



Member of the Surbana Jurong Group

local people
global experience

11 June 2020

Huw Evans
EPA Victoria
181 Williams Street
Melbourne
VIC

Dear Huw,

RE: GSWT Response to Submissions – WAA 1003592

SMEC Australia Pty Ltd (SMEC) provide this letter to the Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) in response to submissions received on 5 June 2020 for the Great Southern Waste Technologies (GSWT) Works Approval application (WAA 1003592) for a proposed Waste to Energy facility, located at 70 Ordish Road, Dandenong South.

A response to each submission has been prepared by GSWT, as presented in herein.

Yours sincerely,

Julian Howard

Manager – Waste

SMEC Australia Pty Ltd

SMEC

Tower 4, Level 20, 727 Collins Street
Docklands, VIC 3008, Australia
PO Box 23027, Docklands, VIC 8012, Australia)
T +61 3 9514 1500 F +61 3 9514 1502 E melbourne@smec.com
www.smec.com



SMEC Australia Pty Ltd ABN 47 065 475 149
SMEC International Pty Ltd ABN 32 065 440 619
SMEC Services Pty Ltd ABN 79 066 504 792
SMEC Holdings Pty Ltd ABN 84 057 274 049

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
225762	It is an a significant health concern for the keys borough community, mentally and physically.	This sort of facility should not be built so close to residential area, no matter what. No! No! No!	The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.
225772	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Too close to the Residential zone and schools. Mt Hira College only 1.5km from the proposed plant. 2. Produces ultra-fine particulates(diameter less than 0.1 m)in high amounts, which cause a high chance of heart or lung disease. 3. The proposal fails to meet the basic principles of renewable energy (Electricity) Act 2000- would burn plastic 4. Studies confirm Health effects of waste to energy incineration - according to "Howard C.V. The health impacts of incineration. Proof of Evidence submitted to East Sussex and Brighton and Hove Local Plan Public Inquiry, 2003" 5. Explosion incidents happened in USA, Europe. 	Please consider our community as your own.	<p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information. Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The proposal is being assessed under Section 19B of the <i>Environment Protection Act 1970</i> (EP Act) for the production of energy at the site.</p> <p>The proposed technology is gasification and example referenced is not consistent with this technology or performance</p> <p>The operating conditions and continuous monitoring manage the performance and operational risk of malfunction.</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
225773	<p>Waste, I am do not support for this project to happens in the dandenong south area.</p> <p>Reasons are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area is too close to residential area. This kind of proposal, has to be proposed in the area which has or far away from residential area. 2. The residential area surrounding the dandenong south proposed for waste, I can say 95% are young families with new born, infant, toddler, school age children. 3. Waste, it doesn't matter what kind of waste, it is still and always another type of polution. This polutions are smells and may cause radiation. These will effect the health issues in the young childrens future healths. Health is always the number 1 issue until today and please don't make it worse. <p>Australia government always implements to young families to live healthy. But if the environment doesn't cooperate, how can we have a healthy living?</p> <p>This health issue has to be cautious start from baby born or even they are still in womb.</p> <p>Healthy means not only from what you eat and indoor excercise, This also means from what you breath and outdoor excercise.</p>	<p>Waste, I am do not support for this project to happens in the dandenong south area.</p> <p>Reasons are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area is too close to residential area. This kind of proposal, has to be proposed in the area which has or far away from residential area. 2. The residential area surrounding the dandenong south proposed for waste, I can say 95% are young families with new born, infant, toddler, school age children. 3. Waste, it doesn't matter what kind of waste, it is still and always another type of polution. This polutions are smells and may cause radiation. These will effect the health issues in the young childrens future healths. Health is always the number 1 issue until today and please don't make it worse. <p>Australia government always implements to young families to live healthy. But if the environment doesn't cooperate, how can we have a healthy living?</p> <p>This health issue has to be cautious start from baby born or even they are still in womb.</p> <p>Healthy means not only from what you eat and indoor excercise, This also means</p>	<p>The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The facility is enclosed and operated under conditions creating a slight negative air pressure to minimise odour release. Air from within the hall and bunker area is utilised as the combustion air injected into the oxidation chamber(s), where odours, hydrocarbons and volatile compounds will be destroyed. Based on evidence from similar facilities currently operating overseas, this will eliminate most, if not all, odours. Regular monitoring for odours will be a requirement of the operational monitoring plan. Please refer to Section 4.5.5.6 (Odour) of the Works Approval Application for further details.</p> <p>The facility is located within a designated Waste and Resource Recovery Hub and it is =</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
