

MRL – Landfill Ops response - Health

Refer also to the evidence of Aleks Todoroski in relation to dust and odour, and to the odour section of the response to submissions

Submission	Quotes	Response
<p>MRL00003</p>	<p>I and my family thoroughly object the proposed landfilling due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Especially the health hazards imposed by this on my child and wife (they are asthmatic patients) 	<p>See witness statement of Aleks Todoroski that deals with dust and odour.</p> <p>The EPA regulates the site and as part of its regulatory role the EPA protects human health and wellbeing through its laws and activities as part of the broader environmental portfolio. Human health issues are part of the EPA's consideration of applications for the extension. Other government departments, such as the Department of Health, also have a role in considering the applications.</p> <p>The EPA's design requirements for landfills ensure that risks of materials escaping from the site, through leachate, gas, odour, windblown litter and other means are mitigated and controlled. The MRL extension applications include best practice landfill gas capture and treatment to mitigate risks to health from landfill gas.</p>
<p>MRL00009</p>	<p>We have lived in this area since 2005, and the change in air quality has been noticed in the last few years. As a parent of two children with respiratory issues, I have grave concerns over the expansion of the current facility. In fact, with the current poor management of the tip and air quality issues, it would best be entirely closed.</p>	<p>See witness statement of Aleks Todoroski that deals with dust and odour.</p>
<p>MRL00010</p>	<p>Property values will be affected not to mention the smells and health hazards.</p>	<p>There is no evidence of property values decreasing. The landfill started operating in the</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
		late 1990s, before much of the housing in the vicinity was established. The landfill extension will be at least 1km from residential developments. For odour matters see witness statement of Aleks Todoroski that deals with dust and odour
MRL00011	Totally opposed to expansion due to... type of waste 'contaminated', health dangers to surrounding residents...	See responses above.
MRL00013	A land fill site should be far away from the health of kids. If the govt want to dump the rubbish in a big hole there is a few near Morwell, which are currently killing off the local population at such an alarming rate, there will eventually be little opposition.	See responses above.
MRL00024	From a health point of view, the bad smell that is emitted from the current landfill is toxic to our bodies. Our health will be compromised further if the landfill expanded to less than a km away from my property.	See responses above.
MRL00025	On many occasions, I had to return home from jogging around Cobblestone Park because I felt sick from the smell. We finally learned that rubbish was being dumped in the Boral Quarry and had been for some years.	See response above.
MRL00033	10) The government has banned people smoking inside vehicles with children inside, why ? for obvious reasons, well this is no different, you need to see it the same way !!!	See response above.
MRL00036	My object is based on health concerns, as a resident of Caroline Springs, located near Ballarat Road, you can already smell the odour from the landfill in summer.	See response above.
MRL00037	We live a very short distance from the site. I worry for my family and friends especially my three young children. What toxic waste will they be breathing in. It's bad enough that there is already a landfill there now.	See response above.
MRL00038, MRL00039,	Kids also complain the smell makes them sick to the point where we can't have windows open during summer and they can't play outside.	See response above.

Submission	Quotes	Response
MRL00041, MRL00042		
MRL00038, MRL00039, MRL00041, MRL00042, MRL00043	New train station is built too close to the Tip and commuters will be exposed to not only smell but any gases escaping	See response above. See also the information in the works approval application regarding the capture of landfill gas.
MRL00040	As being a property owner and having lived in Deer Park for 12 years since the year 2000 before moving to Hillside in 2014, I have great concerns for the health and well being of all residents living in the surrounding area around the proposed Ravenahall tip expansion site.	See response above.
MRL00044	<p>...we are talking about human health not only today and the future, we are talking about our children and our childrens children.</p> <p>...</p> <p>This will destroy our soil and and our health. To me this is about the dollars not the health of the community, there are already problems at different sites around the country and this is going to create mega problems not only for the company but also for the government in the future . STOP THE TIP PEOPLE HEALTH IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ IF THE GOVERNMENT IS TRUELY HERE FOR THE PEOPLE PROVE IT . CHOOSE OUR HEALTH MORE THAN THE \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$.</p>	See response above.
MRL00049	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who & what are the governing bodies assessing the current health risks? - What are & have been the long terms studies behind this proposal behind previous landfill tips? - I've heard that there are back door deals being made with the labor government specifically Daniel Andrews the premier of Vic as the state stands to profit from this initiative. Is Money that important that we put our our children & peoples lives at risk? This is a form of manslaughter if deaths, sickness or illness occurs from it & someone needs to be made accountable if this goes ahead. <p>...</p>	See response above.

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>- I've also been informed that the wildlife, birds & people living close to the lakes have already suffered & wildlife have died, isn't this already a clear sign that the tip should be closed down today let alone expanding it?</p> <p>...</p> <p>- We don't know the long term effects that this tip could do in terms of effecting the community's health especially our children. There has been no long term study of previous tips that have closed down in the past in Melbourne & what the long terms effects on the community/children have been post 20-30 years of the tip being closed.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Is Money that important that we put our our children & peoples lives at risk? This is a form of manslaughter if deaths, sickness or illness occurs from it & someone needs to be made accountable if this goes ahead.</p>	
MRL00051	Apart that, health concerns with current and future expansion.	See response above.
MRL00057	I have grave concerns for the residents' health (resulting from odour leaks, landfill gas migration, stormwater run-offs, etc). I believe that an expansion of the existing landfill should not be approved for the health and well-being of the existing (and future) residents.	See response above.
MRL00060	To approve these plans, the surrounding communities will suffer, our health and well-being will decline, our homes will depreciate and devalue; our lives and our children's lives will suffer psychological damage. If we can smell the landfill, what are we breathing? What is in the air that we cannot smell or see?	See response above.
MRL00064, MRL00075, MRL00091	<p>Trucks fuelled by diesel are notorious polluters because they emit both large and small particulates. The PM 2.5 particulates are so fine that they pass directly into the blood stream. They pose a threat to heart and lung health and are a known carcinogen. These fumes also pose an unacceptable health threat to vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly and those with existing respiratory illness.</p> <p>That's not the type of air quality that families want especially for their children. Clean air is a community right.</p>	See response above. See also the witness statement of Steven Hunt (on traffic).

