 31 July which again affected land to the east and south of the site. The clean up from this escape is continuing.

DG also informed attendees that Melton City Council had issued a Litter Abatement Notice to Boral during June in relation to the condition of Christies Road. A course of works was agreed to with Council which Boral is currently implementing.

As a result of the incidents, DG informed the meeting that additional mobile 6m litter catch nets were being constructed, while the business was looking at further improvements and extension of the 12m fences.

An attendee asked how far beyond Boral's boundary the clean ups extend when the litter crews are deployed.

MEETING NOTES

DG explained that all accessible public land surrounding Boral's precinct was cleaned up as soon as possible. Where private land was impacted, Boral makes effort to contact the property owner and, if access is granted, clean ups will be conducted as far as that property extends.

A question was asked as to how Boral contacts relevant landowners. DG indicated making phone calls was always a first preference, otherwise dropping a note in the property's letterbox seeking permission to access was an alternative. DG explained Boral did not have contact details for some of the vacant properties and was working to obtain the missing information.

Another question was asked as to whether Boral undertook letterbox note 'drops' when an incident occurred. DG replied that Boral did not – a comment was made that these would be effective.

A further comment was made by a Derrimut resident who said locals were being affected by rubbish in their yards and were not being contacted. As a result, litter crews should be sent to the area and notices should be left in letterboxes to keep residents informed.

The Brimbank City Council representative then asked both Boral and EPA representatives present whether the Landfill employed industry best practice. If so, a request was made for a presentation outlining the details.

The Council representative also asked whether infringements and other transgressions were taken into consideration when assessments were undertaken for licensing. It was requested the process for this be also included in the presentation.

A comment was made by an attendee that local media had reported Boral viewed the litter escapes as 'light'. It was suggested the incidents were not of this nature and were demonstrative of a major inability to contain litter to the site.

DG acknowledged that Boral knows litter escape is an issue and it is constantly working to address it. As an example, DG outlined a range of actions which were undertaken at the site once the onset of high winds was forecast, and mentioned the site closure once conditions had deteriorated.

An attendee suggested that Boral should look at the operations of a company called Wastewell which is able to contain litter within its operations without the need for fencing.

DG mentioned he was familiar with their operations and explained that Wastewell use a range of products to assist their containment strategy which were not suited to the large scale of Boral's landfill.

It was then asked whether Boral had received a fine for the latest incident. DG answered no penalty had been received. A question was asked of the EPA representatives as to what actions the organisation was taking.

The EPA representatives mentioned there had been two visits to the site since the latest incident and their investigations are ongoing.

The next question asked concerned whether Boral is using best practice in terms of litter containment. DG commented that the measures undertaken at the Landfill, such as placement of litter fencing high on the tip face, high catch fencing and material coverage, had been verified as best practice recently by visiting US waste industry experts.

A comment was made that it appeared only two mitigations which could be considered best practice were in place, but that they were not working. It was then asked what other measures Boral had tried.

DG raised that spray-on coverage had been tested but wasn't successful, adding that litter escape issues are generated from the point at which waste is tipped from trucks into the working face.

MEETING NOTES

An attendee then asked at what time the operations were closed during the conditions. DG explained the decision was taken and acted upon at 11.15am.

A question was then asked why Boral does not take a proactive approach based upon weather forecasts. For example, ceasing operations before wind speed increases to uncontrollable levels.

DG said the business was trying to improve in terms of being proactive in this way, however this needed to be done in balance with the site's contractual obligations to the various waste contractors accessing the site.

An attendee asked if the nets were subject to regular monitoring. DG said yes, although as reported some had been damaged in the incidents and were now being repaired.

An observation was made that while Boral had moved to clean up the private land to the south of the landfill, Boral's own land was still well covered with litter. With the height of the operations, the next wind would simply blow it all out again.

RMcC said Boral always cleaned up other properties first if there was an incident to remove the inconvenience from the owner and prevent further spread.

DG added that the mobile 6m fence was kept close to the tip face, and that the 'high' litter catch fences had been re-designed several times with improvements gained. He noted there was still more to do, however.

An attendee asked whether the tip face could be enclosed in any type of way. RMcC mentioned this had been looked at amongst many options, and that those which didn't have prohibitive restrictions were the ones pursued.

