



Legislative Council Economy and Infrastructure Committee

Inquiry: Inquiry into the development and expansion of waste-to-energy (WtE) infrastructure in Victoria

Hearing Date: 26 May 2026

Question[s] taken on notice

Directed to: Environmental Protection Authority Victoria

Received Date: 30 June 2026

1. Rachel PAYNE, page 43

Question Asked:

I was curious about the \$1 million fine. I mean, it seems like a lot of money, but when you are talking about multinational companies that, you know, run on – I think Veolia is sitting at around US\$48 billion, as in how much they make each year. But the \$1 million – is that the cost of doing business? That is the question that I am getting to. Is there consideration around some of these breaches? I guess \$1 million to a company like Veolia may be seen as more of a cost of doing business. Is there any sort of review process that is going on now, considering that Supreme Court ruling?

Jen MARTIN: Certainly I cannot comment on the amounts – I can certainly take that on notice.

Response:

Under the *Environment Protection Act 2017*, maximum penalty settings are established through legislation.

EPA does not have the authority to amend maximum penalties. Any changes to penalty settings would be considered through broader legislative review processes led by government, noting DEECA leads legislative review from an environmental portfolio perspective.

In the specific case of EPA's Supreme Court action against Veolia that was concluded in November 2025, following negotiation between Veolia and EPA through mediation, the Court ordered that Veolia pay \$1 million into the Restorative Project Account which is administered by EPA under the provisions of the Environment Protection Act. This amount is related to the level and duration of harm to the community and is to be used for restorative projects that benefit the impacted community. This is the largest order of this type made under the Environment Protection Act. EPA's enforcement action also successfully obtained court orders

compelling the company to meet an adverse publicity order, improve its environmental performance and prevent risks of future harm. These outcomes are important, as pecuniary penalties deter future contraventions and provide for restorative justice.

2. **Sarah MANSFIELD, page 45**

Question Asked:

I would just like to ask one more question about the Lara waste incinerator. There are a lot of community members who are perplexed as to why there is still a development approval from the EPA, despite the fact that that facility has not received a licence under the cap from Recycling Victoria. So I am just wondering whether there are any plans to revoke that EPA development licence.

Jen MARTIN: I might have to take that on notice around the development licence.

Response: Legislation does not mandate a sequenced order to Waste to Energy permissions and approvals. Approvals for waste to energy (W2E) projects sits across three regulatory bodies:

1. Recycling Victoria - waste to energy cap licence (which will transition to EPA Victoria post 30 June 2026).

2. Minister for Planning - planning approval for the proposed location, which considers suitability of location, including traffic, separation distances, heritage considerations, and broader environmental considerations such as biodiversity.

3. EPA assesses applications for:

- a. A08 **Development Licence** to design and construct the facility; and
- b. A08 **Operating Licence** – to ensure the operation is safe, tightly controlled and meets strict environmental standards.

None of the grounds for revocation of a development licence in section 61 of the *Environment Protection Act 2017* apply in this instance. However, without a cap licence from Recycling Victoria and a planning approval from the Minister for Planning, development of the facility is unable to proceed, regardless of the status of the Environment Protection Authority Victoria development licence.

3. **The CHAIR, page 46**

Question Asked:

Have there been any scenarios where this has not met the criteria despite the system being in place?

Jen MARTIN: Not that I am aware of. I can certainly seek further confirmation on that, but what we have is more consistent evidence that absolutely these controls have actually managed this particular issue. But they have to operate, and that is why that strong regulation is critical to this, and that is why our role in this is to make sure that they are designed, the processes and systems are in place and that they are actually operated appropriately.

The CHAIR: That would be amazing if you were able to take that on notice and provide any testing statistics or information to the committee to help us understand that more.

Response:

Information on operational facilities overseas is typically available by directly contacting the relevant regulator. Publicly available information for plants in:

- the United States is located at <https://echo.epa.gov/>.
- United Kingdom: [Incinerator Annual Monitoring Reporting - National Data Library](#)
- Tokyo: Clean Authority of Tokyo (CAT23)

For modern facilities, where examples of criteria not being met have been identified, it has been associated with temporary upset conditions where the system is not operating, such as a fault that requires repair, upgrade or maintenance.

The Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) applies a rigorous, evidence-based regulatory framework to ensure that waste-to-energy facilities meet strict environmental and human health protection requirements.

Licence applications are only approved where risks can be effectively identified, assessed and managed. The EP Act requires a two-staged permissioning approach for waste-to-energy facilities:

- Development licence that requires detailed technical design, risk assessments, public consultation and construction verification

- Operating licence that requires robust verification through the commissioning stage to ensure the operation is safe and tightly controlled.

Granting a development licence does not guarantee operations. An operating licence will not be approved until it can be demonstrated that the facility can meet stringent environmental performance requirements. Depending on the type of permissioning approval (i.e. Development Licence or Operating Licence), a range of licence conditions are applied, including mandating required controls, monitoring and reporting requirements and risk management requirements. If Development Licence conditions are not met ahead of the Operating Licence process, EPA will consider this non-compliance during the assessment of the operating licence. Any proposal that poses an unacceptable risk of harm to human health or the environment will be refused.

During operations, EPA requires continuous operating monitoring, continuous emissions requirements, enable identification of upset conditions, and timely response to prevent potential harm to human health and the environment. This may range from simple repairs through to suspending operations until such times that the system can demonstrate it is compliant. The intervention required would depend on the nature of the issue and potential risk to human health and the environment.

If licence conditions or the general environmental duty are not met, EPA has a range of compliance and enforcement powers, including requiring corrective action, issuing notices, prosecution, fines and suspension or revocation of licences.

4. The ACTING CHAIR, pages 49-50

Question Asked:

Look, I think a big part of so many people turning out is community concern and questions about the science, and I think hence why we keep coming back to you. You have talked about Italy before. You talked about, I think, Denmark. Are you able to just point to countries or regions where you see best practice, so people listening to this can go and do some of their own researches as well, or just so it is on the record?

Jen Martin:... So I think you would probably start with your European standards, and then I know we have taken it on notice to provide a little bit more information on some of those, particularly things like academic papers that talk to some of the environmental monitoring findings and things like that that we can provide.

The ACTING CHAIR: Okay, yes. I think that would be really helpful.

Response:

EPA considers best available techniques and technologies, relevant international standards, and evidence from comparable overseas facilities when assessing waste to energy proposals. This includes consideration of European standards, technical literature and monitoring data from modern facilities. International evidence indicates that modern, well-regulated waste to energy facilities can operate safely where appropriate controls, monitoring and regulatory oversight are in place.

EPA considers this evidence alongside site-specific information for each proposal, including the proposed technology, waste streams, emissions modelling and human health risk assessments.

References:

Official Journal of the European Union, 2024

Title: Consolidated text: Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 on industrial and livestock rearing emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control)

Journal: [Official Journal of the European Union, OJ L 334](#) (click on EN link for English)

Summary:

- European Union directive on industrial emissions

Official Journal of the European Union, 2019

Title: Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2019/2010 of 12 November 2019 establishing the best available techniques (BAT) conclusions, under Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council, for waste incineration (notified under document C (2019) 7987) (Text with EEA relevance)

Source: [Official Journal of the European Union, L 312/55](#) (click on EN link for English)

Summary:

- Best available techniques and technologies, as directed by the European Union.

Example academic references regarding environmental emissions from modern facilities:

Lonati, G., Cernuschi, S., & Giani, P. (2022). Air Quality Impact Assessment of a Waste-to-Energy Plant: Modelling Results vs. Monitored Data. *Atmosphere*, 13(4), 516. <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos13040516>

This paper compared CEMS data for stack emissions, dispersion modelling and ambient air monitoring for a modern Waste to Energy plant that meets EU Best Available Techniques. Key findings were that estimated emissions contributions from the WtE facility were at least two orders of magnitude below ambient concentrations. It also found that monitoring data aligned closely with dispersion model predictions.

Bisinella, V; Negenskov, J. Riber, C, Hulgaard, T. Christensen, (2022) [Environmental assessment of amending the Amager Bakke incineration plant in Copenhagen with carbon capture and storage](#). Waste Management and Research, T.H. Vol. 40(1) 79-95.