Submission	Quotes	Response
<p>MRL00065</p>	<p>In considering the risks posed by landfills one must assess their impacts on human health. While numerous studies sponsored by various resident action groups clearly show increased health risks, the studies conducted by authorities seem to cast doubts on such findings. However, there appears to be a growing body of independent evidence indicating that living within a few kilometers of a large landfill does produce measurable increases in health risk. The most recent research published in the International Journal of Epidemiology in Oxford (see ref 1) illustrates a significant increase in respiratory diseases (consistent with the previous research) and a possible risk of lung cancer for people living within 5km of a large landfill.</p>	<p>See response above and the various materials available on the EPA website, including materials regarding Tullamarine and the Suez landfill in Hallam Rd, Lynbrook which consider human health risks from landfills.</p> <p>A literature review by RMIT for the Victorian EPA in 2013 regarding Air Emissions from Non-Hazardous Landfills (available on EPA website) concluded “This review of current information on the emissions and health effects of living near a non-hazardous waste landfill shows that living near a well-controlled landfill does not have an adverse effect on the health of near-by residents. However, living near a landfill may have an influence on well-being because landfill odours are unpleasant.” The MRL extension has been designed to mitigate the risk of odour – see Aleks Todoroski witness statement. Also the landfill gas capture and treatment proposed for the landfill will mitigate against health risks.</p> <p>The research referred to by the submitter is a study that we understand to be based on a region where there are multiple landfills very close together and using old operating standards (pre 1996 and so before the EU Landfill Directive) and that the landfills were not compliant with the EU directive even in 2012. The paper referred to uses theoretical modelling of H2S in air (rather than air measurements) to work out exposure to people near the landfills. This paper connects respiratory illness to these landfills but does not confirm any link with cancer. The paper refers to other studies in England and Wales that have different findings. The landfills in the Lazio region are not</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
		comparable to the existing landfill or proposed extension at Ravenhall, in terms of the landfill type, the design and controls to reduce emissions.
MRL00068	<p>I am a Consultant Psychiatrist working in the community of Caroline Springs for the last 13 years and Victorian Correctional Mental Health Services for nearly 20 years. I am the senior Consultant in Psychiatry at the Port Philip Prison for the last 18 years. I am also an Independent Medical Examiner for WorkSafe Victoria. Neighbours spoke to me in distress, expressing concern about the largest toxic dump opening at the entry to Caroline Springs in Ravenhall. They were overwhelmed by fear of many adverse effects from such a facility at their doorstep. Since then I made some inquiries to learn that recent road works in the vicinity of Ravenhall were not regional railway project activity, as Caroline Springs residence were allowed to believe but infrastructure for an enormous expansion of a toxic dump. Public has been kept in the dark until it is too late.</p> <p>As a responsible Medical Practitioner I wish to bring to your attention that the stake holders are many and are not restricted to the residence of Caroline Springs. I share the concerns about the impact of health and well-being of the local community. Sliding property value would be only a second issue compared to longterm physical and mental health impact on the local communities surrounding Ravenhall. Communities include young and aspiring population in Caroline Springs, Ravenhall, Derrimut, Laverton North, Tarneit, Rockbank and other neighbouring communities.</p> <p>There would be about 4000 prisoners and thousands of correctional service employees who would have to put with the stench and toxic effects of toxic gases, fires emitting toxic fumes (vandalism is extremely high in area and firebugs would be in plenty), water pollution and soil pollution.</p> <p>I cannot imagine how humans and animals in the area would behave when (not if) they have to put up with stress of constant stench of toxic gases waxing and waning depending on the wind in the area.</p> <p>It would not take much to aggravate majority of prisoners, especially the youth.</p>	<p>See response above.</p> <p>Recent roadworks relate to the train station, not the landfill or the proposed extension.</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>I would hate to see four prison riots in one locality. They have nothing to lose. The victims would not be the politicians or managers but hard working and struggling prison officers. As a result apart from physical health, mental health of prisoners and prison employees would escalate. In my capacity as an Independent Medical Examiner, I have seen employers having to take liability for the impact of cigarette smoke and bushfire smells at their workplace, though the employer had no control over what was happening outside their premises. It is how the law work. Just imagine how the smells and toxins would impact on the WorkCover bills and compensation bills at these prisons and emerging businesses in the local area.</p> <p>Irrespective of the physical health impact, the emotional health impact of the communities in the local area would be enormous. These are young communities with children and high mortgages. The impact of loss in value of their properties would be too much for most of them to cope. Depression is not an illness to be trivialised. I wish to know whether the Melton Council and the Minister concern has had a comprehensive assessment of the location of this dump. Have you sought the opinion of the Chief Medical Officer, Chief Psychiatrist, WorkSafe, Department of Correctional Services, Management of local prisons, employee representative like trade unions, Justice Health, local businesses, schools and occupational health representatives. If you have not, I earnestly request you to seek professional opinion of these people.</p>	
<p>MRL00069, MRL00070, MRL00071</p>	<p>Diesel is not a clean fuel. Diesel fuelled trucks are notorious polluters because they emit both large and small particulates. Particulates in the PM 2.5 range are so fine that they pass directly into the blood stream. These particulates pose a threat to heart and lung health and are a known carcinogen. These fumes also pose an unacceptable health threat to vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly and those with respiratory illness. Families want clean air for their children and loved ones not polluted air. Clean air is a community right.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
<p>MRL00074</p>	<p>I have been advised that the fountain located at the entrance to the Caroline Spring estate (corner of Christies Road and Ballarat Road) has been turned off by the Melton Shire Council due to an increase in eye infections caused by the spray of water in which the birds are washing and feeding.</p> <p>...</p>	<p>See response above.</p> <p>See the EPA's website, 'Tullamarine Archive' for the reports, including with the Cancer Council, that do not find evidence of a 'cancer cluster'. MRL does not take the same type of waste that</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>Cleanaway has been involved with several other tips where health issues have been raised. Article from The Herald Sun, titled 'Group fear cancer hub around Tullamarine tip' dated 13 May 2010, outlines 74 deaths and a cancer cluster in the area surrounding the tip which residents believe has been caused by the tip.</p>	<p>the Tullamarine landfill took during its operation, and is a far superior operation in terms of design and compliance with today's BPEM requirements.</p>
<p>MRL00084</p>	<p>To have odours or emissions travelling through the air causes health issues to the public.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
<p>MRL00089</p>	<p>Victoria's EPA acknowledges that</p> <p>"Landfill sites are pretty ugly. And it's not just the sight of increasing piles of waste that's the problem. There are many negative issues associated with landfill . . . Many materials that end up as waste contain toxic substances. Over time, these toxins leach into our soil and groundwater, and become environmental hazards for years"</p> <p>(http://environmentvictoria.org.au/content/problem-landfill)</p> <p>It is generally accepted that household waste and industrial waste can contain significant health hazards if there is a pathway of contaminants to nearby workers, residents or visitors. The extent of the risk is determined largely by the amount and concentration of the contaminants along with the likelihood of such a pathway being present and active. The types of contaminants that have been found to emit from municipal landfills include Landfill gases such as methane (colourless, odourless and very potent GHG), various chlorinated volatile compounds such as trichloroethane (suspected teratogen, carcinogen and can have serious impacts on heart, liver and other organs); TCE (trichloroethylene – also a carcinogen). In addition there are many similar compounds in the leachate that can find their way into groundwater and subsequently volatilise or contaminate waterways including such hazardous compounds as BPA (Endocrine disrupter, suspected carcinogen and can get into leachate from landfills according to USEPA research), TCE, Vinyl Chloride, etc.</p> <p>VicEPA shows that:</p>	<p>The quotes included by the submitter are apparently not from EPA, but from Environment Victoria, an independent environmental advocacy group, as evident from the web references provided.</p> <p>See response above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>“Almost 98 per cent of all fluorescent lights are crushed into landfill . . . When fluorescent lights are broken, the mercury they contain can vapourise. Inhaling even a small amount of this vapour can impact us in many ways – from harming our kidneys, to causing respiratory failure or even death (at high doses). Methylmercury .. is a highly toxic agent. In nature, methylmercury forms in aquatic systems when anaerobic organisms (organisms that don't need oxygen) feed on it. Unfortunately, landfills often imitate the same conditions. The result can be concentrations of methylmercury in our environment up to 100 times the normal levels (as was the case with a landfill in Florida). That's pretty toxic.</p> <p>Methylmercury is a bioaccumulant, which basically means it builds up in our food chain, and it's most commonly ingested by eating fish. Methylmercury is so dangerous, it can even impede the development of a child's nervous system.”</p> <p>http://environmentvictoria.org.au/index.php?q=content/fluorescent-lights</p> <p>There is substantial evidence and agreement that landfills contain, and sometimes create, a range of gaseous, liquid and solid toxic substances. Toxicologists are not always in agreement but the vast majority agree that we need more research and that, as we conduct more research, we are almost certain to discover more toxic chemical health impacts. A Victorian study undertaken for the EPA concluded that:</p> <p>“Very limited data are available about the types and concentrations of emissions from Victorian landfills. It is strongly recommended that a thorough monitoring campaign be developed . . . both for residential ambient air and for gas source, focusing on the sulphur containing compounds likely to be found in landfill emissions”</p> <p>(Conclusion from Victorian study for EPA by RMIT, Air Emissions from Non-Hazardous Waste Landfills –a literature review, 2013,p. 34)</p> <p>Goodson et al (2015, p.) state that “little has been done to determine whether or not chronic lifetime exposures to mixtures of noncarcinogenic chemicals in the environment (at low-dose levels) have carcinogenic potential. Many chemicals are known to accumulate in bodily tissues over time, but little is</p>	

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>known about their combined effects at a mechanistic level and their impact on cancer-related mechanisms and carcinogenesis”.</p> <p>They go on to state that “Cumulative risk assessment methods . . . may therefore be underestimating cancer-related risks. In-utero and early life exposures, transgenerational effects and the interplay between the low-dose mechanistic effects of chemical mixtures in the environment and the vulnerabilities of subpopulations who are predisposed to cancer (i.e. via genetics or other influences) must also be considered.”</p>	
MRL00090	<p>The relationship between those seeking to profit from the operation and those who bare the negative impacts is inevitably strained. It creates additional stress for the community and unfairly devours community members’ time that could be spent in social and or recreational pursuits. This is a hidden cost on the health and well-being of the community members seeking to protect their families and community environment from harm.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
MRL00094, MRL00095	<p>Health concerns of local community with current and future expansion of the tip</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
MRL00098	<p>If this expansion goes ahead there will be 320 extra trucks daily. My daughter is an asthmatic and her major trigger is diesel fumes. This is a great concern for our family as we are 2 km away from the landfill, and the increase of trucks is going to have a big effect on her health.</p>	<p>See response above. The landfill is located near major road infrastructure that carries a broad range of traffic. See the witness statement of Steven Hunt on traffic, and the GTA traffic report for details on forecast traffic numbers.</p>
MRL00099	<p>8. I’m very concerned that there are children living in the Dame Phyllis Frost Centre (Prison) only 500 metres away from the current landfill. These poor children are living in these facilities because their mothers have been incarcerated. These children are not able to escape these odours or toxic gases. We know that Cleanaway have recently received a \$15K fine because twice failed to notify EPA of methane gas leaks. What are these poor children breathing in? It’s an absolute injustice and d[illegible] that the children, prison workers and prisoners are breathing in these toxins through no fault of their own. We at present are unaware if the methane problem has been rectified.</p> <p>...</p> <p>9. Will the government ever learn lessons from previous landfill disasters. To</p>	<p>See response above, see also the responses in the witness statement of Mr Todoroski (air quality).</p> <p>The recent EPA actions regarding methane levels are acknowledged. The PINs relate to late notification and elevated levels in monitoring bores, and Cleanaway is working to rectify these matters. It is noted that these issues do not present a risk to the community, including the residents at Dame Phyllis Frost Centre, or the environment.</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>name a few:</p> <p>...</p> <p>- Tullamarine Toxic Tip – which was managed by Cleanaway, is known as a cancer cluster in Melbourne</p> <p>10. My family has been personally impacted by the current landfill that Cleanaway are failing to manage. These are:</p> <p>...</p> <p>- Health impacts – tingling of lips and burning of the throat (I'm so worried that these toxins are slowly giving me and my family cancer).</p>	
<p>MRL00085</p>	<p>When looking at the National Pollution Inventory estimates of the 50 toxic substances reported annually by Cleanaway it paints a bleak future for our community. The missing information suggest a truly frightening scenario for our community, there are literally thousands of chemicals dumped at the landfill annually. Added to this are the human waste contained in soiled nappies and the animal waste from dog and cat owners. Cleanaway are hedging their bets by saying that leachate management may require construction of a leachate treatment plant. Why isn't it part of their works approval?</p>	<p>Cleanaway has explained to the community its response to this submission. See the materials listed under the September 2015 meeting of the MRL community consultation group including a human health risk expert visit to give a presentation on NPI and the substances assessed: http://www.cleanaway.com.au/community/major-project/melbourne-regional-landfill/</p> <p>Cleanaway is required by law to report annually against the NPI and those reports are publicly available on the Australian Government, Department of Environment NPI website: www.npi.gov.au</p> <p>See also response above.</p> <p>The works approval application for the extension at MRL includes alternatives of leachate ponds or a leachate treatment plant. The EPA licence for the proposed extension will include requirements around leachate management. The EPA licence will require the leachate treatment to the</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
		applicable standard and leachate ponds or a treatment plant will have to be approved by the EPA.
MRL00103	<p>The landfill also impacts me in the following ways:</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. The stench smells like sour cabbage or rotting eggs. I wonder what toxins are in the air that can produce such putrid odours. Sometimes the odours smell like a gas leak which is frightening.</p> <p>...</p> <p>6. I am concerned about the health of my family, particularly my children as we are unaware of what toxins we are breathing and the impacts of these toxins on our health in the future. I believe a health impact study is required for this area as a matter of urgency. I would like to know what studies have been done up to date including environment impact studies.</p>	<p>See response above and responses in Aleks Todoroski's witness statement.</p> <p>The EPA website includes substantial materials around health issues.</p>

