



# Review of the *Contaminated Sites Act 2003*

## *Discussion paper*

### SUBMISSION COVER SHEET

Complete and email this form with your submission by

**Monday 24 February 2014.**

**To assist us in collating stakeholder responses, please submit in Word format.  
PLEASE DO NOT SEND PDF DOCUMENTS**

**Submissions will be published on the DER webpage, however, personal contact details will not be made public.**

**Email to: [consitesreview@der.wa.gov.au](mailto:consitesreview@der.wa.gov.au)**

**This submission is written on behalf of (individual or organisation name):**

Water Corporation

**Please indicate which best describes you / your organisation:**

Academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Member of the public	<input type="checkbox"/>	Professional association	<input type="checkbox"/>
Auditor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Real estate	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community group	<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal practitioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	State agency	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local government	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental consultant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Planning consultant	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Contact person</b>			
<b>Position</b>			
<b>Email</b>		<b>Fax</b>	
<b>Phone</b>		<b>Mobile</b>	
<b>Postal address</b>		<b>State</b>	
<b>Suburb / city</b>		<b>Post code</b>	
<b>Number of pages (including this cover sheet)</b>	8		

**Review of the**  
***Contaminated Sites Act 2003***  
***Discussion paper***

## Response template

To get the most out of your feedback, **please provide examples and relevant data to support your view (e.g. how the issue affects you, information regarding costs incurred and how frequently the issue arises)**. Comments are most helpful if they:

- contain a clear rationale;
- provide evidence to support your view;
- describe any alternatives we should consider; and
- where possible provide data which could inform a costs and benefits analysis of the issue such as how often the issue arises and what direct and/or indirect costs or savings would be incurred if the change was made.

### ***What will happen to the information I provide?***

After the comment period has closed (24 February 2014), we will review and consider all stakeholder feedback and produce a detailed report for consideration by the Minister for the Environment. The review report will be tabled by the Minister in Parliament. All submissions received will be published on the DER website (personal contact details will not be made public).

### ***Thank you***

We would like to thank you for your time in contributing to this review process. This stakeholder consultation will provide valuable information for us to consider and incorporate into improving the operation of the CS Act and Regulations and the way we do our business.

## (1) Duty to report

Under s.11(4) of the Act, the following persons have a duty to report a site:

- an owner or occupier of the site
- a person who knows, or suspects, that he or she has caused, or contributed to, the contamination
- an auditor engaged to provide a report that is required for the purposes of this Act in respect of the site.

If any other person becomes aware of a known or suspected contamination, they **may** report it, but are **not** obliged to do so.

**In the Consultation paper we asked: Should a person with the professional knowledge or ability to identify contamination have a duty to report it?**

### Proposed way forward – include an ‘environmental consultant’ in the persons with a duty to report under s.11

The intent here is that the reporting obligation would apply to environmental consultants engaged for investigation or remediation purposes [an appropriate definition of ‘environmental consultant’ would need to be included in the Act]. It is suggested that for an environmental consultancy, the onus would be on the project manager to ensure that known/suspected contamination is reported to DER in the appropriate timeframe. It is not intended that a reporting obligation would apply to other professionals such as a field technician sampling wells, a laboratory technician conducting laboratory analyses or to someone conducting a survey at the site.

<p><b>1.1</b></p>	<p><b><i>Do you support the proposed change?</i></b></p> <p>Please remember to provide specific examples and information on the possible financial consequences of making or not making the proposed change. You may also wish to offer an alternative solution.</p>
<p><b>1.1</b></p>	<p>The Corporation supports the intent of the changes; however we cannot support them unconditionally.</p> <p>The proposed change may result in more sites being reported as consultants report sites that industry hasn't. If more sites are reported this will assist the Corporation to manage the supply of safe drinking water and exposure risks to operational personnel undertaking maintenance and incident response work adjacent to contaminated sites.</p> <p>It is good that more context has been provided around the proposed change and the context alleviates some of the initial concerns about the proposed change. If the change is adopted, the Corporation requests that the roles and responsibilities to report are clearly defined and distinguished between the Environmental Consultant and Project Manager. Furthermore, the definitions of suspected and known contaminated sites need to be made clear.</p>
<p><b>1.2</b></p>	<p><b><i>If your answer is no, why do you not support the proposed change?</i></b></p>
<p><b>1.2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Corporation is concerned about an over reporting of sites without sufficient information to assess whether actual suspected or known contamination exists. The implications of over reporting is that land is unnecessarily drawn into the</li> </ul>

contaminated sites process, which will result in resources being focussed in areas where the complete source, pathway and receptor loop isn't strong. This may result in resources being drawn away from proactive site investigation, management and/or remediation.

