



ULAB Community Liaison Committee

Ordinary Meeting

Wednesday 21 April 2021 – 7.00pm

Attendance	ULAB CLC Chair Richard Elkington ULAB Project Coordinator Robin Krause Latrobe City Council Gail Gatt Latrobe City Cr Melissa Ferguson EPA Stacey Clark DELWP Alan Freitag CFMEU Mark Richards Latrobe Health Assembly EJ Browne Fire Rescue Victoria Shane Mynard Committee for Gippsland Tony Cantwell GWRRG Matthew Peake Worksafe Joseph Groves Claudio Marino John Buhagiar Leanne Norwood Philip Reichert Leo Billington Lorraine Bull
Guest	Invest Victoria Zhining Yang, Wayne O'Brien, Chris Jia (Observers) Chunxing Corporation Dr Lakshman Jayaweera (Observer), Ascend Waste and Environment Geoff Latimer, Prodraft Geoff Chilver.
Secretariat	Tracy VanderZalm (Wordwise Communications)
Not present Apologies	Mario Monacella



Agenda Items and Minutes

Topic	Host
Official Welcome	Robin Krause
Introduction of members (Opportunity for members to explain who they are, who they represent and why they are a member of the ULAB CLC)	All
Review and endorsement of meeting schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Chair decided this would be addressed at the end of the meeting.</i> 	Richard Elkington
Review and endorsement of Terms of Reference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lorraine Bull – had concerns with the definition of ‘local community’ and asked if the reference could be changed to include ‘local and broader community’. EJ Browne – explained membership under the Latrobe Health Assembly was described as ‘Those who live, work and study in Latrobe’. <i>It was Moved to replace ‘local community’ with ‘those who live, work, study and recreate in Latrobe’.</i> Lorraine Bull – asked whether permission was needed to take notes in meetings, making reference to this being a requirement in the Terms of Reference. This point was raised in relation to Point 8 under the heading, Meeting agenda and minutes; Meetings may be recorded for the purposes of minutes only. Audio files and transcripts will be held confidentially by the Chair and destroyed upon confirmation of the minutes by all members. Otherwise, meetings are not to be recorded (other than by minutes or hard copy transcript) without prior approval of all members. It was discussed this point relates to official minute-taking only, not personal note-taking, that is permitted. 	Richard Elkington



CHUNXING

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gail Gatt – asked if the ToR could include information about the process of inviting guest speakers to meetings. The Chair explained the Committee could decide to invite a guest speaker at any time with member approval. <i>It was Moved to include this in the ToR. A finalised version of the ToR is included as an attachment.</i> 	
<p>A brief history – how did we get here?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geoff Latimer presented a timeline slide. <i>Refer to attachment.</i> Questions / Comments – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair asked if two years was a typical schedule for projects of this nature to go from planning to approvals. Geoff Latimer explained this project was likely double the length, noting every project was different with individual variables impacting on the process. The Chair asked whether the EPA and Latrobe City Council processes could have been done concurrently. Geoff Latimer explained that Council did not have to undertake its community consultation process, but decided it was imperative given community sentiment and it wanted to ensure it gave the community an opportunity to have input. Gail Gatt further explained Council’s community consultation process was a result of what Council was hearing in the community. She said as a result of the zoning of the site, there was no requirement to do so. Geoff Latimer presented another slide that outlined the additional measures the company has committed to. <i>Refer to attachment.</i> Questions / Comments – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair asked if these sort of measures applied to other industries locally. Geoff Latimer said not necessarily. John Buhagiar mentioned the power industry had them. Geoff Latimer explained there was a network of air monitoring stations throughout the region and EPA had a requirement of these stations around the state. He said for an operation of this scale, it might typically be applied. 	<p>Geoff Latimer (Ascend Waste and Environment)</p>