This paper explored the impact of amending the incinerator with carbon capture and storage technologies. The paper includes details of operational emissions from the facility to support assessment of environmental performance in Table 1.

Environmental data can be also identified from licence compliance reports from overseas plants. Examples include:

- Clean Authority of Tokyo (CAT23), which operates 21 municipal waste incinerators, publishes English-language environmental reports and waste management reports
- The UK government publishes data from all incinerator facilities. This includes both operational and emissions information: [Incinerator Annual Monitoring Reporting - National Data Library](#)
- Individual facilities may provide data on environmental performance in addition to
 - USA:
 - [Camden | Reworld](#)
 - [Essex | Reworld](#)
 - UK:
 - [Emissions Reports - Kent Enviropower Energy from Waste](#)
 - [Emissions monitoring — Gloucestershire Energy from Waste Facility](#)
 - Ireland:
 - [Emissions data – Dublin Waste to Energy](#)

Recent health review of modern facilities:

UK Health Securities Agency, Health impacts of waste incineration: a systematic review of epidemiological evidence in the UK and EU, following implementation of the Waste Incineration Directive.

[Health impacts of emissions from incinerators: UKHSA opinion of the evidence - GOV.UK](#)

UKHSA reviewed epidemiological evidence of waste to energy operations post implementation of the Waste Incinerator Directive in Europe. They formed the opinion on incinerators that modern, well run and regulated Municipal Waste Incinerators are not a significant risk to public health, as these incinerators only make a small contribution to local concentrations of air pollutants. The review is the most up to date assessment of available literature on modern plants and includes references to academic epidemiological studies.

5. **David ETTERSHANK, page 50**

Question Asked: Talking about transparency and public trust, in Sunbury we had a case there where there was an illicit garbage dump you may have heard of, in Riddell Road. This gentleman was on rented land, bringing in a couple of thousand tonnes of waste through a housing estate for two years. It was estimated he was pulling somewhere between \$150,000 and \$200,000 in cash a week. It was not until direct representations were made to the minister and it was raised in the house that we finally saw the EPA take action, at which point in time he was found to be acting improperly – not a surprise to anyone – and fined the staggering sum of \$10,157. I am wondering, in terms of faith in the EPA, is there a lesson for us there?

Jen MARTIN: ... We really do seek to try and engage as much as possible when we have got that application in to be able to provide information to community and to give opportunities for feedback to be taken on board, and we very genuinely take the feedback that we get, which sometimes can be quite significant in the number of submissions that we get through. To be able to bring that in, distil and actually be able to try and address some of those key concerns the community would have we do take a very active role around community engagement. In relation to the specifics of that particular case, and when we were first involved versus maybe when it was spoken about in Parliament, I would actually have to take that on notice and get a bit more detail.

David ETTERSHANK: I am happy for you to take it on notice.

Response:

Hume City Council is the lead agency for the Riddell Road, Sunbury, site in relation to land use, planning compliance, clean fill requirements and whether site activities are consistent with approved land use.

Council's lead role includes assessing whether material brought onto the land meets clean fill requirements and addressing land-use issues under planning controls. The role of the Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) is complementary and relates to industrial waste and pollution risks under the *Environment Protection Act 2017*.

Following investigation into unlawful earthworks, Hume City Council obtained Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT) enforcement orders in October 2025 covering 370 Riddell Road and adjoining properties.

These orders required the immediate cessation of all earthworks and the importation of fill, unless supported by an approved planning permit or Council-endorsed plans.

The landowner is required to submit planning applications to regularise both past and any proposed future works, with those applications subject to standard planning assessment processes.

The orders also restrict site activity to uses consistent with existing agricultural use rights, effectively preventing large-scale fill operations without approval.

Council continues to actively monitor compliance with these orders and retains the ability to return the matter to VCAT if breaches occur.

In effect, the site is now under a strict 'stop work and seek approval' regulatory framework, with ongoing oversight by Council.

EPA became involved in support of Council's lead role following community reports and inspection activity concerning alleged unlawful waste dumping, stockpiling and burning at the site. Reported concerns included smoke, odour, amenity impacts and potential environmental risks, including runoff affecting nearby waterways and surrounding land.

