



## Community dialogue - meeting #2

### Hi-Quality - West Gate Tunnel Proposal

#### Meeting details

*Date:* 11 May 2021, 4:30pm to 5:30pm

*Venue:* Hume Global Learning Centre, 44 Macedon Street, Sunbury

*Attendees:*

#### Community representatives:

- Anthony White - Controller, Sunbury SES
- Chris O'Neill - Not Toxic Soil campaign
- Graham Williams - Sunbury Residents Association
- Heather Dodd - Neighbour
- Michael Osborne - Sunbury Business Association

#### Hi-Quality

- Lance Ingrams - Regional Manager, Victoria

#### i.e community

- Todd Beavis - Principal (facilitator)

#### Purpose

The meeting was held to continue the dialogue between Hi-Quality and community representatives in relation to the proposal to manage, treat and reuse soil from the West Gate Tunnel. The primary purpose of the meeting was to make progress on engagement with the community, considering the actions identified at the first meeting. More broadly, the community dialogue provides the opportunity for Hi-Quality representatives to meet with members of the community in person to provide an update on the proposal, answer questions and obtain input into engagement activities.



## Agenda

The key items for discussion were:

- Introductions
- Update on the proposal
- Questions
- Community engagement.

## Key points of discussion

- Anthony White, Controller of Sunbury SES was welcomed to the group. It was noted that Anthony was attending as a representative of a significant community of volunteers in Sunbury, who had been previously briefed on the proposal. It was also noted that engagement would be undertaken separately with the SES as part of consulting with local emergency services should Hi-Quality win a tender.
- Anthony explained that the primary concern with the proposal from the local volunteers was about the potential for a truck containing PFAS to rollover. He noted that truck rollovers on Sunbury Road were not uncommon.
- The timing and potential impacts of legal action was discussed further, with different parties speculating how it may impact the approvals process.
- Hi-Quality advised that the tender is likely to be awarded through two separate contracts. One from Transurban to build the testing and treatment facility. One from CPB/John Holland to manage, treat and reuse the spoil from the tunnel.
- Community representatives reported that the recent protest went well, with good numbers turning up, demonstrating the anger in the community that they are not being listened to, particularly by the State Government. The upcoming protest at Parliament House was noted.
- A recent inspection of Bulla Bridge was discussed and whether this was pre-emptive of the site being chosen. It was generally agreed that this was a follow up to an early inspection. Community representatives have requested further information from VicRoads.
- Discussion around the risks presented by trucks, noted that the bridge was less of a concern, with the greater risk was with trucks navigating the steep hills and curves.
- Once again, a significant focus of the discussion was about the need for greater engagement and the need to provide more information to the community about the proposal and the project more broadly. It was noted that Hi-Quality was the only party actively engaging the community.
- The need for credibility and independent voices was discussed, particularly when it came to the level of PFAS in the spoil and the potential risks to the community and the local environment. The general view was that an academic or scientist, not being paid by a vested interest, would likely be most credible. The CSIRO was highlighted as a respected institution.



## Agreed actions

- Ongoing dialogue with community representatives
  - It was noted that a representative of the local CFA was invited by a community representative, who was advised they would consider joining the dialogue if a tender was awarded to Hi-Quality.
  - Representatives asked that Josh Bull be invited to the next meeting.
- A more structured Q&A process:
  - A call-out for questions had been put out to members of No Toxic Soil campaign Facebook groups, these were being compiled and sent through.
  - A commitment was given to sharing the responses from Hi-Quality with the groups.
  - An offer had been made to hold an online briefing and Q&A with the No Toxic Soil campaign admin group, who declined at this time due to the focus on the protests. This offer was reiterated to all groups represented.
- Development of the online engagement platform:
  - Hi-Quality advised that a new conversation tool would be added to the platform to enable greater interactivity as requested.
  - It will also be made clear that Todd Beavis from i.e. community, or one of the i.e. team, would be responding to questions on behalf of Hi-Quality.
- Hi-Quality to advise who has accountability for briefing and training the SES and CFA should they win the tender to treat the spoil.
- Further consideration be given to organising an online briefing and Q&A, potentially with all groups involved in the dialogue represented. Community representatives noted that it needs to be a genuine effort and not too “staged managed”.
- Agreement that the notes from the meetings could be shared with Facebook groups.

## Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday 8 June.

# i.e.

## Community questions

The following questions were received from the No Toxic Soil Campaign following the meeting.

1. What happens if a truck has an accident and the soil is dumped [on the road]. Given this soil is toxic, what is the emergency management plan to prevent contaminating the area? Who is responsible for cleaning it up? Also, if this happened with your facility what would be the plan?
2. How will this spoil be treated and what percentage of contaminants will remain after this treatment process? Will the treatment be just the water that comes out of the soil or the soil itself?
3. If Bulla bridge was closed due to structural problems, what would be the alternate route to Hi-Quality?
4. Will all loads on trucks be covered and if it is noticed uncovered who do we report to?
5. How often will the EPA conduct testing for leachate and compliance within your facility?
6. What treatment method will be used?
7. How are you planning on transporting this spoil? How is it sealed off from blowing/leaking out of these trucks?
8. Will the road be maintained better than it currently is out the front of your property?
9. If Hi-Quality are offered the tender prior to the completion of the legal process, will they sign the contract in anticipation of someone else paying the bill?
10. Has a traffic management plan/risk assessment been done for the site? If so, is it available?
11. What will HQ do to improve road safety in the area?

Responses to these questions will be provided ahead of the next meeting. Further questions are welcome.