MRL – Landfill Ops response - Concerns about existing operations and operator

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
MRL00103	The existing landfill has already had methane breaches in May and June 2016 (with the latter resulting in the EPA issuing a Pollution Abatement Notice), which demonstrates why landfill gas and other impacts from a proposed large mound landfill should include a larger buffer.	See compliance table.
MRL00006, MRL00007, MRL00008, MRL00012	<p>The company cannot keep the smell, noise, traffic and loose articles polluting the surrounding environment now and it's a small tip. How will they ever cope with a larger tip space.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The smell, pollution and traffic is out of control now while the tip is small. What will it be like when the tip is bigger? I don't want to take that chance.</p> <p>....</p> <p>They have mismanaged the control of the odour, pollutions, garbage that escapes etc.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Cleanaway continue to have breaches of policy and is regularly fined for its lack consideration. It's a large company who can afford a lousy little fine from either the EPA or the Government. Cleanaway has many shareholders who will profit YET they have no skin in this area. They don't live here. They just want to see the dollars enter their accounts.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Confusions continues to reign around this issue. Boral then Cleanaway have called it different names to make it sound better. They have tried to say that it will be of benefit to our community yet have provided none of these benefits at meetings. They have mismanaged the control of the odour, pollutions, garbage that escapes etc. The company cannot be trusted.</p>	<p>The extension will not result in a larger active face, rather the face stays the same size, and moves across the site.</p> <p>See compliance table.</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
MRL00009	<p>We have lived in this area since 2005, and the change in air quality has been noticed in the last few years.... In fact, with the current poor management of the tip and air quality issues, it would best be entirely closed.</p>	<p>This submission is contrary to the EPA's odour surveillance programme, reported on its website Also, the pattern of odour complaints reported on the EPA website does not indicate an increase in odour complaints. See AleksTodoroski Air Sciences witness statement for response on air quality submissions.</p>
<p>Stop the Tip - MRL00085, MRL00009, MRL00034, MRL00046, MRL00050, MRL00054, MRL00060</p>	<p>Issues of odour, noise and congestion from truck movements from the current landfill are a constant for residents in suburbs including Caroline Springs, Deer Park, Burnside and Albanvale. Cleanaway has consistently failed to manage odour and litter...</p> <p>3. Mismanagement of persistent issues with the current landfill</p> <p>Odour and escaped litter are constant issues that Cleanaway has repeatedly failed to address.</p> <p>Two recent incidents are of particular concern. On May 10 and June 7 of this year the EPA issued warnings to Cleanaway over breaches of the dangerous gas methane. In the first case, Cleanaway simply failed to notify the EPA of a methane breach. A month later, further elevated methane levels were detected.</p> <p>At best, Cleanaway's management of environmental, amenity and public safety risks is inadequate. At worst, it has deliberately tried to conceal issues such as methane breaches by not reporting them to the state's environmental regulator.</p> <p>Cleanaway simply cannot be trusted to run the current landfill, let alone one of the world's largest.</p> <p>...</p> <p>In light of Cleanaway's repeated mismanagement of the current tip and the serious deficiencies in its planning application and works approval application, I urge you to reject both applications.</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
MRL00009	<p>6. Failure to report breaches of policy- risk to community.</p> <p>Refer to the EPA website for further information (linked). The facility has failed to follow correct protocols when they have a clear understanding of the requirements. If they cannot follow protocols now, what will happen when the facility is expanded? They have shown a disregard for correct process and are placing the community at risk. If they cannot manage their site currently, they are in no position to manage a larger site.</p> <p>http://www.epa.vic.gov.au/about-us/news-centre/news-andupdates/news/2016/june/07/epa-directs-ravenhall-landfilloperator-to-take-action-following-further-breaches</p>	See responses above.
MRL00010	<p>We have experienced problems with bad odours from the existing tip and reported same to the EPA. There has been claims by the tip owners there is no smell so I am loath to trust them. Property values will be affected not to mention the smells and health hazards.</p>	See responses above.
MRL00013	<p>Cleanaway is a new entity, it is ""Cleaning Away" the tarnished name Transpacific Industries Group Ltd who were named by the ATO as a Non Tax Paying Company. They made \$1.8Billion & paid No Tax. Why should a company which makes no contribution to Australia be permitted to reduce the asset value of Real Tax Payers.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Their management are so confident that they can control the problems, they locate their offices for all their important staff in St Kilda road 25km away.</p> <p>...</p> <p>There is no point in listening to a company say ""we will be good from now on"" when their past does not show the really mean it.</p>	See responses above.
MRL00021	<p>The tip itself has had many warnings already about methane leaks and scattered rubbish escaping their facility. Imagine the environmental impact it would make if it was allowed to grow to the enormous scale they are proposing.</p>	See responses above.

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
MRL00029	<p>... rubbish that flies away from the tip into our suburb of Caroline Springs but most of all, my children don't want to play outside when the smell is so bad and at school they have to stay outside even if the smell is disgusting.</p> <p>Please, don't expand this tip!!! Our house prices will drop as a result. I don't object to having tips as they are needed but just not right near a residential suburb with lots of young growing children.</p>	See responses above and the responses on Litter and the responses in Aleks Todoroski Air Sciences witness statement for odour/ air quality.
MRL00039, MRL00041, MRL00042, MRL00043	Currently breaching laws eg methane gas escaping how will they abide once they expand. Will become like the river issue in QLD where gases will catch on fire.	See responses above.
MRL00044	Cleanway have been fined for methon gas already and this is a lot smaller than what they want so please explain how are they going to control the huge expansion.	See responses above.
MRL00051	The company only cares about money, not the residents.	See responses above.
MRL00055	2. The current operator of the landfill, Landfill Operations Pty. Ltd. (Cleanaway) have on numerous occasions breached their licence conditions. The most recent breach being for exceeding Methane gas emissions and failure to report the incident to the relevant authorities, namely the EPA. This highlights the lack of "duty of care" the operator has shown to the local communities. What will the "duty of care" be in the future if the application is granted?	See responses above.
MRL00058	My young son of 9 cannot comprehend why this would be happening and is constantly asking questions about it. He is already stressed about the thought of it possibly happening, who knows how or what he will feel if it goes ahead. Shame	See responses above.
MRL00060	From Cleanaway's website: "Sustainability: Our past has, our present does, and our future will depend on it." If Cleanaway would only reflect on this statement and not just their balance sheet.	See responses above. Further Cleanaway is a total waste management company – see responses on submissions regarding alternative technology.
Brimbank City Council - MRL00059	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCL has been issued with at least two Pollution Abatement Notices within the last four months relating to methane gas emissions from the site. <p>...</p>	See responses above.