DG then updated the meeting on odour management efforts. Attendees were informed the EPA had issued Boral with a minor works Pollution Abatement Notice (PAN) for the surface condition of the landfill in February, however this had been revoked following the completion of required works.

A further minor works PAN and then an actual PAN have also been issued so far this year for emissions of landfill gas in the capped area of the site. Again, both notices have been revoked following the completion of required works.

DG raised that 15 additional gas wells had been installed in cells 2L and 2K, and that mobile and fixed odour neutralisation systems which target odours from freshly laid waste were being considered.

An attendee asked whether any perfuming agents were presently in use at site. DG explained that a product called 'Mask' was being used in the site's water cart, however recent use had been minimal.

DG then showed the meeting the results of the voluntary monitoring which is undertaken by Boral for its own purposes on a daily basis. He added that personnel involved had been trained to the existing Australian Standards for odour detection.

Of 1289 samples taken between 1 March and 18 July, Boral monitors noted 288 instances of odour. From these, 163 were regarded as green waste, 77 from landfill, 27 from asphalt and 21 from other sources.

The EPA representatives present were asked how their figures compared to Boral's. The response was that no confirmed instances of odour had been recorded in recent months, however they noted that there had been lots of northerly winds.

An attendee, in asking for a definition of 'other' odours, asked for the source of the food odours which were given as an example. DG mentioned they were aromas noticed from local restaurants during monitoring and as such were not 'odours' in strictest definition.

MEETING NOTES

A question was asked as to how Boral was capturing and recording green waste odour. DG explained that employees involved in monitoring were very familiar with the distinct nature of green waste odour as opposed to others.

A comment was then made that Boral was using the Pinegro operation as an excuse for its own odour emissions. This was denied by Boral staff present. Another comment was made that the odours the community experiences are from the landfill, not Pinegro.

Another question was asked as to whether the 'calibrated noses' being used for monitoring were independent of Boral. It was again explained the data was being captured by Boral for Boral's own purposes and was not part of any official requirement. All personnel are, however, trained to Australian Standards for odour detection.

DG then showed the meeting the number of external odour complaints received at the Landfill for the March-July period. Only one external complaint was received by the site for the period. In addition, one further complaint was received via the EPA. The EPA had conducted three site visits.

The EPA representatives attending were asked whether this data accorded with their figures. A response that they were broadly consistent was given. A further question was asked as to whether the EPA recommended the use of odour detection instruments by Boral for accurate monitoring.

The representatives responded by saying odour was a very specialised field, but that no equipment had been developed which was as indicative and reliable as the human nose.

A comment was made that there appeared to be a range of reliable and suitable odour monitoring equipment available in both the United States and Europe. The EPA were asked whether, as a result, they would put this type of equipment into use in Victoria, especially at Deer Park.

The representatives explained that the suitability of the equipment would depend on the application for which it was being used. They further explained that the Australian Standard for odour detection was written on the basis of the internationally accepted standard.

A question was asked as to whether the employees involved in monitoring would be affected by sensitisation to landfill odour. DG explained monitoring was undertaken by employees prior to their arrival at the workplace to avoid this.

Another question was asked about the composition of 'Mask'. DG said he was unsure of the specific chemical make up, however the product is mixed with water. AN EPA representative asked why Boral would be bothering to use it – DG responded that Boral is willing to try everything at this stage.

The EPA representatives were asked another question in respect to conducting odour monitoring around the region in addition to calibrated noses to 'balance' the results. The representatives said the EPA are investigating their options in respect of this but no preferred path had yet emerged.

The EPA also offered that they are appointing an odour management expert later in the year.

An attendee noted that they had been complaining about odours for at least the past five years. They also noted that a few months ago, the odour was so severe that it began affecting their partner. They asked what the health impacts of odours like this are.

The EPA representatives said that there have been a number of studies conducted on the health impacts of odour. On present knowledge, there are no demonstrable health issues arising as a result of odour from sources such as landfills.

A comment was made that while there may not be any physical health issues from the odour, there were psychological related issues from having to bear the odours so frequently.

