

Woodlawn Eco-Precinct Community Liaison Committee Workshop Minutes

Date	15 May 2025	Time	5:00pm to 7.00pm
Coordinator	Justin Houghton, Site Manager, Woodlawn Eco Precinct	Location	Woodlawn Conference Room 619 Collector Road, Tarago

Committee List

Name	Present	Name	Present
Justin Houghton (JH - Veolia)	✓	Dr Samantha Johnson (SJ - Community Rep)	✓
Cr Keith Smith (KS - GMC Councillor)	✓	Lois Wake (LW - TADPAI)	✓
Fiona Jeffery (FJ - Community Rep)	✓	Cr John Preston (JP - QPRC Councillor)	✓
Tom Martin (TM - Longwater Association Member and Community Rep)	✓	Andrew Warner (AW - Community Rep)	✓

Visitors List

Name	Name
Scott Martin (SM) (GMC Director Planning & Environment)	Kathryn Whitfield (KLW) (Veolia ARC Project Director)
Lena Bax (LB) (Veolia Head of Communications and Public Policy Veolia Australia and New Zealand)	Jamie Seaton (JS) (CLC Chair)

Minutes

1	Introduction and welcome
<p>JS: Opened the meeting at 17:10pm. Delivered Acknowledgement of Country. Described the purpose of the workshop is to identify and discuss the characteristics of a community consultative committee (CCC) in comparison to the existing CLC, and determine the next steps in terms of the committee's decision-making process. Explained that each section of the CCC Guideline would be reviewed in the workshop, the committee would decide which aspects are valuable, and the decisions would be captured in an excel file circulated to the committee members.</p>	
2	Apologies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Martin (TM) (Longwater Association Member and Community Rep) • Scott Martin (SM) (GMC Director Planning & Environment) • Kathryn Whitfield (KW) (Veolia ARC Project Director) • Lena Bax (LB) (Veolia Head of Communications and Public Policy Veolia Australia and New Zealand) • Rob Sherry (RS) (NSW DPHI Acting Director Compliance NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure) 	
3	Actions from previous meeting
<p>JS: Identified the single action from CLC meeting #21 relevant to the workshop - JS to organise meeting to determine if CLC members want to transition to a CCC.</p>	
4	CCC vs CLC
<p>Review of Guideline (linked here).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guideline Part 1) Introduction <p>RC: The Guideline review period is different to the CLC. JH: The CCC is controlled by the department not the committee itself. LW: Doesn't the department have an equivalent CLC Guideline? RC: No but historically it did. SJ: CLC committee members have a role to play in controlling a CLC, the Government play this role more in the context of a CCC. SJ: Do CCCs operate in project planning stages? JS: Explained the project lifecycle, stated that a CCC is prescribed by the Minister as a condition of consent when a project receives planning approval. They are not used in planning stage. FJ: The ARC will have one according to the ARC EIS. RC: Yes logic says the ARC will have a CCC if it receives planning approval. JH: The Introduction fulfils the need of the existing Woodlawn CLC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guideline Part 2) Committee purpose <p>SJ: A CCC has an advisory role - what is the significance for the Woodlawn CLC in terms of purpose of liaising with non-committee members? LW: This is clarified later in the Guideline.</p>	

FJ: The guidelines provide a structure for meetings and NSW DPHI has updated it over the years to be fit for purpose. It has advise that is not in the CLC charter.

RC: It's a guideline but it is mandatory.

JH: It's a way of the community keeping Veolia accountable.

FJ: It works both ways - Veolia can hold the community accountable too.

JP: It is a mandatory condition for the committee chair to be selected by NSW DPHI. We have done reviews of the CLC Charter recently. An independent chair is selected so we would have no control.

FJ: Supports the independent oversight.

JP: We can adopt these things rather than transitioning into a CCC and losing autonomy.

SJ: Agreed, prefers to adopt some aspects the CCC into the CLC.

LW: We need to do due diligence and consider if the CCC is more appropriate.

JP: There are two issues discussed in the existing committee; the Eco-precinct and the ARC. Are two committees required?

Justin: Encouraged all to save time in this workshop and simply decide on supporting or rejecting each part of the CCC guideline as it is read.

Sam: Agreed.

- Guideline Part 3.1) Membership of the committee

All: Agree the role of the chairperson described in Guideline is adequate.

FJ: The chairperson would rotate per the advice of NSW DPHI at the last CLC meeting, this would be beneficial.

JH: If a rotating chair is used, it takes some time to get them up to speed with the site operations and meeting topics.