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<p>Whilst it is understood that Cleanaway have implemented improvements in the operation of Melbourne Metropolitan Land there are still incidences of environmental concern including dust, litter, odour emissions and breaches which requires Pollution Abatement Notices to be issued.</p>	
<p>MRL00061</p>	<p>The EPA issued Cleanaway with an official warning in May 2016 for waiting 12 days to notify the EPA of a methane exceedance incident when they are legally required to notify them immediately. A subsequent Pollution Abatement Notice was issued in June 2016 requiring remedial action after further elevated methane levels were detected.</p> <p>Methane breaches are a serious matter and the community is therefore justified in being wary of an operator that does not follow legal obligations in regards to methane breaches. Expanding such a use may increase the instances and severity of such breaches which is concerning for both existing residents and for developers who are creating high amenity residential estates and community villages in the surrounding area.</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>
<p>MRL00062</p>	<p>As a neighbour to the existing landfill and the new proposed landfill my concerns are extremely high regarding Cleanaway and the EPA processors.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Does anybody actually think that Cleanaway will be able to manage a bigger "TIP", this happened 3 days ago when the weather was our coldest in months, what happens to the smell when the weather becomes 33-40oC...</p> <p>EPA fines Cleanaway more than \$15000 for licence breaches</p> <p>11 Jul 2016</p> <p>Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) has fined Landfill Operations Pty Ltd (Cleanaway) more than \$15,000 for two breaches of its EPA licence. EPA Metropolitan Manager Danny Childs said the fines were issued because of elevated landfill gas concentrations detected at the boundary of the Ravenhall landfill premises and because the company had failed to notify EPA of an ongoing licence breach since May 2015.</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<p>The operator of the site has an obligation to ensure it meets the conditions of its licence, and if any breaches do occur, there is a responsibility to inform EPA immediately, Mr Childs said.</p> <p>Cleanaway has breached its licence twice as it has recorded elevated landfill gas concentrations at its boundary, and then failed to inform EPA about the exceedance as it is required to do under the conditions of its licence.</p> <p>It is EPA's expectation that all licence holders immediately contact EPA through procedures spelt out in their licence and in line with supporting guidance as soon as any breach of a licence occurs. The failure to inform EPA in this case has led to the fines being handed down to the company.</p> <p>Mr Childs said an EPA investigation that required Cleanaway to provide EPA with all of its monitoring data since May 2015 " when the company became the duty holder of the landfill " found that there had been ongoing issues with methane leaving the site.</p> <p>The company has also been issued with a pollution abatement notice that requires it to install further control measures and to check the function of existing control measures to adequately control landfill gas at the site, which is in line with EPA's normal operating procedure for this type of licence breach, Mr Childs said.</p> <p>How many more breaches can we let companies get away with before we say enough is enough and lets fine them more then a just a \$15k fine which I would happily pay, if Im worth a net profit after tax of 45.7million dollars as per Cleanaway, Macquaries conference document 16 which also states that they are "confident" in getting the Ravenhall tip.</p>	
<p>MRL00064, MRL00069, MRL00075, MRL00091</p>	<p>Companies dislike post closure expenses and they are very slow to implement post closure plans. e.g. Cleanaway at Tullamarine is still negotiating its post closure plans with the local community 8 years after the landfill closed. Although EPA issued a Pollution Abatement notice in 2009 requiring Cleanaway to remove toxic oils from the leaking landfill they are now seeking to avoid any extraction of the toxic oils. Such behaviour gives a community little confidence that Cleanaway can be relied on to fulfil their</p>	<p>See responses above.</p> <p>The Tullamarine site is not comparable to MRL given the nature of waste taken at the sites and the periods during which they have operated. Cleanaway purchased the Tullamarine landfill in 2007, as part of an acquisition from the Brambles Australia group. The Tullamarine landfill</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<p>post closure obligations.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Companies need a social license to operate and companies with a poor track record in community consultation, compliance with environmental law and post closure responsibilities should not be trusted with a global license to operate such a massive landfill.</p>	<p>commenced its operations in 1972 and took a broad range of wastes, including prescribed industrial waste, until its closure in 2008. A post closure pollution abatement notice ('PC-PAN') was issued in 2009. Cleanaway has undertaken significant works to remediate and rehabilitate the Tullamarine site. Cleanaway has worked productively with the community group at Tullamarine, and continues to do so in relation to post closure plans.</p> <p>Cleanaway has responded to all requirements of the 2009 PC PAN, and a follow up PC PAN is proposed but has not yet been issued. Cleanaway is completing many remediation tasks over and above PAN requirements voluntarily such as installing additional groundwater monitoring bores, emissions monitoring of the enclosed flare, and leachate extraction.</p> <p>Cleanaway identifies all post closure requirements and costs during comprehensive planning for ongoing site post closure management (Whole of Life process). Cleanaway has significant financial provisions for ongoing management of Tullamarine and all other landfills to ensure that all post closure obligations are fulfilled.</p>
<p>MRL00067</p>	<p>2). Furthermore, because the proponent, Landfill Operations / Cleanaway, failed to meet the legislative requirements, I submit that the Works Approval Application must be refused outright on legal grounds. Despite repeated requests, the proponent prevented the release to the public of a crucial and mandatory section in the Works Approval Application, namely the Financial Assurance document ("Appendix C").</p> <p>The proponent lodged its Financial Assurance document with the EPA under separate cover as "Commercial in Confidence" and is insisting that</p>	<p>See responses above.</p> <p>The Financial Assurance detail is commercial in confidence. The EPA, being the environmental regulator, determines an appropriate amount in accordance with its publicly available guidelines.</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<p>EPA treat it as such. As a result, all that is publicly available (www.epa.vic.gov.au/CleanawayMRL) is the following statement:</p> <p>"Appendix C – Financial assurance – we cannot publish this document as it is marked as –commercial-in-confidence–™ by Landfill Operations". The proponent then proceeded to justify this behaviour by saying that Cleanaway, being a publicly listed company, could not release this document due to ASX reporting obligations. This is clearly an invalid excuse. If Cleanaway were genuinely concerned about this issue, then it was always possible for Cleanaway to keep the stock market fully informed by issuing a standard ASX Announcement.</p> <p>But regardless of how the proponent is explaining its motives, the end result is that the public is now in the dark with regard to the vital issue of this landfill's proposed Financial Assurance.</p> <p>Due to the proponents decisions and actions, the public was deprived of its legal right to participate in an open and transparent statutory process. The proponent ensured that the public would have no access to certain essential content of its Application, thus depriving interested parties of their legal rights to consider the application in its entirety and to be able to make informed submissions and/or objections.</p>	
<p>Corrections Victoria - MRL00072</p>	<p>3.5 EPA compliance</p> <p>All EPA licence holders are required to publish their Annual Performance Statements (APS) on the EPA website. The website then retains three years of records. The Ravenhall landfill is administered under EPA licence 12160 and shows non-compliance with that licence for all three years on record (2013-15). The following licence conditions have been broken every year (by either Boral or Landfill Operations Pty Ltd):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> depositing litter beyond the boundaries of the premises <input type="checkbox"/> exceeding leachate drainage levels <input type="checkbox"/> exceeding 'best practice' landfill gas emission levels <input type="checkbox"/> not progressively rehabilitating landfill cells in accordance with 'best practice' requirements 	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ exceeding final landfill cells contour lines (overfilling) □ discharging offensive odours beyond boundaries of the premises. <p>Landfill Operations were issued with a pollution abatement notice (PAN) for elevated levels of methane at the Ravenhall landfill on 7 June 2016. The EPA said that the 500m buffer should not present concerns for the surrounding community, however, licence conditions are still not being met by the operator.</p>	
MRL00074	<p>It is noted that Cleanaway have already failed on one known occasion to report unacceptable levels of methane gas to the EPA. In the article titled 'Failure to notify EPA of incident leads to official warning for Ravenhall landfill operator'. EPA.vic.gov.au website, date 10 May 2016. Cleanaway have already failed in complying with their current licence, it appears that the increase in Methane gas is self-regulatory and took 12 days for Cleanaway to notify the EPA of this breach. An increase in the size of the site will cause an increase in the amount of Methane gas being produced.</p> <p>...</p> <p>7. CLEANAWAY RECORD: Cleanaway has been involved with several other tips where health issues have been raised. Article from The Herald Sun, titled 'Group fear cancer hub around Tullamarine tip' dated 13 May 2010, outlines 74 deaths and a cancer cluster in the area surrounding the tip which residents believe has been caused by the tip.</p> <p>September 29 2015, EPA Victoria article titled 'Clayton South, Clarinda and Dingley Village odours' outlines the unacceptable odours caused by the Clayton regional landfill operated by Cleanaway. Another example of breaches and issues arising from landfills operated and owned by Cleanaway.</p>	<p>See response above.</p> <p>In relation to issues raised regarding Tullamarine see the EPA website and the archives section which includes reports regarding the health issue raised.</p> <p>http://www.epa.vic.gov.au/our-work/current-issues/landfills/tullamarine-landfill and the archive material http://www.epa.vic.gov.au/our-work/current-issues/landfills/tullamarine-landfill/tullamarine-landfill-archive which includes health reports that find there is no increased risk of cancer incidence within the 4km area of the Tullamarine site.</p> <p>The landfills in the Clayton area are in the final stages of filling. Cleanaway's putrescible landfill at Fraser Road will be closed for waste acceptance in mid 2017. The MRL site has far greater buffers to residential areas than Cleanaway's operations in the Clayton area.</p>
MRL00083	<p>The SWRRIP goes on to state on page 8 that "Some of the material we dispose of to landfill, if not managed properly, can impact on the community, environment and public health." The risk that the existing landfill operations is not being managed properly appears to be significant, which is supported by recent news that EPA Victoria has fined the landfill operator for breaching its licence at the Melbourne Regional Landfill.</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<p>...</p> <p>The landfill operator does not appear to have conducted existing operations in a manner that does not impact on the community, or will have minimal impact on local amenity. It therefore is reasonable to expect that future operations will be no better, and that with an extension to the landfill the impacts may be larger.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Engineering controls at the existing Melbourne Regional Landfill, that are intended to reduce the impact of the landfill operations to an acceptable level, appear to be problematic based on the reports by EPA Victoria. The EPA Victoria website states "Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) has fined Landfill Operations Pty Ltd (Cleanaway) more than \$15,000 for two breaches of its EPA licence.</p> <p>EPA Metropolitan Manager Danny Childs said the fines were issued because of elevated landfill gas concentrations detected at the boundary of the Ravenhall landfill premises and because the company had failed to notify EPA of an ongoing licence breach since May 2015." Further, "Cleanaway has breached its licence twice as it has recorded elevated landfill gas concentrations at its boundary, and then failed to inform EPA about the exceedance as it is required to do under the conditions of its licence."</p> <p>(Reference: http://www.epa.vic.gov.au/about-us/news-centre/news-andupdates/news/2016/july/11/epa-fines-cleanaway-more-than-\$15000-for-licence-breaches)</p> <p>...</p> <p>If the existing engineering controls are not working adequately, it raises concerns about the capacity of the landfill operator to adequately implement engineering controls on the proposed landfill extension and avoid an adverse impact on the environment.</p> <p>The SWRRIP goes on to state on page 8 that "Some of the material we dispose of to landfill, if not managed properly, can impact on the</p>	