In October 2025, following a joint inspection with Hume City Council, EPA issued an Environmental Action Notice requiring the occupier to stop accepting and burning waste and remove waste from the premises.

EPA has responded to community complaints and pollution reports where they relate to industrial waste and pollution risks and has undertaken joint

inspections and coordination with Hume City Council, recognising the complementary but distinct roles of each authority.

EPA's compliance activity has included inspections, enforcement action and engagement with affected residents and stakeholders about EPA's regulatory role and outcomes.

EPA has also responded to non-compliance through regulatory action, including issuing a further penalty in relation to waste burning at the site.

During a compliance inspection in early 2026, the occupier advised EPA that a VCAT order restricts access to the site by vehicles not associated with farming activities, limiting the removal of waste required under the notice.

Hume City Council and EPA have worked collaboratively to address this constraint and have agreed to amended arrangements to enable waste removal, subject to updated VCAT orders. These orders have been issued.

EPA will continue to support Hume City Council as the lead agency, while exercising EPA's own powers where industrial waste, pollution risks or environmental and amenity impacts require regulatory action.

6. **David ETTERSHANK, page 51**

Question Asked:

Could I ask – and I would be very happy if you took this on notice; likewise Recycling Victoria – would you be able to provide us with some advice as to what environmental standards you will be seeking to apply? I guess future tense for EPA, past tense for RV. Are you able to provide that to the committee so that we have an understanding of just how stringent and how thorough it is? Because I think that strikes to a lot of the concerns in the community.

Jen MARTIN: The very first place I would direct people to is the guideline for assessing and managing air pollution in Victoria. That is on our website. It has a comprehensive list of standards that we apply and also the tiered risk assessment process that we would expect to see. But we can absolutely take that on notice and add to it.

Response:

The Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) assesses waste-to-energy facilities under the *Environment Protection Act 2017* and *Environment Protection Regulations 2021*. In relation to environmental standards, EPA

gives consideration to the Environment Reference Standard (ERS), which provides indicators and objectives that support the environmental aspirations for Victoria. The ERS is then further supported by additional guidance, such as the Guidelines for Assessment and Managing Air Pollution in Victoria, which outlines air quality standards for over 112 chemicals that may be emitted to air by industry. Guidance for conducting human health risk assessments are set out by the enHealth Council.

The Environment Protection Regulations require proponents must demonstrate that best available techniques or technologies (BATT) have been employed. This includes the EU BAT reference documents, which set out best technologies, relevant controls and their associated emissions levels (BAT-AELS). These are set at levels the technology and controls can achieve, through appropriate design. Conditions are included in the engineering design that consider non-standard operating or upset conditions to ensure the design of controls has appropriate capacity to meet BAT-AELs.

Proponents must demonstrate that the proposed design will ensure risks to human health and the environment can be eliminated or minimised so far as reasonably practicable. This includes detailed air quality impact assessments and human health and environmental risk assessments. Air quality impact assessments must model emissions based on the proposed design and include background air quality.

Human health risk assessments must also consider cumulative risks to community for chemicals that may be deposited to ground. This includes assessing ways people may be exposed from air, soil, uptake into homegrown produce and, where relevant to the location, potential for runoff to waterways. The cumulative risk from all these pathways combined must show BATT can achieve levels that do not pose a risk to human health and the environment for the application to be considered suitable.

Air emissions limits are then set based on BATT and monitored with Continuous Emissions Monitoring System (CEMS) and Continuous Operations Monitoring System (COMS), which enable real-time understanding that the system is operating appropriately. Additional monitoring is required to further confirm environment performance throughout the year.

Any approved facility must comply with licence conditions, which includes emissions limits, monitoring, reporting, waste controls and management of residual materials.

References:

Official Journal of the European Union, 2024

Title: Consolidated text: Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 on industrial and livestock rearing emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control)

Journal: [Official Journal of the European Union, OJ L 334](#) (click on EN link for English)

Official Journal of the European Union, 2019

Title: Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2019/2010 of 12 November 2019 establishing the best available techniques (BAT) conclusions, under Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council, for waste incineration (notified under document C (2019) 7987) (Text with EEA relevance)

Source: [Official Journal of the European Union, L 312/55](#) (click on EN link for English)

EPA guidance for [Preparing a risk management and monitoring program](#) | epa.vic.gov.au

EPA Guidance for assessing and minimising air pollution, [EPA Victoria Publication 1961](#).

