

RWRRIP Consultation Snapshot as at 9Sept2016

	Date Received	Medium	Stakeholder	Proponent's Submission	GCWRRRG Comment	ACTION	NOTES	THEMES	FEELING
1	18/07/2016	Written	Council	Multiple notes on printed Version 3.5	All comments considered and updated accordingly	Plan Updated	Typographical and factual items updated where applicable	Data	✓
2	26/07/2016	E-mail	Industry	Industrial waste recycling issue - lack of commercial recyclables collection in Western Vic.	Offer to meet (9/11) and progress investigations on local and regional industrial/commercial recycling collection (for health services)	No change to Plan	Good example of industry issues across rural and regional areas. Opportunity for collaborative procurement from Health institutions for plastics, glass and steel	Material streams	✓✓
3	28/07/2016	Written	Government	Alignment considerations	To be aligned accordingly	Working on through alignment process		Multiple	✓✓
4	9/08/2016	E-mail	Industry	Waste to energy plant options in GCW. Gasification for industry; not enough feedstock for large Biogas options. Universities (Such as Fed Uni) to investigate a EfW system as part of research	Considered and EfW section may be expanded	Do we add any info on this?	Maryborough GSWT Facility is planned gasification	Infrastructure Energy from Waste	✓✓
5	10/08/2016	E-mail	Industry	Great consultation. Differences in the region such as sub-regional needs (west). Supportive of meeting further. One plan may not cover all needs.	Acknowledged	Does this message need strengthening?	It is one plan but can indicate sub-regional needs and direction.	Multiple	✓✓✓
6	12/08/2016	E-mail	Government	Recommendations and corrections for inclusion in the final plan	To be considered accordingly and included in the final plan	As per #10 EPA		Data	✓✓
7	15/08/2016	Written	Association	A selection of waste and resource recovery definition:	Compared to SWRRIP definitions for reference	No change to Plan	Definitions currently used as per SWRRIP and in Appendices:	Data	✓✓✓
8	16/08/2016	E-mail	Individual	Plastics research; Education; Local V regional solutions	Acknowledged	No change to Plan		Material streams	✓✓✓
9	16/08/2016	E-mail	Industry	Very good plan; Pilot EfW Plant and need to secure feedstock	Acknowledged	No change to Plan	Facility listed in Schedule. Securing feedstock is their need now.	Infrastructure Energy from Waste	✓✓✓
10	17/08/2016	Written	Government	Recommendations and corrections for inclusion in the final plan	To be considered accordingly and included in the final plan	Some changes to the Plan. Some comments rejected.	1. Cell approval wording updated. 2. Statement on no need for landfill does not therefore need approval - no change. Cell approval and Works approval clarified. Added in "Continuation of landfills are subject to all relevant approvals being granted and adhered to" 3. Airspace information removed - thus no need for change. 4. Updated waste types and licenses updated. Registered Business for Statewide to be confirmed. 5. Data clarification - data provided is voluntary information from reprocessors and the only data available. The source explains where the data comes from and the figures have to be rounded thus - getting full figures and in this case 100%. Therefore if this principle was used on all material streams then as there are data gaps on all materials the figures can never be exact and all numberS would be unavailable. E-waste 100% now listed as N/A. It is covered in assumptions (appendix) as to the gaps. Recommendations for future work once plans are finalised is listed and noted.	Data	✓✓
11	22/08/2016	E-mail	Association	Recommendation to advocate for reduce or recyclable packaging; Closed landfill Planning; Regional landfills to be revegetated when closed; School data recommended and targets; illegal dumping post closures and AWT recommended	To be considered accordingly and included in the final plan	They recommend addition to the plan? Longer term landfill rehab; Resource smart stats - do we add?	The scope of the plan does not consider changing packaging controls for greater recycling. After use of landfill sites is addressed -e.g. closed (and those about to close) landfills and their rehabilitation; as well as existing landfills likely to operate through 10-year period of the plan. Land use planning is about zoning. Additional Resource recovery use on those sites is welcomed. To be addressed in future planning closer to the end of the landfill's respective operational life. Principle acknowledged. ResourceSmart schools targets are set contractually and cannot change. It is a voluntary program so cannot be enforced upon schools. The program is focused on learning and quality rather than quantity. The illegal dumping matter is not part of the plan although mentioned in the litter section. It is operational rather than strategic.	Planning and Legislation	✓
12	23/08/2016	E-mail	Individual	If the aim of future better waste management is to minimise landfill costs, reduce litter control costs and optimise recycling, then combined approach of education, encouragement and clearly demonstrating (the savings) personal benefits to the wide community on a consistent program will build on work to date.	Acknowledged	No change to Plan		Community education, engagement and capacity building	✓✓✓
13	30/08/2016	E-mail	Individual	Canvassing Stonehaven Landfill and RRC	Acknowledged	Should plan include Stonehaven reference? Re insert factual info as per Draft 3.0	Must respond as to why Stonehaven not included in the Plan as question asked. Landfill not required due to airspace availability; RRC/TS may not be viable without. Market Sounding rejection.	Infrastructure Landfill and RRC	✓
14	30/08/2016	E-mail	Individual	Canvassing Stonehaven Landfill and RRC	Acknowledged	Should plan include Stonehaven reference?	GPS Customer Service issue. Desire for proximity to southern end of GPS. Request to include Stonehaven	Infrastructure Landfill and RRC	✓
15	30/08/2016	E-mail	Individual	Canvassing Stonehaven Landfill and RRC	Acknowledged	Should plan include Stonehaven reference?	Must respond as to why Stonehaven not included in the Plan as question asked. Landfill not required due to airspace availability; RRC/TS may not be viable without. Market Sounding rejection.	Infrastructure Landfill and RRC	✓