	<p>The new school built in keysborough south. And I can only laugh if this waste plan still go on.</p> <p>4. Right now and happens since I move here 5 years ago, sometimes my self and the whole neighbourhood can smell something disgusting before this new waste implements and proposed.</p> <p>5. The result of implements this, will lower the price of the property surrounding the suburbs which are a lot of million dollars houses built.</p> <p>And this will makes more people moving from the area which may impact the business around such as shopping center will not have a good profit.</p> <p>I do believe a lot more people object this proposal just fro the same reason as what I write above.</p>	<p>from what you breath and outdoor excercise.</p> <p>The new school built in keysborough south. And I can only laugh if this waste plan still go on.</p> <p>4. Right now and happens since I move here 5 years ago, sometimes my self and the whole neighbourhood can smell something disgusting before this new waste implements and proposed.</p> <p>5. The result of implements this, will lower the price of the property surrounding the suburbs which are a lot of million dollars houses built. And this will makes more people moving from the area which may impact the business around such as shopping center will not have a good profit.</p> <p>I do believe a lot more people object this proposal just fro the same reason as what I write above.</p>	<p>consistent with the intent of this Hub and its co located waste management industries.</p>
225954	<p>I support this proposed project. Being engaged for over 40 years construction of refractory end users in waste incineration, power plants, petro chemical plants and many other industries I am fully aware of the advanced technologies in the operation of such plants as described for this project. It will be safe, clean and provide a much needed energy source.</p>	<p>Having read the s22 I believe the SMEC response to EPA WAA requested details have been provided.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
226337	<p>Not support the project because the location is too close to the residential area and the hazard associated with it. Being so close to the residential area, the risks and hazard has been amplified, especially when the plant and equipment getting older and the profit over takes the safety and health of the workers and community in general. The risks and hazard are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air emissions from the combustion constitutes more of a serious health hazard to human health - Increased noises and road traffic of garbage trucks to transport municipal waste to the plant are risks to the communities around the site. - The stigma and perception from the public of the community being less liveable due to the Waste to Energy plant in the area. Bad image of our city - Produces a hazardous waste stream (fly ash and gas cleaning residue). - The hazardous solid residues - The noise from the plant - The constant requires to control the NOx and the toxic organics which highly potential hazard as plant aging 	<p>Anyone who has been paying attention will know that gasification projects are infamous for over-promising and under-delivering.</p>	<p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The facility is enclosed and operated under conditions creating a slight negative air pressure to minimise odour release. Air from within the hall and bunker area is utilised as the combustion air injected into the oxidation chamber(s), where odours, hydrocarbons and volatile compounds will be destroyed. Based on evidence from similar facilities currently operating overseas, this will eliminate most, if not all, odours. Regular monitoring for odours will be a requirement of the operational monitoring plan. Please refer to Section 4.5.5.6 (Odour) of the Works Approval Application for further details.</p> <p>The operation of the facility will comply with the relevant SEPP N-1 noise limits and the proposed design objectives for each of the</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
	- Potential risk of the gasification plant explosion and fire endanger the communities		identified noise sensitive receptors, following implementation of the mitigation measures presented in Section 5.4.1.3. Please refer to Section 5.4 (Noise) of the Works Approval application for further detail.
226379	Based on the information provided from GSWT, I do not believe they have fully understand the impact of the buliding of waste-to-energy facility not only means the regenerated energy from the waste but the environmental problems and heavily shock to the health and real estate will be much more sereious. The modelling of the air emissions assessment, only takes previous model from other reference and data, but not much real data from Melbourne based environmental monitoring sections. That will greatly introduce the deviation of future results from the predictions. In a word, i do not support this proposal as it will generate more	The GSWT has provided related reponse to the queries but not sufficient and effective. They should provide more methods to solve the problems. Also, what they have responded are all based on the point of waste-to-energy, as for other negative sides will generate from the proposal they did not mentioned much	The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.
227585	Living in close proximity to the proposed site I have to question the safety aspects but am more concerned with the quality of emissions, the quantity and the odors that will certainly be produced by this type of activity. I live in an over 50's village in Frankston/Dandenong Rd. Bangholme and many in the village are already impacted by the smells and air quality from the industrial areas around us. Whilst the intention of the	-	The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information. Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility were all below the relevant assessment