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<p>community, environment and public health.” The risk that the existing landfill operations are not being managed properly appears to be significant enough to be unacceptable, and therefore creating a significant risk that an adverse impact on the environment is unacceptable with an even larger landfill.</p>	
<p>Stop the Tip - MRL00104</p>	<p>2. Mismanagement of persistent issues with the current landfill</p> <p>Odour, escaped litter and congestion are issues of constant concern for members of our community. The current landfill causes significant environmental and amenity impacts that Cleanaway has repeatedly failed to address. Complaints about odour are regularly dismissed without being properly acknowledged, let alone investigated.</p> <p>Two recent incidents are of particular concern. On Monday, 11 July 2016, the EPA fined Cleanaway \$15,000 over two breaches related to the potentially dangerous gas methane. The fine relates to two specific incidents. On May 10, Cleanaway simply failed to notify the EPA of a methane breach. Less than a month later, on June 7, further elevated methane levels were detected.</p> <p>At best, Cleanaway’s management of environmental, amenity and public safety risks is inadequate. At worst, it has deliberately tried to conceal issues by failing to report them to the state’s environmental regulator. Put simply, our community has no faith in Cleanaway’s ability to run the current landfill, let alone one three times the size.</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>
<p>Stop the Tip - MRL00104</p>	<p>6. Cleanaway’s disregard for community engagement</p> <p>Prior to and throughout this planning process, Cleanaway has demonstrated complete disregard for the concerns of the community. On 27 May, Cleanaway abandoned a community consultative group when its facilitator resigned, citing a lack of commitment to genuine engagement on behalf of her client. In doing so, Cleanaway abandoned the community at precisely the time it should have been making every effort to address the community’s concerns, not only in relation to the landfill expansion but in relation the licence breaches noted above and other issues.</p> <p>In conclusion, the people of the western suburbs want jobs and</p>	<p>See responses above.</p> <p>Cleanaway has undertaken a number of initiatives to improve community engagement regarding MRL, as set out the in the works approval application and the witness statement of Andrew Green.</p> <p>The MRL Community Consultation Group (MRLCCG) met six times, but was suspended in May 2015 as a result of the resignation of the independent facilitator. Cleanaway has implemented the following process to ensure an MRL community</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<p>opportunity, not the world's largest tip. In light of Cleanaway's repeated mismanagement of its current landfill, the serious deficiencies in its planning and works approval applications, and on behalf of Stop the Tip's more than 8000 supporters, I urge you to reject both applications.</p>	<p>group is restarted and provides a productive forum for community engagement: an independent review (including interviews with participants in the MRLCCG to date) is close to being finalised, which will consider improvements for the reformed community group; following receipt and consideration of the findings a new facilitator will be engaged, advertisements placed to call for interested parties to become members and membership confirmed.</p> <p>Subject to the review findings, meetings can then resume their quarterly structure. During this period of suspension Cleanaway has continued its other community initiatives as described in the WAA. This includes a dedicated community liaison staff member, a direct email address and the community hotline.</p> <p>Also, the Cleanaway CEO Vik Bansal and senior managers met with community members and the CEO of the EPA Nial Finegan on 26 July 2016 and 9 August 2016 to answer questions from the community. Other direct communications with community members have also occurred and will continue until the consultation group is back up and running.</p>
<p>Melton City Council - MRL00086</p>	<p>The Application material state that the existing landfill is currently operating within the relevant legislative requirements and guidelines. Whilst this is the view expressed in the materials accompanying the application, Council is away that there have been complaints received, particularly with regard to odour and litter escape from the site, which must be appropriately addressed before any decision is made to expand landfill operations on the site.</p>	<p>See responses above and in responses to litter, odour (in Aleks Todoroski's witness statement).</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<p>The current landfill has resulted in complaints from surrounding residents, particularly in relation to the escape of odour and litter from the site. Council acknowledges attempts by the landfill operator to mitigate these issues, most recently with the removal of the composting activity and other measures to address both the odour and litter issue. Council would be concerned if there were ongoing off-site amenity issues as a result of odour emission and litter escape, particularly impacting on sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the site and adjoining residential communities of Caroline Springs, Deer Park, Derrimut and the future communities proposed by the Mount Atkinson and Tarneit Plains Precinct Structure Plan area. The landfill operator has much work to do in order to sufficiently address these issues. Council therefore does not support the application on the basis of the current ongoing odour issues that continue to come from the site and the ongoing community concerns about the detrimental and negative health effects on the community and its residents.</p>	
<p>MRL00089</p>	<p>If the Applicant was successful in obtaining approval for this massive expansion the growth of the landfill and accumulation of waste cells and quantities of waste, leachate and LFG and hence so will the risks of inevitable aging, inadequate management and maintenance and infrastructure failure.</p> <p>None of these possibilities have been directly considered in the Application. Instead the Panel and the community are expected to take on trust that all this is covered by the Applicant's assertion that they will manage the landfill in full accordance with EPA Guidelines and the BPEM requirements (which they are legally required to do anyway), neither of which documents actually addresses such contingencies.</p> <p>In view of the inevitable uncertainties surrounding the future design and safety improvements that might occur and the inability to effectively determine the risks involved in any landfill resulting from infrastructure failure, human error or natural events such as fires, floods, etc. it important to treat the failure to consider many of the risks and to dismiss many of the risks as low because they are "unlikely" should be treated with considerable scepticism, not least because breaches of licence conditions, non-compliances with regulations, etc. due to infrastructure failure or</p>	<p>See responses above.</p> <p>Note that the 2014-2015 report includes the period where ownership of the landfill operations transitioned from Boral to Cleanaway (March 2015).</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<p>human error are not as “unlikely” as the Applicant wants the Panel to believe.</p> <p>For example, breaches and non-compliances recorded by Cleanaway for 2014-15 in their annual report to EPA shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Litter breaches <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple leachate breaches throughout 2014-15 due to inadequate or faulty leachate management infrastructure <input type="checkbox"/> Continuing LFG emissions in exceedance of BEPM triggers and EPA licence requirements throughout 2014-15. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuing failure to progressively rehabilitate the landfill as required by BEPM and Licence <input type="checkbox"/> Failure to construct final cap on any completed cell in Stage 2. <input type="checkbox"/> “Overfilling of waste... occurred in areas of the site” breaching the licence and BEPM by exceeding the pre-settlement plan which forms part of the Licence. 	
<p>MRL00090</p>	<p>We are very familiar with industry claims that they are improving landfill designs in reducing environmental and social impacts. The latter is particularly galling as people requesting us to believe it don't live in the area. Yet they seem to think they have the right to determine what level of risk we should live with. Consultation processes are frequently a shame. Even the improved facilitation at Tullamarine Landfill Community Consultation Group meetings has not accelerated action by Cleanaway but it does help keep our issues on the agenda. Neither is there any adequate support offered to the community who has to live with the landfill. Community groups are not resourced and therefore must do all their own research, analyses of technical documents, try to find access to free local expert opinion. It isn't a fair contest. It ought to be mandatory for the landfill operator to give an independent budget to the community so that they can access independent expert advice That would help insure the community's concerns are well represented and addressed in a timely matter. Access to expert opinion helps the community to prioritise their issues. It is too easy for operators to dismiss the communities concerns as a failing to</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<p>understand technical information.</p> <p>It is a next acceptable that state government intervene and refer this matter to a panel, particularly as it was done at the behest of Cleanaway! It is further proof that the culture of Cleanaway is to ignore and override the local community's concerns and ti has limited understanding of a democratic process.</p> <p>...</p> <p>We urge the Panel to reject this greedy, ill conceived proposal because it is :</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. Rewards an operator who is contemptuous of community consultation.</p> <p>..</p> <p>5. Falsely argues that the only post closure use for inquiry is to use it for a landfill.</p>	
<p>MRL00094, MRL00095</p>	<p>Company only cares about financial gain and not the residents</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>
<p>MRL00098</p>	<p>I don't have any confidence in Clearways management of the landfill, with the current stench we regularly experience, and EPA fines issued for breaches, I strongly disagree to any expansion.</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>
<p>MRL00099</p>	<p>9. Will the government ever learn lessons from previous landfill disasters. To name a few:</p> <p>...</p> <p>- Tullamarine Toxic Tip – which was managed by Cleanaway, is known as a cancer cluster in Melbourne</p> <p>...</p> <p>In light of Cleanaway's repeated mismanagement of the current tip and the serious deficiencies in its planning application and works approval</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	application, I urge you to reject both applications.	
MRL00085, MRL00102	<p>Cleanaway do not have a good record with management of landfills across Australia. Our community have had ongoing issues with odour, heavy vehicle traffic and litter. There was also the recent methane leak that went unreported for a period of time. To allow the landfill to operate beyond its expected closure in 10 years would stop any discussion about the above mentioned aims. It should be remembered that Melton Council rejected the previous Boral landfill expansion in May of 2014. Council rejected the planning application on 9 planning points nothing has changed between now and then. Cleanaway have reduced the original landfill application from 562 to 313 hectares. Cleanaway have always made it clear that the landfill will follow the Boral quarry. No doubt a future application will include further quarried land at the site.</p> <p>At a recent MRLCCG meeting community members were told that over 700 000 tonnes of waste is dumped at the site. When trying to review the tonnage dumped annually in the planning application, it appears that approximately 800 000 tonnes will be dumped in financial year 2015 – 2016. At the MRLCCG meeting we were informed that 1.3 million tonnes of waste will be dumped at the site by 2017 and increase to 1.5 million tonnes by 2025. I suggest the estimate for 2025 is a gross underestimation by Cleanaway. The fact that the application discusses a shortfall of 20 million tonnes between 2025 and 2041 is a major concern not only for me but the community. The application makes very clear that the MRL will meet this shortfall.</p> <p>...</p> <p>I would like to finish my submission by discussing the relationship Cleanaway claim they have with the community. Section 5.1.1 of the document outlines the aims of the relationship the company want to have with the community, it is worthwhile exploring this in more detail. Before doing that I would like to mention that as a member of Stop the Tip, our committee has contacts with groups in Tullamarine and Ipswich where Cleanaway have similar groups in operation. It would appear that both</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
	<p>committees have strained relationships with this Cleanaway.</p> <p>The scorecard on the objectives of the MRLCCG is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> To provide a genuine opportunity for community members to have a voice on relevant matters of concern. FAILED <input type="checkbox"/> To build community understanding and confidence in the operation of the landfill and its compliance with licence conditions through the provision of factual and unbiased information, monitoring data, presentations and site tours. FAILED <input type="checkbox"/> To develop broad understanding of landfill Ops current and future priorities regarding the ongoing operation of the site. FAILED <p>Cleanaway claim that there are 13 community members of the MRLCCG only two of these are not members of Stop the Tip Inc (STT). Cleanaway have from day one been reluctant to provide information in a timely manner. The final breakdown of the relationship came when they reneged on a promise to hold a public meeting to inform the community of the intended landfill expansion. Cleanaway thought it was appropriate to hold community information sessions instead. They did not inform the MRLCCG until 4 days after the sessions commenced of their intention to submit a planning application. I along with other members of STT were incensed by their behaviour. Cleanaway have never been transparent and have deflected many of the concerns raised during the MRLCCG meetings. On several occasions they have been caught out providing the group misleading information. They have thought up some questions and answers and placed them on their website and passed it off as coming from the community, I personally find their business ethics questionable at best.</p> <p>At the last meeting of the MRLCCG the group facilitator resigned, Cleanaway's response to that was to suspend the group. When asked what the meant, we were informed that all positions would need to be applied for in regard to community representation. This is typical of the way this company operates all smoke and mirrors. We do not believe they will accept anyone from STT onto their next committee, we are still waiting for a response from Cleanaway.</p>	