CHUNXING

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Ellen- Jane Browne, in relation to condition 3 on the slide, flagged that the Latrobe Health Assembly had been approached by Member for Eastern Victoria MP Harriet Shing's office about engaging in the long term health study in Latrobe Valley. She said there was a lot of work happening around a lot of issues at the moment.- Phillip Reichert – on blood testing, he said obviously the company was not going to test a population of 40,000 people and asked if there was a number around this? Geoff Latimer explained the condition was to investigate blood testing as an option for those interested in the first instance and suspected people closest to the facility might be an initial priority. He added the testing provided a regular set of evidence throughout the life of the facility around exposure.• Gail Gatt – In relation to condition 1, asked what the timeframe around this was. Geoff Latimer explained there were a number of different ways to monitor the environment performance of the plant. He said the EPA may have conditions in the operating licence to specify the timeframe.• Claudio Marino – asked whether there was a timeline on commissioning. Geoff Latimer said this could be quite a long process if the plant was not performing as per the Works Approval's emission conditions. He said if some held concerns the original air quality modelling estimates were not achievable then it would show up at the commissioning time. If emission standards were not being met (during commissioning) then improvements would have to be made until performance requirements were met, or the company would not gain licensing approval to operate.• Lorraine Bull – asked if there was a way to provide a summary of data to highlight any exceedance to make it easier to understand. Geoff Latimer said this information was easy to graph, agreeing summarising the data was a good idea and recommended it get done periodically. Cr Ferguson – wanted to ensure this periodic report was made available to anyone who needed it, to empower them with evidence a layperson could understand.	
---	--



CHUNXING

- Gail Gatt – asked what was expected from CLC members. Geoff Latimer said the focus of the company was meeting EPA requirements while the focus of the CLC was reporting and summarising information.
- Leanne Norwood – On point 5, asked if this real time monitoring would be only available once the plant was operating. Geoff Latimer explained the monitoring would be operational as part of the commissioning stage but would not be online until commissioning was complete. Leanne Norwood asked if the public could have access to the data during the commissioning stage. Geoff Latimer said it was more important the post commissioning data was publicly available because it included various elements for testing, including lead.
- Mark Richards – In relation to point 3, wanted to flag early on that families of workers be covered by the Workcover Act also and reiterated that an operating licence would not be granted until the plant was operating at 100 per cent. He asked Robin Krause how many workers would be on each shift and it was explained there would be 15 workers per shift and day staff. Mark Richards also noted that a teacher from Hazelwood North Primary School said an air monitoring station would be located at the school and asked if this was separate to the company's system. Geoff Latimer said earmarking station locations would occur and that the school was a reasonably obvious place to have a monitoring station.
- Phillip Reichert – In relation to point 2, asked whether there was a timeline and whether they could be installed now to have baseline levels to compare with the levels in two years when the facility was fully operational. Robin Krause explained useful background monitoring levels would not be achieved until the building had been completed, along with the slab. Phillip continued that if monitoring was done now the value would be '1', then during construction you would assume with disturbance of the soil, it would go higher. As a result, he said waiting for the plant to be built was not conducive. Robin Krause responded that the time to build the plant was roughly 12 months from slab laid then a minimum of



CHUNXING

<p>three months of commissioning. Geoff Latimer added there were EPA air monitoring stations currently available that would give that baseline. Although they don't test for lead, lead was not an issue until the plant was operating. Gail Gatt then asked how current levels of lead were monitored. Mark Richards explained power stations had continuous monitoring for dust. A full monitor would be conducted once a year and rarely did the levels change. Leanne Norwood stated that if stations were in early there would be a reasonable data set broadly to see what lead is in the environment. Adding the Fourth Road site was contaminated so it would be beneficial to know what was being discharged prior to the disturbance of that soil. Geoff Latimer agreed the company needed to be more explicit when referring to 'background' testing. He said 'Campaign testing' to understand current levels of lead would assist. As part of point 2 in the slide, testing, particularly for lead, was part of that condition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cr Ferguson – asked whether there were other contaminants this system could measure and whether they were set by the World Health Organisation as to what got measured. Geoff Latimer said it depended on the types of industries in that particular locality as to what contaminants got measured. 	
<p>Lead and Flue Gas Process Flow Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robin Krause presented an animation. <i>Refer to the attached.</i> • In summary Robin Krause explained the two main processes; a) breaking up the batteries and smelting it to lead; and b) flue gas emissions up to and out of the stack. He said the process was designed to maximise recovery and minimise waste. He said this process had been used in China for 20 years and it was unique in that it featured the break-up of all components of the battery. The system separates all the elements to be re-used. This is one of the reasons why the emissions will be so low. The smelting process with this technology is cleaner. He acknowledged people's concerns of what was going up the stacks and explained there were two types of flue emissions; a) those coming directly off the heating process; and b) fugitive emissions. Leanne Norwood said that Mark 	Robin Krause