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
	<p>incinerator is admirable and a necessary evil, there is not a place for such an intrusive and debatable facility when you have people so close by. There are schools and a housing estate nearby, try considering us all as I am sure this would be a 24</p>		<p>criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The facility is enclosed and operated under conditions creating a slight negative air pressure to minimise odour release. Air from within the hall and bunker area is utilised as the combustion air injected into the oxidation chamber(s), where odours, hydrocarbons and volatile compounds will be destroyed. Based on evidence from similar facilities currently operating overseas, this will eliminate most, if not all, odours. Regular monitoring for odours will be a requirement of the operational monitoring plan. Please refer to Section 4.5.5.6 (Odour) of the Works Approval Application for further details.</p>
229014	<p>1, Some sessions hasn't been answered clearly 2, There are some incomplete responses, (including mentioned on Summary report) 3, Technical plan and data cannot eliminate any risk, and such risk must not share with local residences, students, workers nearby, and wider communities 4, The way to manage waste cannot guarantee the burning temperature of the materials, it creates risk to create more Dioxin emission</p>	<p>It is good to provide all the responses and application to the public. However, the whole process has not been widely informed to the community, i.e. majority of the local community and the surrounding community don't know about this project and the progress of this application.</p> <p>Also, lots of the reports are not being able to be understood by general public. As to be responsible to the general public, it is always good to use laymen terms as well as listing</p>	<p>The operation of the facility has been designed to mitigate the potential for dioxins and furans to be generated. Dioxins are known to form during the burning of plastic waste at temperatures between 250°C - 400°C. The formation of any dioxins in the feed are destroyed in the combustion chamber due to the temperature of the chamber exceeding 400°C. Rapid cooling occurs in the energy recovery system such that reformation of dioxins is avoided. Refer to Section 4.1.10 (Key Process Controls) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
	<p>5, Liquid sink into land and damage on land and food chain is a proven high risk for long term</p> <p>6, The location selected has breach the local policy.</p>	<p>pros & cons for the opinion of locals. It should gain a community permit to join in as a community member.</p> <p>Technical problems can always suggest a technical solutions, but splitting community harmony, risk of health and safety, and anxiety are never being able to resolve by technical solutions!</p>	<p>Potentially contaminated water will be contained within the bunded building and separated from stormwater outside the building. Please refer to Section 5.5 (Water) for further information.</p> <p>The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Community and stakeholder engagement has been conducted throughout the process. Please refer to Section 3 (Community Engagement) of the Works Approval application for further information. Additionally, three stakeholder engagement forums have been held, a community workshop and direct communication with a range of stakeholders and other interest parties.</p>
229019	<p>Report still have lots of incomplete responses. Air emission is still a possible risk even providing data.</p> <p>Written emergency management is also a risk.</p>	-	<p>Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
	There is no strict monitoring policy for such facility. It must be installed near residences and school and religion centres.		<p>A Site Environmental Management Plan (SEMP) has been developed to address the potential risks occurring during routine and non-routine events. This will be amended to include specific monitoring requirements, as required by EPA. Please refer to Section 6.5.1 (Site Environmental Management Plan) for further information.</p> <p>The Work Approval conditions will stipulate all monitoring requirements and frequencies.</p>
229336	Concerns on air/water pollution to residents/school surrounded.	Is the current technology advanced enough to protect environment?	<p>Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Potentially contaminated water will be contained within the bunded building and separated from stormwater outside the building. Please refer to Section 5.5 (Water) for further information.</p>
229352	<p>The location of this plant is too close to residential areas. The gas that poured out by this waste factory would be harmful to many people such as local residents, kids and students. So, the government should be responsible for protecting these people's health and community.</p> <p>As a result, I firmly oppose this plan.</p>	I do not support this application!	<p>The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
			<p>were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>
229355	<p>Technical data and processing schemes cannot represent the removal of fatal risks</p> <p>Residents, schools, and communities should not bear any risks with the applicant</p> <p>The pre-treatment of waste incineration cannot effectively manage the heating value management, and the risk of toxic gas emissions is high.</p> <p>The impact of penetration on land and bio-chains failed to propose solutions.</p> <p>Both fly ash and bottom ash contain large amounts of dioxins,</p>	-	<p>Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Dioxin destruction occurs when the gasification process temperature is maintained at >850°C for >2 seconds. The feedstock continues along the moving grate, at a temperature of >850°C until it reaches the end point. Material which meets the endpoint is called bottom ash. Bottom ash is disposed</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
			<p>of into a quenching bath where it is rapidly cooled, preventing the re-formation of dioxins. Bottom ash and fly ash will be disposed to an appropriately licenced landfill or reuse facility, should reused be deemed feasible. Please refer to Section 5.7 (Waste) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>
229362	<p>I have read reports on toxic emissions from incinerators and I dont want to live in a polluted environment. The proposed facility is only 1.5 kilometres from our residential area, schools and places of worship. It will put us in danger</p>	<p>I have read reports on toxic emissions from incinerators and I don't want to live in a polluted environment. The proposed facility is only 1.5 kilometres from our residential area, schools and places of worship. It will put us in danger.</p>	<p>The proposed technology is gasification which is inconsistent with incineration. Incineration plants are very different in both operation and emissions.</p> <p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>
229366	<p>Technical data and processing schemes cannot represent the removal of fatal risks.</p>	-	<p>The technology has over 800,000 hours of operation without a fatality. It has many systems and controls which prevent fatal risk events occurring. The facility is designed in line with Australian standards, building codes</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
			etc and operates under stringent OHS conditions
229373	<p>The proposed facility is only 1.5 kilometres from our residential area, schools and places of worship. It will put us in danger.</p> <p>An incinerator risks the escape of dangerous pollution. I am concerned about airborne pollution including greenhouse gases, CO₂, sulphure dioxides, dioxins, and many other chemicals.</p> <p>These pollutants are harmful to the environment and human health.</p> <p>I am worried about my grandchildren who play outside for hours every day. They will naturally take in more air, and more pollutants.</p>	Please stop this project.	<p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>It is estimated that the facility will result in a greenhouse gas emissions net benefit of 142,800 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e) per year. Please refer to Section 5.1 (Energy Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>
229381	I am worried about my son and other kids who play outside for hours every day. They will naturally take in more air, and more pollutants.	-	<p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
			were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.
229382	it is too close to residential areas e.g. Keysborough and a school (Mt Hira College), and shopping centres.	No one can guaranty that this plant will make no pollution at all. History has told us such plants built in other area lead to a enviroment pollution. Once it built, our local people become victims. Such plant should be built far distance from residential area, school and shopping centres.	<p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>
229383	Technical data and processing cannot solve the problems of community health safety and mental health impact of residents.	-	The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
229387	Too close to school and residential area, not good for environment .	Not good for environment.	The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.
229391	I do not support due to environmental pollution and too close to residential properties	-	<p>The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>
229392	Too close to the residential area!! Please care about the resident and students around!	-	The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.
229411	harm to our health, especially our children. Danger to our living.		The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
	Damage to the weather! Totally disagree with this proposal. Too close to residential area!		(Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information. The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.
229421	Technical data and processing schemes does not mean total elimination of fatal risks	Some questions are not answered with details	The technology has over 800,000 hours of operation without a fatality. It has many systems and controls which prevent fatal risk events occurring. The facility is designed in line with Australian standards, building codes etc and operates under stringent OHS conditions
229424	it is formal objection from me and my family. we community strongly suggest to reach allocate the incinerator at 70 ordish road. it is too close to the dense populated residential area. the technology is uncertain. the whole process is not transparent enough to the public.	if EPA can't locate and sort out current air pollution and bad smell in Dandenong South and keysborough area. please don't rush to add another burden.	The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information. Data has been obtained from reference facilities with proven technology (the same as the proposed facility) to inform the relevant assessments. Please refer to Section 4.1.6 (Reference Facilities) of the Works Approval application for further information. The EPA is a independent authority which administers the EP Act in Victoria.