Submission	Quotes	CWY Response
MRL00085	As a hard working community member I have been on numerous committees over the past 36 years and never once have I been stood down from any committee, I am thoroughly disgusted at the way we have been treated.	See responses above.
MRL00102	<p>The SWRRIP also makes mention of the AIMS of the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Reduce reliance on landfills <input type="checkbox"/> Achieve best practice standards so that communities and the environment are protected <input type="checkbox"/> Make well informed evidence based decisions. <p>Cleanaway do not have a good record with management of landfills across Australia. Our community have had ongoing issues with odour, heavy vehicle traffic and litter. There was also the recent methane leak that went unreported for a period of time. To allow the landfill to operate beyond its expected closure in 10 years would stop any discussion about the above mentioned aims. ...</p>	See responses above. Also note that the Sustainability Victoria submissions deal with the on-going need for landfill, despite improved recycling.
MRL00103	7. We know that most of the waste is dumped unchecked and I am deeply concerned about what is being dumped and how this will impact my family and community. There appears to be no real regulation of the landfill as it self regulated. Further Cleanaway have failed to report two methane gas leaks. This is not acceptable and clearly shows their contempt for the community and our environment.	See responses above.

MRL – Landfill Ops Response - Litter

Submission	Quotes	CWY response
MRL00005	the... extra litter from the trucks ... is unexceable [sic].	Assuming this refers to litter being blown from trucks en route to MRL, please see below response to STT submission.
Stop the Tip - MRL00104	The impacts of... litter along the convoy route have not been considered at all in Cleanaway's applications.	<p>Most putrescible waste that come to MRL is in enclosed trucks – either Council municipal trucks or front lift bin trucks, significantly reducing any risk of litter being deposited on roads. Cleanaway ensures that all of its own vehicles are covered when travelling on public roads. Cleanaway encourages other operators to have loads covered when travelling on public roads to MRL.</p> <p>Typically, 'open top' trucks carry construction waste or hard waste such as timber and they usually have covers (such as tarpaulins) on them to secure their load, and such covers are not always visible from road level</p> <p>Our dedicated litter crews conduct a sweep of Christies Road twice a day from the site entrance to the railway overpass, and collect any off site stray litter as a priority on a daily basis.</p> <p>There have been no material litter escapes from site since Cleanaway took over operations in March 2015.</p> <p>On taking ownership of the landfill operations Cleanaway implemented a Litter Management Plan which covers matters such as containing all litter on site, illegal dumping and actions to be taken on high wind days (which can include closing the site in certain conditions).</p> <p>There are three 'layers of defence' to mitigate risks of litter being blown off site. There is a 12 m fence along the southern boundary, a 6m fence around the risk perimeter of the active cell and eastern boundary and then angled mobile netting/ screens that are kept as close as</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY response
		<p>practicable to the active face, and moved as required by wind direction.</p> <p>In addition, all waste materials accepted at the active operational area within the landfill are covered daily with soil to reduce the likelihood of litter escaping the site.</p> <p>These practices will be continued for the MRL extension.</p>
<p>MRL00014, MRL00015</p>	<p>This previous application was rejected & it seems the new application by the current owners/applicant has not changed or addressed previous community concerns.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The wants & concerns of the community should be held in the highest regard in this application & the Community says NO to the TIP.</p>	<p>The Cleanaway applications for a works approval and planning permit are very different from the Boral planning application. Cleanaway has considered the impacts of its operations on the communities in the vicinity of the site in preparing its applications. The Cleanaway applications contain very detailed information including the technical reports that form the works approval application, the reasons given by the Melton Council for rejecting the earlier planning permit application by Boral were largely around the lack of detailed information.</p> <p>The area covered by the Cleanaway proposal is much smaller than the Boral application and set back from residential communities. Cleanaway has also made significant operational improvements since owning the business including improved litter controls, a wheel wash, reduced active face area, odour neutralisers, improved landfill gas recovery and it has also established a number of initiatives to ensure improved engagement with the community.</p>
<p>MRL00024</p>	<p>Not to mention that the loose rubbish and paper flies from the current landfill, to just across the road from my property, on the other side of Ballarat Road. The terrible odour and a larger quantity of loose rubbish will only get worse if the tip extends further closer to my property.</p>	<p>See above response to submission by STT.</p> <p>For odour see response to odour submissions in the witness statement of Aleks Todoroski Air Sciences.</p>

Submission	Quotes	CWY response
MRL00029	... rubbish that flies away from the tip into our suburb of Caroline Springs but most of all, my children don't want to play outside when the smell is so bad and at school they have to stay outside even if the smell is disgusting.	See above response to submission by STT. For odour see response to odour submissions in the witness statement of Aleks Todoroski Air Sciences.
MRL00030	We object on the following basis; ... - More litter being carried away by the winds.	See above response to submission by STT.
Brimbank City Council - MRL00059	Officer Recommendation That Council: 1. Endorses the objection to Planning Permit Application PA2016/5118 and Works Approval Application 1002191...at Attachment 1 to this report. 2. Notes the key grounds and proposed conditions contained in the objection are: a. Any expansion of the Melbourne Metropolitan Landfill – Ravenhall not be approved until such time as the off-site amenity impacts to nearby residential areas are resolved. Specifically in relation to odour, dust and litter including: ... ii. Implementation of proven containment measures to ensure litter remains within the boundaries of the landfill area. Assessment Report Litter While, many improvements have been implemented on the site, the high winds and slightly elevated location of the site can lead to paper litter being blown outside the landfill boundary despite the use of 14 metre high temporary fencing. There is further work to be completed	See above response to submission by STT.