RWRRIP Consultation Snapshot as at 9Sept2016

	Date Received	Medium	Stakeholder	Proponent's Submission	GCWWRRG Comment	ACTION	NOTES	THEMES	FEELING
16	30/08/2016	E-mail	Council	Energy from Waste facility and organics processing	To be considered accordingly and included in the final plan	Plan to be Updated	Project info to be included where applicable	Infrastructure Energy from Waste	✓✓✓
17	30/08/2016	E-mail	Council	Council endorsement of the Plan 23/8	Acknowledged	No change to Plan		Objectives and Actions	✓✓✓
18	30/08/2016	E-mail	Council	More waste issues in south eastern sector of GPS (Bannockburn/Teesdale). Stonehaven significant benefit to these communities noting planning permit in process. City of Ballarat to consider Transfer Station at Smythesdale. Supportive of PSC Snake Valley Regional TS.	To be considered accordingly and included in the final plan	Should plan include Stonehaven reference? Re insert factual info as per Draft 3.0	Can we include? Is it beneficial to communities re accessibility, convenience - not pre-empting planning process. CoB TS - should liaise with them first and when a position then can be documented in the plan.	Infrastructure Landfill and RRC	✓✓
19	30/08/2016	E-mail	Individual	Was plan printed on recycled paper?	Advised it was printed on recycled paper	No change to Plan		Nil	✓✓✓
20	2/09/2016	E-mail	Industry	Eliminate landfills Economics of alternative waste technologies. E-waste ban support; Green waste; Buffer distances; Innovation; Consider pricing in Plan;	To be considered accordingly and included in the final plan	Do we add any info on this?	Suggesting policy change which is not part of scope - such as should be eliminate landfills, landfill economics flawed, unlicensed landfills unacceptable, price variation is an issue, prohibition to landfill interstate, Request contaminated timber ban, etc. Plan should consider pricing, issue of Councils subsidising compared to commercial operators. Change Priority Actions to address their concerns.	Infrastructure Energy from Waste	✓✓✓
21	2/09/2016	E-mail	Industry	Canvassing Stonehaven Landfill and RRC	To be determined whether permitted/applicable to include factual Stonehaven status in narrative of plan (as drafted earlier)	Should plan include Stonehaven reference? Re insert factual info as per Draft 3.0	Landfill not required due to airspace availability; RRC/TS may not be viable without. Market Sounding rejection.	Infrastructure Landfill and RRC	✓
22	2/09/2016	E-mail	Council	Full support of the Plan. 6% of Council expenditure goes to waste management. Minor anomalies in the plan noted	Minor amendments	No change to Plan	Factual amendments updated. SV manage their funding and the plan cannot influence that. Intention is for planning to occur. Mobile waste and recycling facilities to be investigated.	Material Streams	✓✓✓
23	2/09/2016	E-mail	Council	Congratulations. Industry data gaps. Waste flow maps would be useful. Industry to lead some of the actions. Diverse communities across region.	To be considered accordingly and included in the final plan	Does this message need strengthening?	Priority actions present industry relationship and data improvements. As data is poor waste flow mapping is not beneficial or valid - yet. Industry listed in 4 Priority Actions and approx. almost 1/3 of the short term activities. Can ask industry to lead following improved relationships. Diverse needs and scales across the region acknowledged.	Data	✓✓✓