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
229426	<p>First it is illegal as it is within 1.5km to the school.</p> <p>Second it is far too close to the residential area. We are all lifes. We can not be tested.</p>		<p>The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>
229429	<p>All technical data dose not mean risks are being eliminated! Too close to residence. Community should not bare the risk for commercial businesses!</p>	<p>I completed response need to be complete before any decision!</p>	<p>The separation distance to identified receptors and the 500 m buffer was considered acceptable. Please refer to Section 1.6 (Site Selection) and Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The technology has over 800,000 hours of operation without a fatality. It has many systems and controls which prevent fatal risk</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
			events occurring. The facility is designed in line with Australian standards, building codes etc and operates under stringent OHS conditions
229432	No waste-to-energy facility		A work Approval application has been prepared for assessment by the EPA of Victoria, an independent State Government Agency who administer activities and approvals for facilities such as that proposed at 70 Ordish Road.
229434	Thousands and thousands peoples health would be affected by the pollution. And this effect is irreversible. I guess no one can afford to risk health. Why cant it be away from residential area. We are a new built community, mainly young families, and there are schools around. Thousands and thousands children would be affected for their entire life. Our family strongly oppose this project.		<p>Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>
229442	Very high risk to human beings health	Very close to residents land.	The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.
229445	Harmful to people	Very close to my home.	The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
			are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.
229447	<p>The response dodged questions from community concerns, especially on risk assessment and management, There is no solid QA and continuous monitoring and governance from a reliable thrid party either.</p> <p>This further impaired the already damaged trust and we do not believe the applicant will make efforts to minimise risks to residents at all given what they have done. Yet there is no one, NO ONE, can technically constrain them from doing what they should not be doing, as EPA relies on community reporting to initiate investigation, while we do not have access to equipments that are required to measure pollutions, and some negative impact is long term damage which will have a serious consequences and hard for non-environmental professionals to establish the links.</p> <p>This is insincere and I would be deeply disappointed if EPA ever issued a works approval without being able to supervise what the applicant will do. If you approve it you should take responsibilities. If you have doubts, get them to build it somewhere far from schools and residential areas. There</p>	<p>They just ignored us, dodging the questions for which they will either have to provide an answer that does not support their own claim , or lie. e.g. on risk assessment and management.</p> <p>Again, there is nothing done to establish a solid QA process and continuous monitoring and governance from a reliable thrid party, after we raised the concern. Also this feels like you complete you plan then you don't have to stick to it because no one can catch you.</p>	<p>An environmental risk assessment was conducted to identify environmental risks, guiding the application of Best Practice technology during construction, routine operations and non-routine operations. The risk assessment is intended to identify risks and controls to reduce risks to an acceptable level. The risk assessment identified both social and environmental risks associated with the project. Please refer to Section 6.2 (Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Data has been obtained from reference facilities with proven technology (the same as the proposed facility) to inform the relevant assessments. Please refer to Section 4.1.6 (Reference Facilities) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
	lots of proved cases from history and we don't want to become one. If you choose to do nothing until something happens, you are helping them to hurt people.		The facility has continuous monitoring and strict requirements to report a range of data outputs to EPA as a condition of operating. EPA is an independent authority who administer the satisfactory environmental performance of all activities in Victoria.
229450	Environmental protection		Please refer to Works Approval application for further detail regarding environmental protection measures.
229468	<p>Some tech questions are not answered well</p> <p>The report summary shows a large number of unanswered questions</p> <p>Technical data and processing schemes cannot represent the removal of fatal risks</p> <p>Residents, schools, and communities should not bear any risks with the applicant</p> <p>The pre-treatment of waste incineration cannot effectively manage the heating value management, and the risk of toxic gas emissions is high</p> <p>The impact of penetration on land and bio-chains failed to propose solutions</p> <p>Both fly ash and bottom ash contain large amounts of dioxins, and the current treatment plan is not appropriate</p>	<p>Some tech questions are not answered well</p> <p>The report summary shows a large number of unanswered questions</p> <p>Technical data and processing schemes cannot represent the removal of fatal risks</p> <p>Residents, schools, and communities should not bear any risks with the applicant</p> <p>The pre-treatment of waste incineration cannot effectively manage the heating value management, and the risk of toxic gas emissions is high</p> <p>The impact of penetration on land and bio-chains failed to propose solutions</p>	<p>The human health risk assessment has determined that the risks to human health associated with acute and chronic exposures are negligible. Please refer to Section 5.3 (Human Health Risk Assessment) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Modelled ground level concentrations associated with emissions from the facility were all below the relevant assessment criteria. Please refer to Section 5.2 (Air Emissions) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p> <p>Dioxin destruction occurs when the gasification process temperature is maintained at >850°C for >2 seconds. The feedstock continues along the moving grate, at a temperature of >850°C until it reaches the end point. Material which meets the endpoint is called bottom ash. Bottom ash is disposed of into a quenching bath where it is rapidly cooled, preventing the re-formation of</p>