CHUNXING

Stevenson from EPA made a statement that WESPS were best practice and a more efficient pollution control. Geoff Latimer explained that WESPS stood for Wet Electrostatic Precipitators and that the EPA had asked Chunxing to investigate WESPs.

Questions / Comments –

- Lorraine Bull asked whether greenhouse gas emissions was a requirement in the EPA Works Approval. *Energy and greenhouse gas emissions are the entire subject of Section 6 of the WAA (p.54-67).*
- Lorraine Bull asked for clarification of the differences between this plant and the China plant. Geoff Latimer explained; Size: China is two plants on one site totalling 800,000 tonnes of ULAB/yr. ULAB at Hazelwood North will be 50,000 tonnes/yr. Technology: generally the same as the newest China plant (#2) with the following additions:
 - Higher degree of sulfur removal (desulfurisation) prior to introduction of Pb paste into the smelting furnace.
 - Desulfurisation uses soda ash (China uses lime), as required by EPA to achieve the higher reduction in sulphur.
 - Full vent extraction system to collect fugitive emissions, exhausted to a second stack with sufficient suction to create negative pressure in the entire building.
- Lorraine Bull asked how batteries would be transported to the factory. Robin Krause said they would be picked up from designated collection points and trucked in at approximately six to seven trucks a day during business hours.
- The members asked for a definition of Fugitive Emissions. Robin Krause explained this was emissions outside the main process, or what leaks. He explained these emissions were captured under the negative pressure system of the facility and would be discussed further at the next meeting.



CHUNXING

<p>Proposed current activities in progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robin Krause explained the company had engaged eight consultants to produce the next phase of required reporting under the Works Approval to meet the construction program of the plant. He explained that ground ball monitoring, soil monitoring, building design and water management of the plant had already been conducted. The company will be fencing off the existing contaminated areas of the site that has already been capped and tested. There is no leaching. The concrete lined gasification tank that exists on site has also been filled and capped. By the end of May, Robin explained the company would have submitted the necessary reports and would expect to receive approval to start construction of the building shortly after. Another set of reports that will allow the laying on the slab is due in September while more reports prior to the installation and commissioning will also be required, totalling more than 46 reports. Alan Freitag – explained that planning controls required the commencement of operation in 12 months. Robin Krause said the company was on target to meet this deadline. 	<p>Robin Krause</p>
<p>Questions and Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mark Richards <i>Moved to re-order the listed conditions to reflect priorities. Revised presentation attached.</i> Lorraine Bull requested jobs, workforce and training be discussed at the next meeting. Stacey Clark reminded members that a call for agenda items would also be made two weeks prior to the next meeting. 	
<p>Review and endorsement of Meeting Schedule <i>It was Moved to amend the Meeting Schedule for meetings to be held on the fourth Wednesday of every second month due to the availability of the majority of members. Refer to the attached.</i></p>	<p>Richard Elkington</p>
<p>Agenda items for next meeting by 9 June 2021 to Chair, Richard Elkington via email at richard@fuelonaus.com</p>	<p>Richard Elkington</p>
<p>Next Meeting Wednesday 23 June 2021, 7.00pm. Venue TBC.</p>	<p>Richard Elkington</p>
<p>Close</p>	