MEETING NOTES

The EPA were asked whether they could present a report to the next meeting on toxicology studies related to odours and a list of the equipment which could be deemed suitable in Victoria for odour monitoring.

A regular CLC attendee stated that walking along the boundary of the site, it is often easy to tell based upon the wind direction whether odours are coming from the Pinegro facility or from the landfill. The view was given that nine times out of ten, the odour can be attributed to the landfill.

Another attendee asked whether the odours generally issued from the capped areas or the working face. DG explained that odours from the capped areas should be at a minimum, and that repair work as a result of the recent EPA notices has been effective since being implemented.

The EPA representatives also added that the issues were discovered as a result of one of their inspections of the site, and that monitoring equipment has been installed to keep a check on any further issues arising.

A further attendee asked what happens to the gases collected within the landfill. DG explained that most was diverted toward the on-site biogas-to-energy plant which generates electricity for the national grid. The remainder is 'flared' in accordance with licensing conditions.

A comment was made that the odours were not like those normally associated with decomposition, but were rather 'fresh' waste smells.

One last question was asked as to what sources were generally behind the 'fresh' waste odours. DG noted that any organic substances within the waste stream usually caused odours, however that these odours are not toxic in nature.

PJ then asked RMcC to offer an update on Boral's planning activities in support of extending the future airspace of the landfill.

RMcC began by confirming that Boral had decided not to proceed with an appeal of Melton City Council's refusal of its application through the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT).

Since the refusal, Boral has been reviewing Council's decision and has sought further feedback from the various regulators involved as well as the community. RMcC said there were consistent themes in the responses received, such as why is the application being made now?; Why is the proposal so big?; and can more detail about your plans be provided.

RMcC explained that once the decision not to appeal to VCAT had been made, Boral wanted to communicate same as quickly as possible to key stakeholders. This is why the confirmation was being made to the meeting.

To answer the question of 'why now?', RMcC explained that Boral sees the operation as being present for the long-term given the essential role it plays as part of Melbourne's waste management strategy.

An obvious change was needed with regard to engagement of the community, who need to be informed of the business' plans ahead of time. RMcC informed the meeting that an appeal through VCAT was felt by Boral to not offer the transparency or opportunities for community input which were needed for the matter.

Accordingly, RMcC informed attendees that Boral will instead seek to develop a new application for the future of the landfill. It would be framed based upon the feedback received from the community during the past six months and further input as the process continues.

In gathering the relevant information, RMcC said Boral would be making effort to ensure the concerns of all stakeholders, not just specific interest groups, were included and addressed as much as practical in the new application.

MEETING NOTES

RMcC also committed to the CLC to ensure that an appropriate and detailed presentation would be given to the group on the new application, ahead of any attempt to submit it to the relevant authorities.

In concluding, RMcC raised that the landfill is critical and essential infrastructure for not just the local community but the greater Western Melbourne area. That said, Boral wanted to be more open about the running of the site and, if it is required, special meetings of the CLC will be called to ensure details are not left to the 'ordinary cycle' of meetings.

A comment was made by an attendee that to properly engage with the community, Boral would need to meet with more than just the core CLC group. Proper consultation would need to be much broader and involve multiple communication channels rather than just making commitments to the CLC.

PJ indicated that Boral understood this and would certainly not be relying solely on interactions with the CLC and one or two meetings as the extent of consultation. He acknowledged there would need to be a comprehensive program, but that it would be aimed at discussing the landfill's future plans, not whether the landfill should be there at all.

Regular CLC attendee and long-time resident, **Marion Martin (MM)**, commented that she believed the community had been 'ripped off' through the establishment of the landfill to begin with. She also suggested this was continuing today with the emergence of the region as a growth corridor.

MM went on to explain that the original permits for the landfill had been granted at the time when Victoria's Local Government system was based upon appointed commissioners rather than elected Councillors. Accordingly, she believed the community of the time was denied a say.

Today, MM raised that people have bought into the area largely not knowing the landfill would have such an influence over their day-to-day lives. Despite the intentions of Boral in running the site, people were being left angry and disappointed.

RMcC acknowledged MM's comments and said the only answers he could offer was that the operation had a legitimately approved planning permit, and that the site is shown on a variety of Government and local planning documents as a state-significant industrial precinct.