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
	<p>Technical data and technical processing cannot solve problems such as community health and safety and residents' mental health effects</p>	<p>Both fly ash and bottom ash contain large amounts of dioxins, and the current treatment plan is not appropriate</p> <p>Technical data and technical processing cannot solve problems such as community health and safety and residents' mental health effects</p>	<p>dioxins. Bottom ash and fly ash will be disposed to an appropriately licenced landfill or reuse facility, should reused be deemed feasible. Please refer to Section 5.7 (Waste) of the Works Approval application for further information.</p>
229469	<p>Some tech questions are not answered well</p> <p>The report summary shows a large number of unanswered questions</p> <p>Technical data and processing schemes cannot represent the removal of fatal risks</p> <p>Residents, schools, and communities should not bear any risks with the applicant</p> <p>The pre-treatment of waste incineration cannot effectively manage the heating value management, and the risk of toxic gas emissions is high</p> <p>The impact of penetration on land and bio-chains failed to propose solutions</p> <p>Both fly ash and bottom ash contain large amounts of dioxins, and the current treatment plan is not appropriate</p>	<p>Some tech questions are not answered well</p> <p>The report summary shows a large number of unanswered questions</p> <p>Technical data and processing schemes cannot represent the removal of fatal risks</p> <p>Residents, schools, and communities should not bear any risks with the applicant</p> <p>The pre-treatment of waste incineration cannot effectively manage the heating value management, and the risk of toxic gas emissions is high</p> <p>The impact of penetration on land and bio-chains failed to propose solutions</p> <p>Both fly ash and bottom ash contain large amounts of dioxins, and the</p>	THIS IS A DUPLICATION

