

I object to this proposal for the following reasons:

- The odour levels assessed within the document do not align with or consider complaints of odour issues in the area
- Issues with Veolia not providing community information in timely manner (community consultation)
- Irrigation is proposed to go on soils that are potentially water logged with no indication of soil moisture content or irrigation controls within the plan.
- Incomplete data in assessment

I expand on these reasons below:

- Odour Levels

The assessment on odour levels state an expectation that odour levels will increase. Yet there is no mention within the report on odour issues that are present within the community. The odour is being assessed at a level of 6OU which aligns with less than 10 affected people. The people in Tarago Town and surrounds have been putting up with and complaining of odour from locations up to 20km away from the Veolia Woodlawn facility. The odour assessments are clearly not considering the correct information and the setting of the OU limit for the area should be reconsidered. The report states that the population in the area is approx 1000 people in Tarago, Lake Bathurst, Currawang and Mount Fairy. With the odour issues All of these should be considered affected people and from table 6.10 this would lead to an OU limit of 2.0 or 3.0.

If these levels were utilised within the report then Veolia would exceed the OU limit for the receptor 1 location and be extremely close for others. This would be a much more appropriate assessment based on the number of complaints that are regularly made from the community.

- Community consultation

The submission states that the community was consulted in table 5.2.

The first item mentioned is the CLC where the plan was presented and not commented on. On review of the CLC information the presentation available on the Veolia website shows the ROP mentioned in one row of a table. There are 4 lines describing the proposal and then a status column. The status in November states letter lodged, in February additional surveys and progressing with DPE. There are no minutes of the meeting in November 2023 available and the minutes from February state *"JS: Asked the committee if they want to have this section of the slide pack presented, acknowledging time constraints?"*

JP: Preferred only outstanding matters to be presented" indicating that this was not discussed.

The report states that *"No concerns were raised by the CLC, with the committee generally supportive of the proposed modification and welcoming the capital investment by Veolia to reduce the leachate storage capacity across the site"*.

From the information available, the statement made in the report is disingenuous and not supported by the information available from the CLC meetings. This item was clearly glossed over and the goals of the project were not clear.

On the information provided in the Tarago Times article in December 2023; there were 2 paragraphs within a 3 page submission (not at beginning or end of article) that commented on the ROP proposal. There was no specific statement that it was going ahead, nor was there a specific call for community input on the proposal. Yet the report states *"An article was prepared by Veolia in the December 2023 edition of 'The Tarago Times' . This article*

*outlined the proposed reverse osmosis and irrigation initiative in principle and invited the community to provide any feedback to Veolia via a community feedback line, webpage or email address for the site.” This statement makes it appear like the **entire** article was on this proposal and that they provided specific request for feedback on it. There was a generic call for issues to be reported to Veolia in the last paragraph but not specific for the ROP. On the contrary, it appeared that reporting was only requested for odour.*

The paragraphs were

The initial water balance update identified the potential for additional treatment of already treated water onsite with a new Reverse Osmosis plant built within our current water treatment plant compound. This would purify the water to a quality consistent with Australian Drinking Water Guidelines, which is a benchmark of very high quality. This drinking quality water can then be used in a range of processes at the eco-precinct, including in water carts on our roads, irrigating small plots for fodder, and supplying water for operational processes to further reduce our borefield usage. We are assessing the feasibility of building this Reverse Osmosis plant at the existing water treatment plant onsite. It is an extremely capital intensive project, but we are confident that in the long-term, the beneficial reuse of our own water will bring the best environmental and business outcomes.

As with any change to a State Significant Development, a great deal of testing by third parties and supportive analysis would be required to do this. We have lodged a scoping letter with the Department of Planning and Environment to progress through the early stages of getting those requirements before putting together a modification proposal. Using a Reverse Osmosis plant to treat already treated water is extremely expensive and rarely undertaken in the waste industry, but we are pursuing it because it is consistent with the objectives of further water resilience, water security and compliance onsite as well as the circular economy principles.

Last Paragraph

REPORTING TO SITE

Your feedback is incredibly valuable as we measure the performance of our operations and odour management. To report incidents of odour, please fill out our online odour report form at veolia.com/anz/WoodlawnEcoPrecinct, contact Veolia’s Community Feedback line on 1800 241 750 or send an email to woodlawn@veolia.com. To report a leaking container please use the feedback line or email.

- Irrigation

The report states that at least a portion of the soils to be used for the irrigation area are likely to be saturated as a feature of “duckfield hut” soil landscape. Based on this I would have expected to see some sort of soil moisture measurement feedback into the control system. Another concern is the rainfall that is used for assessments is from a long term average and does not take into account the elevated levels over the last few years and the changes that are occurring due to climate impacts that may be driving more intense rainfall events. From our records in the last few years there has been months of more than 200mm rainfall with a number of 100-200mm months. If the ground moisture in our location (on a hill) is any indication then the soil is currently saturated as with the slightest rain we have standing puddles for weeks.

- Incomplete Data

There is no information on the expected energy consumption of the plan and if there is any impact on the energy requirement on site and any additional impacts on energy supply infrastructure.

There is no information on the amount of water that the LTP currently processes nor the expected amount of water that may be required to pump out of the WBR in the future. While there are statements that the LTP and ROP can be upscaled by about 1.5 and 2 times respectively there is no indication if this would be sufficient to achieve the goals set out in the future.