Submission	Quotes	CWY response
<p>MRL00062</p>	<p>to reduce this from occurring on days of high wind velocity</p> <p>Furthermore as a boundary neighbour, The amount of rubbish/plastic/paper been blown into our property is not only an environmental concern but with us running cattle on the property, its a major health risk to the cattle as they are found chewing the plastic bags. Clean away seem not to care about the fact that they are damaging the area and our capacity to raise cattle on the neighbouring property.</p>	<p>See above response to submission by STT.</p> <p>Cleanaway has broadly communicated the availability of its 24 hour community hotline service. To date, Cleanaway has not received a complaint from the submitter who has however, met our Stakeholder and Community Engagement Manager.</p> <p>Cleanaway takes its relationships with its neighbours very seriously and aims to have no impact on their land uses. Cleanaway believes that since implementing its improved controls litter escapes from site are managed very effectively. Neighbours are encouraged to call our Community Engagement Manager, or our Hotline should any such litter escapes occur and the litter will be cleaned up by Cleanaway.</p>
<p>MRL00033</p>	<p>4) Who controls what is dumped at the site, 800 vehicles a day cannot be monitored by just a few people and clean away cannot guarantee asbestos and other harmful substances will be picked up as its being dumped. They don't have Xray vision to see whats inside the trucks.</p>	<p>The bulk of the waste trucks that complete their collections are enclosed with no waste exposed.</p> <p>Cleanaway monitors incoming waste in three ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to the delivery of the waste, Cleanaway engages with its customers to ensure their waste loads comply with the EPA licence and strict operational requirements. 2. When waste loads are brought on site, they pass over a weighbridge. Weighbridge staff observe the load at the entry and question truck drivers about the source and type of waste. In addition, staff conduct weekly random audits of incoming waste loads to confirm the type of waste being delivered matches what is declared. 3. Operational staff at the active face observe all unloading of waste. If they identify a potentially

Submission	Quotes	CWY response
		<p>prohibited waste delivery, it is pushed to a non-active area of the landfill cell and assessed by Cleanaway environmental staff. If assessment confirms the presence of non-approved waste, it is removed from the site and disposed of appropriately. The company who delivered the waste is contacted and cautioned to ensure such waste is not delivered to the site again.</p>
<p>Corrections Victoria - MRL00072</p>	<p>3.3 Rubbish</p> <p>Despite litter fencing and litter mitigation strategies undertaken by Landfill Operations, rubbish has historically blown out of the active landfill and into the prison environs. This presents a number of amenity and security problems. Stray rubbish is regularly blown out of the landfill and into prison grounds. This can have a detrimental effect on security systems, which will be explored in more detail at the panel hearing.</p> <p>The current facility receives 780,000 tonnes per annum with waste volume expected to increase as per the following schedule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ 1.3 million tonnes in 2017 □ 1.4 million tonnes in 2020 □ 1.5 million tonnes in 2025 □ 1.7 million tonnes in 20412. <p>The expected growth in annual waste volumes may increase the likelihood of litter blowing off the active face.</p> <p>The daily covering of litter will assist in suppressing litter but there will still be significant periods with more litter uncovered by soil than currently is (based on scheduled waste volumes).</p>	<p>See above response to submission by STT.</p> <p>There have been no significant litter escapes from site since Cleanaway took over operations in March 2015. Cleanaway has self reported to the EPA some minor litter escapes during 2015/2016, but they have been minor and remedied very quickly by sending out litter crews to collect the litter. The EPA has not issued any notices to Landfill Ops regarding litter over 2015/2016 reporting period. Cleanaway is not aware of any complaints from the prisons since it has owned the site but has heard from the former operator that there was one significant litter escape well over 5 years ago.</p> <p>The operational size of the active face has been reduced since the former operator ran the site, and it is covered daily with soils in accordance with licence requirements. The extension does not increase the amount of litter 'exposed' on the active face at any point in time, the active face remains the same size.</p> <p>It is noted that, relative to the existing landfill, the MRL extension will be significantly further away from the prisons.</p>

MRL – Landfill Ops response - Alternative Technology

Submission	Quotes	Response
<p>Stop the Tip - MRL00104, MRL00009, MRL00034, MRL00046, MRL00050, MRL00054, MRL00060, MRL00100</p>	<p>The applications seek to commit Victoria to archaic waste management methods for decades.</p> <p>This is one of my greatest areas of concern as expanding the tip is against best-world-practice for waste management. Landfill is recognised both locally and globally as the least desired method of waste management, yet Cleanaway is seeking to commit Victoria to another 50 years of landfill at a time when there have been rapid advancements in alternative waste technologies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cleanaway, the EPA and the State Government should not commit Victoria to another five decades of landfill, but instead should be looking for new and innovative ways to manage waste. 	<p>Cleanaway is seeking to deliver a key piece of infrastructure for Melbourne, to ensure that Melbourne has sufficient waste management capability in line with State policy. As a residual waste landfill Cleanaway relies on (and participates in) the substantial resource recovery network present in Victoria to reduce waste to landfill.</p> <p>Sustainability Victoria is the government agency responsible for setting the strategic direction for waste and resource recovery in Victoria. Under the publicised document Statewide Waste and Resource Recovery Infrastructure Plan, the SWRRIP, SV makes reference to the undesirability of landfill however acknowledges the importance of landfill to enable the other recovery mechanisms. MRL is listed as a key strategic asset under Sustainability Victoria's strategic framework for the next 30 years.</p> <p>Victoria is an Australian leader in resource recovery. This is evidenced by the three bin kerbside collection system. As municipal residents are a major generator of waste this source separated process is the first line of defence in minimising the waste that goes to landfill.</p> <p>Cleanaway has shown through investment in the kerbside Organics and commingled recovery</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
		<p>market segment, that it is a large supporter of resource recovery and the three bin system. Cleanaway will continue to drive innovation into this space. Some key examples of Cleanaway's investment in Victoria include,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organics decontamination, shredding and recovery for South East Melbourne. This will help long term to remove organics from the landfill and divert to a beneficial re use as compost. - The addition of multiple new energy generating units at MRL is a key example of ensuring that the value (environmental and financial) is extracted from the waste as per community expectation. - Investment in materials recovery facility (MRF) technology for rural Victoria and formation of strategic alliances with large MRF operators in Melbourne provide system wide coverage for co-mingled recycling. - Investment in kerbside collection services from the bass coast including Phillip Island to commence in 2017, this will require a decontamination, shredding and transfer facility to support final composting. - Strategic Alliance with Clean-up Australia day to help drive resource recovery behaviour across Victoria and the country.

Submission	Quotes	Response
		<p>- Kerbside recovery of Organics for Wodonga and Indigo shires – all organics material is diverted to composting through weekly kerbside collections.</p> <p>Cleanaway has significant recycling and MRF facilities across Australia.</p> <p>The MRL facility does not inhibit Victoria’s opportunities in the development of alternative waste technologies. Irrespective of the development of alternative technologies and increased recycling it is prudent to ensure there is availability of long term safe, cost efficient and proven disposal options for residual wastes.</p>
MRL00040	My thoughts are that it makes more sense to look at other avenues for waste disposal other than landfill. Europe has been using alternatives for decades now. I cannot see anything positive for the whole region with this proposal.	This application is for residual waste disposal facility, consistent with State policy. This does not inhibit exploration of alternative waste technologies.
MRL00055	<p>8. World cities, the likes of Tokyo, with a population 5 times the size of Melbourne sends to landfill approximately 80,000 tonnes per annum and we here are planning to send 1.5 million tonnes of waste to landfill per year if this expansion is allowed to go ahead.</p> <p>...</p> <p>10. Finally, if we are to continually provide waste contractors with easy access to landfill, then, we will be forever lazy and regressive, and in as such, fall way behind leading countries of the world in waste management and treatment technologies.</p>	See responses above.
MRL00057	Strategies should include greenfield landfills to be located in remote areas	See responses above.