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
	<p>Technical data and technical processing cannot solve problems such as community health and safety and residents' mental</p>	<p>current treatment plan is not appropriate</p> <p>Technical data and technical processing cannot solve problems such as community health and safety and residents' mental health effects</p>	
229470	<p>Some tech questions are not answered well</p> <p>The report summary shows a large number of unanswered questions</p> <p>Technical data and processing schemes cannot represent the removal of fatal risks</p> <p>Residents, schools, and communities should not bear any risks with the applicant</p> <p>The pre-treatment of waste incineration cannot effectively manage the heating value management, and the risk of toxic gas emissions is high</p> <p>The impact of penetration on land and bio-chains failed to propose solutions</p> <p>Both fly ash and bottom ash contain large amounts of dioxins, and the current treatment plan is not appropriate</p> <p>Technical data and technical processing cannot solve problems such as community health and safety and residents' mental</p>	<p>Some tech questions are not answered well</p> <p>The report summary shows a large number of unanswered questions</p> <p>Technical data and processing schemes cannot represent the removal of fatal risks</p> <p>Residents, schools, and communities should not bear any risks with the applicant</p> <p>The pre-treatment of waste incineration cannot effectively manage the heating value management, and the risk of toxic gas emissions is high</p> <p>The impact of penetration on land and bio-chains failed to propose solutions</p> <p>Both fly ash and bottom ash contain large amounts of dioxins, and the current treatment plan is not appropriate</p>	THIS IS A DUPLICATION

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
	health effects	Technical data and technical processing cannot solve problems such as community health and safety and residents' mental health effects	
229472	<p>Some tech questions are not answered well</p> <p>The report summary shows a large number of unanswered questions</p> <p>Technical data and processing schemes cannot represent the removal of fatal risks</p> <p>Residents, schools, and communities should not bear any risks with the applicant</p> <p>The pre-treatment of waste incineration cannot effectively manage the heating value management, and the risk of toxic gas emissions is high</p> <p>The impact of penetration on land and bio-chains failed to propose solutions</p> <p>Both fly ash and bottom ash contain large amounts of dioxins, and the current treatment plan is not appropriate</p> <p>Technical data and technical processing cannot solve problems such as community health and safety and residents' mental health effects</p>	<p>Some tech questions are not answered well</p> <p>The report summary shows a large number of unanswered questions</p> <p>Technical data and processing schemes cannot represent the removal of fatal risks</p> <p>Residents, schools, and communities should not bear any risks with the applicant</p> <p>The pre-treatment of waste incineration cannot effectively manage the heating value management, and the risk of toxic gas emissions is high</p> <p>The impact of penetration on land and bio-chains failed to propose solutions</p> <p>Both fly ash and bottom ash contain large amounts of dioxins, and the current treatment plan is not appropriate</p> <p>Technical data and technical processing cannot solve problems such as</p>	THIS IS A DUPLICATION

Contribution ID	Explanation	Comments on S22 Notice	SMEC/GSWT Response
		community health and safety and residents' mental health effects	