RMcC also added that the best thing Boral could do was to work as hard as possible to achieve better outcomes as a result of continually improving performance, so that the issues affecting the surrounding community can be minimised.

The Brimbank City Council representative then suggested that in terms of developing the application, it might be better to align the consultation processes required for the new planning permit and the associated EPA Work Authority. Brimbank would be seeking to address both simultaneously.

A comment was made that Boral should be buying out affected property owners given the 'unintended' consequences.

A further comment was made that the site clearly couldn't manage what it was already allowed to do under its current approvals. Odours are passing well beyond the buffer zones. Boral should fix its current issues before even considering an expansion, as the effects are impacting local's lifestyles.

An attendee mentioned they had seen signs recently appear along the boundary fences of Boral's land which said the site would become a landfill. It was asked whether approval had in fact already been given by the EPA for the landfill to proceed.

RMcC explained this was not the case and that the signs were just placed to ensure passers-by know what the current use of the land is.

MEETING NOTES

A question was asked about the current size of the landfill and how much room is estimated to be left under the current approvals. RMcC indicated the landfill was presently at around 70-80 hectares in size and has around five years airspace remaining on current market trends.

A comment was made that the approval for the landfill was granted when the site was outside the Urban Growth Boundary and was not an identified growth zone. The area has since changed markedly and so locals want to know why the site can't be located elsewhere.

4. General business

To conclude the meeting, PJ then asked whether there were any items of general business, noting that he had one item submitted ahead of the meeting to share with attendees.

The item was a proposal developed by a regular CLC attendee which requested that Boral not seek any further permits to expand the landfill beyond the area historically approved. The request was made on the basis of unsatisfactory performance, particularly on odour management, and the site's location within a growth zone.

DG acknowledged the proposal and reaffirmed RMcC's earlier remarks that the business would be seeking to develop a new application with community input given the essential nature of the landfill to Melbourne's waste management system.

A number of attendees then asked that Boral's Chief Executive Officer be issued with a copy of the proposal. Further comments were made that locals would like the opportunity to address Boral's Chief Executive Officer on the effects of the site on their community.

PJ undertook to have the sentiments of the meeting relayed to the CEO's Office.

A suggestion was then made that an option for better engaging with the local community could be to partner with organisations like City West Water to provide better education programs, or to assist with tree plantings.

It was asked whether it would be possible for the newer CLC attendees to be given the opportunity to inspect the landfill in the near future. DG indicated this was possible and that Boral would come back to the group with suggested timing.

An attendee asked whether the Metropolitan Planning Authority had been in contact with Boral with respect to several new Precinct Structure Plans being introduced for lands around Boral's site. They wondered how much Boral had been involved in the process given potential effects on operations.

The attendee further commented that the new Plans would encourage residential development at much closer proximity to Boral than presently exists. It was noted the meetings about the Plans which the attendee had been present at did not include Boral representatives.

PJ informed the meeting that Boral was aware of the various Plans and, in the instance of the closest site, had tried to engage with the Authority about potential conflicting uses.

While these engagements had been limited, PJ assured the attendee that Boral was working on ensuring the Plan outcomes did not result in more issues for both the operations and future new residents.

Another attendee suggested that a committee of the type used to resolve community concerns about the Werribee Water Treatment Plant could be useful in respect to the landfill. This was noted.

Returning to raising awareness of the community's concerns with the senior management of Boral, an attendee commented that the CEO must understand the impacts the site was having on the local community as the people who live and work in the area 24 hours a day.

MEETING NOTES

The attendee referred to the Boral Group's values and mentioned the abject failure of the company to 'live' them with respect to the objective concerning respect for the communities in which Boral operates.

A number of comments were then made that if Boral was able to achieve a satisfactory resolution to its current main operational issues, namely the odours and the escape of litter, no-one in the community would be overly concerned about the landfill at all.

PJ then moved to close the meeting by informing residents about the work of Boral's corporate social partner, Conservation Volunteers Australia, during July with Derrimut Public School which had resulted in further improvements to the school's environmental learning areas.

PJ then thanked everyone for their attendance and input through what was a very lengthy meeting, then mentioned that the next session would return to a Thursday, being 13 November.

The meeting closed at approximately 8.30pm.