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>(while this may be costly in the end, and ratepayers may end up paying higher waste service charges, I would readily prefer this option) funding studies or researches for alternative technologies or providing grants to encourage the private sector to build this alternative technology (increased use of wastes for power generation, etc), among others.</p>	
<p>Brimbank City Council-MRL00059</p>	<p>The proposal, at its core is land reclamation of an exhausted quarry, which was identified as an excellent opportunity in the 1954 Report, albeit with current technology. In 2016 Melbourne continues to generate residual waste based on a strategic approach and disposal solution which has not fundamentally altered since 1954, despite advances in technology elsewhere.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Council Officers' report:</p> <p>Council officers have considered the applications and propose an objection be lodged for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extensive life of the landfill will potentially divest investment from alternative forms of waste disposal and innovation, therefore reinforcing Victoria's reliance on landfills as a method of waste disposal over the long term. This is contrary to future direction for waste disposal in Victoria 	<p>See responses above.</p> <p>Taking a precautionary approach to securing longer term landfill options (locations for which are scarce) does not inhibit the development of alternative waste technologies.</p>
<p>MRL00060</p>	<p>Making such a decision will eliminate the need for a strategy to start developing a clean first-world solution, a truly sustainable solution for our waste.</p> <p>I believe landfills are a third-world solution to a first-world problem. Without any true consideration of the alternatives, putting off the decision for a healthier alternative will also increase the cost to the health and wellbeing of local communities and our environment. A landfill in such a grand scale will inevitably become a greater cost and taxing to the government and all taxpayers due to the financial repercussions of the damaged health of our families.</p> <p>You have an opportunity right here and now to say no to this landfill expansion. By saying no to this landfill expansion, you have an opportunity right here and now to say yes to any solution that is a healthier and environmentally cleaner alternative.</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>By saying no to this landfill expansion, you have an opportunity to saying yes to developing an alternative such as a waste to energy plant.</p> <p>If you continue saying yes to landfills, Melbourne and all of Victoria will never change our waste habits. No longer will we be “the most liveable city”.</p> <p>From Cleanaway’s website: “Sustainability: Our past has, our present does, and our future will depend on it.” If Cleanaway would only reflect on this statement and not just their balance sheet.</p>	
<p>MRL00061</p>	<p>3. Melbourne should be utilising alternative waste management methods to landfilling, as it is the least preferable option in Victoria’s waste management hierarchy.</p> <p>Not only is the location of the Ravenhall landfill inappropriate, but the very nature of the proposed activity is inappropriate. The state government should be investigating alternatives to landfilling, which should be the last resort for waste management.</p> <p>Clause 8 of Victoria’s Waste Management Policy (Siting, Design and Management of Landfills) clearly articulates a waste hierarchy that identifies disposal as the least preferable method:</p> <p><i>Wastes should be managed in accordance with the following order of preference:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) avoidance;</i> <i>(b) re-use;</i> <i>(c) re-cycling;</i> <i>(d) recovery of energy;</i> <i>(e) treatment;</i> <i>(f) containment;</i> <i>(g) disposal.</i> <p>These applications seek to perpetuate Melbourne’s reliance on landfilling for</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>the next 44 years. Alternative technologies such as pyrolysis should be investigated. Waste to energy systems are used around the world and are operated with significantly fewer community impacts compared to landfilling.</p> <p>This 44 year proposal would require a buffer for another 30 years post-closure due to the risk of landfill gas.</p>	
<p>MRL00064, MRL00075, MRL00091, MRL00069, MRL00070, MRL00071</p>	<p>Government policy states that landfill is the least preferred management option.</p> <p>That preference is based on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extensive evidence that landfills have serious, long term detrimental environmental impacts and 2. That waste is a resource and its reuse generates new economic opportunities and jobs while reducing demand for resources. <p>...</p> <p>To provide virtually unlimited landfilling capacity for the next 30- 50 years undermines the intention of the policy to minimise waste. European countries which have moved away from landfilling did so largely because they ran out of suitable landfill area.</p> <p>That meant they needed to fast-track the development of recovering waste resources through more sustainable technologies such as composting, recycling, waste- to-Energy infrastructure, etc.. Providing continuous capacity does not support current government policy. To approve this development with its long term, multiple adverse impacts on one Melbourne western population would be harsh and undemocratic. It runs contrary to the expressed community desire to have a greener west and a healthy local environment in which to raise their young families</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>
<p>MRL00073</p>	<p>1) The application does not clearly establish a need for the landfill, or consider the use of alternative resource recovery technologies.</p> <p>Before considering issues relating to the location and operation of the proposed landfill, the most fundamental shortcoming of the proposal is that it does not provide adequate justification as to why a landfill of this scale is required, and why it is even needed when much cleaner technologies could be</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>adopted. Victoria's Waste Management Policy (Siting, Design and Management of Landfills – gazetted 14th December 2014) includes Policy Principles that encompass a Waste Hierarchy (Clause 8(8)) that lists "(g) disposal" as the least preferable method of waste management. A more sustainable approach to managing waste in Melbourne would be to utilise waste-to-energy technologies such as those used in Europe.</p> <p>The needs assessment in the application is lacking in detail. Too much emphasis is given on having additional "just in case" capacity.</p>	
<p>MRL00083</p>	<p>3. Alternatives to landfill</p> <p>Alternatives to landfill are available, however these can vary significantly with different policy and regulatory requirements in multiple jurisdictions.</p> <p>In Europe it is viable to incinerate many waste streams, including those that are accepted at the Melbourne Regional Landfill, however this is not usually available for Victorian conditions due to regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Recent advances in science and engineering will allow waste streams to be viably processed into energy and other products that have commercial markets.</p> <p>In the time until the commencement of landfilling in 2025, technology that is under development has a very good chance of being able to demonstrate the functional and economic viability. As the landfill levy goes up the commercial incentive to create a viable alternative gets stronger, and the return on investment becomes more attractive.</p> <p>The Victorian government has a progressive attitude towards reducing waste and landfill as evidenced by the SWIRRP and the \$450 million Victorian Sustainability Fund.</p> <p>The Victorian Sustainability Fund purpose as defined by the Environmental Protection Act 1970 is to foster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • environmentally sustainable uses of resources and best practices in waste management to advance the social and economic development of Victoria; and/or • community action or innovation in relation to the reduction of greenhouse gas 	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>substance emissions or adaptation or adjustment to climate change in Victoria. (Reference: http://delwp.vic.gov.au/environment-and-wildlife/sustainability-fund)</p> <p>With a strong policy and regulatory mandate to reduce (and eventually eliminate) landfill it would seem premature to approve a development that would not be operational for another nine years. It is therefore not appropriate to extending the life of the Melbourne Regional Landfill without considering the outcome of the alternatives that are under development in the next few years, as these may be able to a better job at achieving the Victorian government policy objectives – i.e. reducing the impact on the community, the environment and public health of surrounding land users.</p>	
MRL00094, MRL00095	<p>Government should be looking at alternatives to landfilling which fit with sustainability – reduce, recycle, recover. This is not world’s best practice, we should be trying harder.</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>
MRL00096	<p>This late submission is as a local resident, parent, academic educator and founding director of locally based consulting company COMFORTiD, which enables smart affordable inclusive solutions to be integrated, everywhere around the world.</p> <p>Transition out of fossil fuels is inevitable, this amendment is a major opportunity. On various public events we’ve proposed together with Bendigo based KAV Consulting’s principal Klaas Visser and Melbourne based PHTRarchitects Peter Hogg and Toby Reed the inclusion of hybrid thermal exchange networks and waste to energy solutions in the Greater Melbourne area, like Dandenong VIC and over 5000 locations globally.</p> <p>In the current Melbourne Regional Landfill expansion Ravenhall proposal, unfortunately we can not find these elements back.</p> <p>This should be considered and included NOW, as part of COMFORTiD’s bigger picture solution to utilise hidden assets like industrial waste heat in the greater Geelong and Melbourne metropolitan area : https://youtu.be/jPsPTANGGbo We need to utilize the massive waste to energy potential, use global best practices, like Melbourne University’s Dominique Hes has published in a few of her books and paper on thriving liveable communities. Our Occupational Health and Safety act 2004 indicates</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>local best practices are NOT good enough, world's best practices need to be adapted. TPI/Cleanaway's Ravenhall proposal, to fill and cap a big Boral quarry hole with rubbish, is clearly NOT adapting WORLD's best practice. Landfilling creates massive environmental legacy. Trying to catch the mixed methane gas from the slowly rotting mixed rubbish and burn that dirty gas is NOT considered proper waste to energy. We might have to clarify that difference to TPI and the committee. Side effect from NOT considering us now, is that we will NOT be able to create alternative business cases for serious waste to energy processing facilities as is preferred by Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group's boss Rob Millard and many others.</p> <p>Copenhagen's new Amager Bakke will get a ski slope topping on top of serious rubbish pre-sorting into different fractions. Then followed by incinerating these different fractions, in the cleanest possible way. Real state of the art, large scale, smart.</p> <p>The Amager Bakke waste to energy plant is still under construction June 2015 © Mik Aidt</p> <p>This globally published facility is part of smart locally interconnected Danish community, and will be selling into various local microgrids: electricity, steam, heating, cooling and CO² This is already common practice in over 5000 smart community projects around the world: Vancouver, Rotterdam's Randstad & Dandenong VIC. We at COMFORTiD would be happy to support the exploration of the process by being involved in the hearing and providing more detail of the potential. We might need 45 minutes. We look forward to hearing from you.</p>	
<p>Melton City Council - MRL00086</p>	<p>Council also submits that alternative technologies should be investigated for this site, which would reduce reliance on the current practices being dependent on such a large land supply. Council's submission to the draft MWRRIP stated:</p> <p>"Council strongly supports implementation of alternate waste technologies that will reduce our reliance on landfill. Our community does not wish for the City of Melton, and in particular the Ravenhall hub to be turned into the primary disposal location for all of Melbourne's waste.... we must move to a system where pre-sorting or alternate technologies are used first, with only residual</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
	<p>inert waste requiring landfill".</p> <p>Council supports the expansion of the renewable energy production on site.</p> <p>Council has voiced concern in previous submissions to the State government in relation to waste and resource recovery about this site being identified as one of three of the most important landfill sites for Melbourne with waste expected to come from all over Melbourne. Council acknowledges the site has been identified as a State significant resource and recovery site, is currently being quarried and is already operating as a landfill. However, reliance on so few sites for Melbourne's future waste and resource recovery needs may result in a landfill operation at this site which is larger than what may be required if other sites were sourced.</p> <p>Council requests that the operators should be required to develop a detailed plan for the next 5-10 years which provides sustainable solutions for the collection, disposal and resource recovery for its waste collection — which coincides with Council's 2011-2016 'it Starts with Zero' waste management strategy.</p> <p>Council also submits that the State Government rescinds this site as a major regional landfill for future expansion and that this landfill should cease operating once the current permit has expired — and that a fairer distribution of landfill sites needs to be provided across Melbourne.</p>	
<p>MRL00089</p>	<p>To give a landfill operator a 40-50 year permit to construct landfill cells (presumably based on some form of initial Works Approval for the whole site) sends a message to both community and industry that the Government is happy to entertain major landfilling for the next 40 – 50 years. It indicates that there is no realistic intention to recover resources, including embedded energy from “wastes” that would otherwise be landfilled and which will grow to many millions of tonnes per year with this expansion. Why invest in alternative technologies for resource recovery if this is the approved Government intention?</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

Submission	Quotes	Response
MRL00103	8. What gives another human being the right to destroy my community, my children's health and well-being? Rubbish and people do not mix. There must be ways to deal with Rubbish. Money received by the government through landfill levies should be utilised to find new and innovative ways to deal with waste that has less impact on humans, community and environment. Please look at waste technology / management that is being utilised in Scandinavian countries.	See responses above.