EnHealth Council Guidelines for assessing human health risks from environmental hazards, [Enhealth](#)

Additional questions on notice from David ETTERSHANK

7. Question Asked:

Is WtE consistent with the EPA's Precautionary Principle and if so how? e.g. "If there exist threats of serious or irreversible harm to human health or the environment, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent or minimise those threats." See <https://www.epa.vic.gov.au/principles-environmentprotection>.

Response:

The approach of the Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) to regulating waste-to-energy facilities is consistent with the precautionary principle, which is defined in the *Environment Protection Act 2017*: “If there exist threats of serious or irreversible harm to human health or the environment, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent or minimise those threats”.

EPA applies this principle through a precautionary, risk-based framework that requires proponents to demonstrate, through detailed monitoring and assessment, that risks to human health and the environment can be effectively managed before approval is granted. The environmental standards and risk assessment frameworks underpinning these assessments are set at levels at which risks of harm to health are low and unlikely to pose a long-term risk to health.

The Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) applies a rigorous, evidence-based regulatory framework to ensure that waste-to-energy facilities meet strict environmental and human health protection requirements.

Licence applications are only approved where risks can be effectively identified, assessed and managed. The EP Act requires a two-staged permissioning approach for waste-to-energy facilities:

- Development licence that requires detailed technical design, risk assessments, public consultation and construction verification
- Operating licence that requires robust verification through the commissioning stage to ensure the operation is safe and tightly controlled.
- Granting a development licence does not guarantee operations. An operating licence will not be approved until it can be demonstrated that the facility can meet stringent environmental performance requirements. Throughout the assessment process, proponents are required to provide detailed information on the proposed technology, comprehensive air quality impact assessments and human health risk assessments which incorporate emissions modelling, cumulative impacts and background conditions. Human health risk assessments for permissions applications seek to identify if risks can be managed to a level that is low and does not pose a significant risk of harm to health or the environment.

The precautionary principle is intended to ensure in the event of a scenario where risks are serious or irreversible, lack of full certainty will not delay measures to mitigate or minimise that risk. Environmental standards and objectives adopted within the permissioning process are set at a level at which the risk of harm to human health and the environment are to be very low. This means that we ensure that permissions approved are set at a level where even a small exceedance, particularly temporary exceedances are unlikely to result in harm at a scale that could be considered serious or irreversible.

EPA does not approve a development or operating licence where risks show the potential for serious or irreversible harm that cannot be managed through the use of reasonably practicable proportionate controls.

Risks are expected to be managed so far as reasonably practicable, with proponents considering both the likelihood and consequence of a harm occurring. Guidance on how to identify what is reasonably practicable can be found at [Reasonably practicable | epa.vic.gov.au](https://www.epa.vic.gov.au/reasonably-practicable)

8. Question Asked:

At the 26th May hearing proponents HiQ indicated that they would be happy for applications to be made public, as we as a need to be “singing from the same song sheet” to ensure community concerns are addressed. It was stated that they would prefer the regulator to do that. So far the communities we’ve spoken to feel they are poorly informed, adding to their concerns. Will you share more information about how licenses are assessed, and what regulations and requirements applications will be subject to?

Response:

The Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) assesses development licence applications against the statutory requirements of the *Environment Protection Act 2017*, *Environment Protection Regulations 2021* and other relevant Acts, policies and standards.

Information is available on our website and includes:

- measures taken by the applicant to comply with the [general environmental duty](#)
- the impact of the activity on human health and the environment
- the principles of environment protection

- the best available techniques or technologies for the activity
- any referral agency comments
- any comments received during the public consultation period.

EPA publishes a notice for every application as soon possible after receiving an application. We publish on [Engage Victoria](#), a local newspaper (if available) and other channels as we consider appropriate.

EPA invites public submissions on all applications. The law requires a minimum submission period of 15 business days (excluding the day the notice was published). There is no maximum period in the Act, but EPA typically limits submissions to 25 business days to meet statutory deadlines. Anyone can make a submission during this period. Submitters can attach files, such as detailed written submissions. Submissions are published on the Engage Victoria website.