- If the definitions of suspected or actual contamination and the responsibilities to report are not made clear enough, there is still potential for unqualified people to be reporting land as contaminated when the site is not actually contaminated sites. This will unnecessarily draw land into the contaminated sites process. An average site costs more than \$100,000 and a year to get through the PSI and DSI phase. If actual contamination doesn't exist, this is quite an onerous impact to industry.
- Due to the complexities of assessing contamination, consultants, land managers and other people in the industry have different opinions as to whether a site is actually a known or suspected contaminated site, the change may lead to consultants over reporting land that is not contaminated, please see the examples below.
- It is possible that relationships between industry and individual consultants will be damaged if the consultant reports a site that the land manager doesn't think is contaminated.
- In order to ensure the effective management of the possible negative impacts of the proposed change, the Corporation requests that industry is consulted throughout the drafting of related documents.
- Question - Will this change apply retrospectively?

Examples:

Example 1:

The contaminated sites reporting criteria for asbestos impacted sites is complex and the relationship between Hygienist's work and contaminated sites work is not always clear. I understand that Worksafe guidance states that no visible asbestos should be on site. This guidance is more onerous than the DOH 2009 guidance so there is a chance that a Hygienist will see an asbestos fragment on the ground, make the assumption that the risk of exposure is present and contribute to writing the asbestos section of DSI report. The lead consultant may not be across the intricacies of DOH asbestos requirements and subsequently report that site as a contaminated site.

Example 2:

Due diligence groundwater investigations show that a metal is above either one or more of the relevant guidelines, e.g. the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines (ADWG), DOH non-potable criteria and the fresh water guidelines (FWG). Due to standard industry resourcing and project scoping constraints, the project managing consultant doesn't carry out a desktop assessment as to how that metal will impact typical garden bore users or to see whether the FWGs were set on regional water quality data, or whether the sensitive species that the FWGs were set to protect are likely to be present, so they assume that suspected contamination exists and then unnecessarily report the Site.

Please note that most consultants do not look into the reasoning behind how or why a

	guideline is set.
--	-------------------

## (2) Site classification scheme

**In the Consultation paper we asked: In circumstances where contamination has been identified but requires further investigation to determine whether clean-up is necessary for the current or proposed land use, would a new classification, *contaminated—investigation required* be helpful? Would such a classification prompt more timely investigations at a site?**

### Proposed way forward — process improvements — no change to classification system

We have initiated substantial improvements to our internal procedures to provide clearer guidance on what a site classification of *possibly contaminated— investigation required* means. A summary of the planned improvements is provided in the Discussion paper.

<b>2.1</b>	<b><i>Do you support the proposed way forward?</i></b>  Please remember to provide specific examples and information on the possible financial consequences of making or not making the proposed change. You may also wish to offer an alternative solution.
<b>2.1</b>	Yes, the proposed change would add value. The new classification would add value to how industry prioritises their program of work.
<b>2.2</b>	<b><i>If not, what modifications or alternative course of action do you propose?</i></b>
<b>2.2</b>	

## (3) Mandatory disclosure

Under s.68 of the Act, landowners must provide written disclosure to any new or potential owners if selling or transferring land that is classified *contaminated—restricted use*, *contaminated—remediation required* or *remediated for restricted use* or land that is subject to a regulatory notice.

**In the Consultation paper we asked: Are the mandatory disclosure requirements clear? Have you encountered difficulties in knowing when to make a disclosure?**

### Proposed way forward—minor changes to the Act

The definition of ‘owner’ is provided in s.5 (1) of the Act. For the purposes of s.68, we propose to clarify the meaning of ‘owner’ and ‘completion of a transaction’ as described in the Discussion paper.