RC: It has been difficult in the past to find a chairperson available at a time convenient to these meetings and available to travel to each one.

SJ: JS is hired by Veolia so he is independent.

FJ: There is a perception that the chairperson is supportive of Veolia.

SJ: Part of our role is to shift the perception that the chair is supportive of Veolia.

AW: Veolia will still pay the chairperson of a CCC, so how is that arrangement any different?

FJ: The chair is appointed by Veolia at present that would change under the CCC.

SJ: The broader community does not have a bad perception of the CLC.

FJ: Disagrees, stated the majority does have a bad perception.

RC: Suggested the committee could elect the chairperson.

LW: There is a problem keeping the committee small if there is interest from a lot of people in the community.

JS: Described previous experience as committee Chairperson in Sydney metro area where the committee expanded to a point where the membership requests were excessive. So there can be an issue if the committee grows to a larger number.

JH: Put it down as a point to consider at a later date.

SJ: Is 3 Veolia representatives enough?

RC: Sometimes we need more for example when experts are required.

JH: Suggested the committee can set the number of people if a CLC is maintained.

AW: Surnames of members need to be disclosed and the 20 kilometre radius condition in the CLC needs to be reviewed.

JH: Agrees.

JS: Confirmed surnames are published in the meeting minutes at present.

RC: The alternate representative section is unreasonable.

FJ: Understands that community representatives can choose alternate stakeholder organisations.

LW: The CCC membership process seems very bureaucratic.

FJ: Likes the idea of an alternate representative.

JH: Agrees we need a process for determining alternate representatives.

SJ: Suggested an apology is adequate rather than an alternate representative.

FJ: A lot of effort goes into the meeting so if no one attends it's not helpful.

JH: Preferred to note it as a point to consider at a later date.

- Guideline Part 3.2) Appointing Members

AW: Regarding the appointment of community or stakeholders, if the CLC is not comfortable with Veolia selecting the chairperson, then the same should apply for selecting members.

SJ: The committee needs its own identity, using a committee branded letterhead.

RC: Agree.

LW: The advantage of the CCC selection process is it that it helps with the independence. The disadvantage is that a non-local will be responsible for selecting committee members.

SJ: It's the same issue here as with the chair; the perception of independence.

AW: The committee must review applicants with the chairperson.

LW: The process will be biased to those who can write well.

SJ: CLC branding is required. The committee uses Veolia branding now but other branding will help with the perception.

FJ: Read and described the CCC EOI form.

RC: The CCC is not involved in the selection of applicants at all.

SJ: Under the CCC process, someone we want on the committee may not be allowed to become a member.

JH: Yes, by this process an unknown person can join.

FJ: Any individual would still have to adhere to the charter.

SJ: If the issue is lack of diversity in the CLC, then we can add a selection criteria process to the Charter and it would be achieved through advertising.

JP: The Charter needs to include quorum details.

- Guideline Part 3.3) Replacing Members

SJ: The process for replacing a committee member is too bureaucratic.

FJ: Supports the existence of a mechanism to remove a member.

JH: Agrees.

RC: There is a mechanism in the CLC Charter to do this.

- Section 4.1) Terms of reference

SJ: Supports the idea of an annual report.

RC: The annual report is a compliance report only.

SJ: The committee needs an annual report which describes its achievements for the year.

LW: Agrees.

RC: Suggested a need to consider two annual reports being developed by the committee; a compliance report and an achievements report.

- Section 4.2) Role of the chairperson

LW: Need to determine what is classified as 'suitable meeting times'.

SJ: One person can't decide the timing of meetings, this needs to be agreed.

JS: That is the approach taken at the CLC meetings.

AW: The term 'amenable' should be used instead of 'suitable'.

- Section 4.3) Frequency timing and location of meetings

[No objections/discussion about details in this section]

- Section 4.4) Agenda and meeting minutes

JH: We need the CLC Charter include a provision for requesting a technical expert to present to the committee.

- Section 4.5) Site visits

[No objections/discussion about details in this section]

- Section 4.6) Joint committee meetings

[No objections/discussion about details in this section]

- Section 4.7) Attendance by non-committee members

FJ: If we invite people here they must be able to ask questions.

SJ: The chairperson has a lot of control, for example, only allowing non-committee members to speak when they are invited. Does not support this.

JH: If non-committee members are at the meeting, there will be an agenda item for them.

RC: The chairperson or committee members must have the ability to invite people to speak.

- Section 4.8) Attendance by non-committee members

FJ: Committee members have signed a document outlining information sharing and confidentiality responsibilities in the past.