The applicant has an opportunity to address the concerns raised through consultation. EPA may convene a conference of interested parties to help resolve those concerns.

EPA completes its assessment, taking into account any public comments received and any applicant response. EPA will then decide whether to issue a development licence and whether to attach any conditions to the licence. Proposed conditions will be discussed with applicants.

The *Environment Protection Act 2017* requires EPA to make a decision on development licence applications within 4 months of receiving a complete application. We may request further information from the applicant during the process or require an extension of time to complete the assessment. The Department of Transport and Planning would also require community consultation under the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*, depending on the approvals pathway.

9. Question Asked:

When will the EPA commence baseline testing of all the proposed waste to energy sites and environs pollutants, particulates, and heavy metals?

Response:

The Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) does not conduct site-specific baseline testing for proposed waste-to-energy sites, as this is the

responsibility of proponents as part of the development licence application process.

Proponents must undertake detailed air quality impact assessments and human health risk assessments. These assessments characterise background environmental conditions and cumulative impacts, and model proposed emissions against existing air quality to demonstrate that the facility will not cause unacceptable impacts to human health or the environment.

To support these assessments, proponents are typically required to collect site-specific background air quality data. This generally includes pollutants such as:

- particulate matter (e.g. PM₂₅ and PM₁₀)
- oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and other combustion gases
- acid gases (e.g. SO₂, HCl, HF)
- heavy metals (e.g. mercury, cadmium, lead and other trace metals)
- trace organic pollutants, including dioxins and furans
- other relevant air toxics, depending on the waste stream and technology.

Baseline data is usually collected prior to and in support of the development licence assessment application. It is tailored to the specific location and risk profile of each project and informs the assessment and modelling process.

EPA's ambient air quality monitoring network may also be used to provide regional data to inform these assessments and support the evaluation of changes in air quality, including the contribution of emissions or impacts arising from specific activities.

EPA may also require additional site-specific monitoring or analysis where necessary. The timing and scope of baseline data collection are determined on a case-by-case basis through the permissioning process.

10. Question Asked:

What will ongoing monitoring entail?

Response:

The Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) will condition for duty holder monitoring, depending on the impacts identified through the

assessment process. This could include air quality emission monitoring systems. A standard requirement for licences includes development of a risk management and monitoring program (RMMP) which identifies risks of harm to human health and the environment, environmental performance and risk controls objectives, measures to eliminate or minimise risks and how information is collected and disseminated or used.

The RMMP has to be made available to EPA on request and is used in compliance and enforcement situations to ensure environmental obligations are being met by licence holders.

Once built and operating, EPA authorised officers would undertake periodic licence compliance assessments, which includes a review of the site's risk identification and management systems. Also, any pollution reports alleging the premises would be assessed and triaged and could result in an inspection.

11. Question Asked:

Will the EPA require stringent reporting about any potential health risks and how these will be managed, as part of license applications, including the disposal or storage of bottom ash?

Response:

The Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) requires that licence applications for waste-to-energy facilities include detailed assessment of environmental and human health risks and demonstrate how those risks will be managed.

This includes the management of ash and other byproducts, with licence conditions ensuring that these materials are handled, stored, treated or disposed of in a manner that protects human health and the environment.

Once operational, facilities must comply with operating licence conditions that include emission monitoring and reporting, waste monitoring and auditing and management of residual materials.

Failure to meet licence conditions can result in enforcement action, including fines, prosecution or withdrawal of licences.

12. Question Asked:

How will the EPA ensure only permissible waste is burned in the incinerators?

Response: Licence conditions will be used to specify the type and volume of wastes permitted to be received at a waste to energy facility. It is each licence holder's responsibility to ensure they only receive waste they are licenced to receive. EPA has compliance and enforcement powers to ensure these conditions are met. Such powers entail use of intelligence gathering technologies, and risk-based site visits by EPA Operations staff.

13. Question Asked:

What will be the course of action if there is non-permitted waste burnt?

Response:

Where the Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA) identifies a breach of the operating licence or EPA duties, EPA authorised officers would refer this through our investigation process for enforcement consideration. Breaches of a licence or the general environmental duty may be enforced through legal proceedings in a court of law.