<b>3.1</b>	<b><i>Do you support the proposed way forward?</i></b>  Please remember to provide specific examples and information on the possible financial consequences of making or not making the proposed change. You may also wish to offer an
------------	--

	alternative solution.
<b>3.1</b>	Yes, the Corporation is supportive of clearer disclosure requirements.
<b>3.2</b>	<i>If not, what modifications or alternative course of action do you propose?</i>
<b>3.2</b>	

## **(4) The Contaminated Sites Committee**

### **(4.1) Improved timeframes for decisions on responsibility for remediation**

It was originally anticipated that most committee decisions on responsibility for remediation would be made within six months of a request being filed with the committee (reg. 27). However, these decisions are taking much longer in practice. In many cases this is because relevant information is submitted after material has been circulated by the committee, resulting in multiple rounds of consultation prior to the committee making its final decision.

**In the Consultation paper we asked: Should there be a time limit and requirement for all relevant documents to be sent to the committee to decide on the responsibility for remediation? What time limit (e.g. three months) would be fair to all parties? Can you suggest other ways to expedite the decision making process?**

#### **Way forward – possible changes to the Act**

The possible changes to the Act to improve the timeliness of committee decision-making could include:

- a timeframe of three months in the Act to complete the circulation of all information submitted to the committee. For example, a three-month timeframe would mean that parties would have about 10 weeks from the call for submissions to provide all relevant information for circulation to the other parties. The process would need to be clearly articulated in supporting guidelines to avoid claims that the process lacked procedural fairness if exchange of information was curtailed.
- extending the offence of providing ‘false or misleading information’ (s. 94) to include making a written submission to the committee in connection with a decision on responsibility for remediation (penalty \$125,000, and a daily penalty of \$25,000).
- the authority (or ‘headpower’) in the Act for the committee to publish its reasons for each decision on responsibility for remediation. (Reference to published decisions may help parties to identify the types of documentation which will be required by the committee and may also help parties to come to an agreement on responsibility without applying to the committee for a formal decision).

***Please also consider the next section on the role of the committee and whether you would support the possible transfer of some committee functions to the State Administrative Tribunal before finalising your response to Q.4.1.***

4.1	<p><b><i>Do you support the proposed changes?</i></b></p> <p>Please remember to provide specific examples and information on the possible financial consequences of making or not making the proposed change. You may also wish to offer an alternative solution.</p>
4.1	<p>Proposed change 1 – The Corporation supports the intent of the change; however the time frame for the submission of information could be too short in some circumstances. Perhaps the timeframe could be extended to six months if work is in progress.</p> <p>Proposed change 2 – No views for or against.</p> <p>Proposed change 3 – Supportive of the change, the greater transparency will definitely add value to Industry’s management of contamination.</p>
	<p><b><i>If not, what modifications or alternative course of action do you propose?</i></b></p>
4.1	

#### **(4.2) Role of the Contaminated Sites Committee and the State Administrative Tribunal**

When the Act was being drafted, the State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) did not exist so Parliament did not address the question of whether or not all or part of the role of the committee should be performed by SAT. Further information on this issue is provided in the Discussion paper.

4.2.1	<p><b><i>Do you support SAT review of the Contaminated Sites Committee’s primary decisions (e.g. the committee decisions on responsibility for remediation), assuming that SAT is appropriately resourced to perform this task?</i></b></p> <p>Please remember to provide specific examples and information on the possible financial consequences of making or not making the proposed change. You may also wish to offer an alternative solution.</p>
4.2.1	<p>No views for or against.</p>

Review of the *Contaminated Sites Act 2003*  
Discussion paper response template

<b>4.2.2</b>	<p><i>Do you support SAT becoming the review decision-maker in place of the Contaminated Sites Committee for appeals against classification and notices served under the Act, assuming that SAT is appropriately resourced to perform this task?</i></p> <p>Please remember to provide specific examples and information on the possible financial consequences of making or not making the proposed change. You may also wish to offer an alternative solution.</p>
<b>4.2.2</b>	No views for or against.