LW: The CLC Charter already has its own confidentiality conditions.

SJ: Supports the confidentiality provision in the CCC Guideline and suggests it should be adopted.

FJ: Supports the scenario where a community member can make a public comment as an individual.

RC: Supports the scenario whereby a committee member can nominate someone to speak to media on behalf of the group.

JP: Disagrees, no one should speak to media as part of the committee.

JH: The CLC Charter needs some external media dialogue requirements.

- Section 4.9) Committee training

JP: Training should be outside the remit of the committee.

FJ: It would be beneficial if we have induction process so new members are able to be prepared.

Group: Agreed.

RC: The language in the Guideline should be changed to say a training offer 'offer' will be made to new members.

JH: We can have qualified trainers visit and speak rather than offering formal training to new members.

LW: An induction should be compulsory, whereas training should be voluntary.

- Section 4.10) Committee funding and remuneration

FJ: There should be no funding.

[Group agreed]

- Section 4.11) Declaration of interests

FJ: Supports this part of the Guideline. This is required for transparency and trust.

[Group agreed]

- Section 4.12) Conflicts of interest

SJ: Supports this part of the Guideline, for reasons outlined by FJ above.

RC: Should Chairperson have the ability to remove a member from the discussion based on a conflict of interest?

JH/FJ/AW: Yes, would support this.

- Section 4.13) Conduct of committee members

FJ: Notifications of code of conduct breaches should be made in members' interaction with each other.

LW: What about leaks of information?

RC: How could NSW DPHI have an influence on the outcomes of a breach?

FJ: NSW DPHI can provide actions for the committee to complete.

JP: The chairperson must recommend to remove a person and committee members must decide, not NSW DPHI.

LW: Agrees and suggests the member must be absent from the room when the decision is made.

- Section 4.14) Dispute resolution

LW: Read the CLC Charter dispute resolution process.

RC: Supported equivalent language in the Guideline.

AW: If there is a dispute and the chairperson can't resolve, how would it be resolved?

FJ/JS: By an external mediator.

- Section 4.15) Annual report

RC: Stated that this was discussed earlier in the workshop.

JH: Suggested it would be done under CLC branding, per earlier discussion about branding.

- Section 4.16) Review of effectiveness

LW: Need to adapt a similar process for the CLC to ensure effectiveness.

AW: This would demonstrate to the community that we are doing something valuable.

- Section 4.17) Closure of a committee

AW: The committee shouldn't need to go through this process unless there is an issue that cannot be resolved among the committee.

- Section 5) Responsibilities of the proponent

LW: Prefers this section of the Guideline compared to the CLC Charter equivalent.

FJ: The Guideline clearly identifies what members are entitled to do.

RC: Regarding the statement that the "proponent must respond to any questions or advice from the committee about the project's environmental performance", stated that Veolia submits correspondence to NSW EPA at least three times per day. The language needs to be modified to say that that the committee will consult the CLC on 'significant' matters of environmental performance.

- Section 6) Publication of information

SJ: The Woodlawn CLC website doesn't identify members of the committee.

JS: Yes they are in the minutes.

AW: Requested Veolia to update website and add names of members.

FJ: Suggested organising documents on the website according to the month of production. The top document should be the minutes.

RC: Regarding the minutes, Veolia prefers to link to external documents and avoid attaching multiple files.

Determine next steps

JH: Requested each committee member to review the excel file summary to be prepared and distributed by JS, decide what aspects of the Guideline should be adopted, and then consider if a re-write of the CLC Charter or transition to a CCC is preferred.

5	Meeting close
----------	----------------------

JS: Explained that not all agenda items were addressed due to a lack of time and the earlier decision of committee to complete agenda item 4.

[Meeting closed at 7pm].

Action List

Item	Action	Assigned to
1	ACTION: Review the excel file summary to be prepared and distributed by JS, decide what aspects of the Guideline should be adopted, and then consider if a re-write of the CLC Charter or transition to a CCC is preferred	All committee members

Veolia Community Liaison Committee Meeting Minutes

2	ACTION: JS to create xcel file with outcomes of Guideline review and circulate to members.	JS (Facilitator)
3	ACTION: JS to create CLC Meeting #22 agenda item to discuss Action 1. file with outcomes of Guideline review and circulate to members.	JS (Facilitator)
4	ACTION: Veolia to consider request to make the following modifications to Woodlawn website: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update website to include names of members• Organise documents on the website according to the month of production and ensure the document at the top of the documents list is meeting minutes.	RC (Veolia)