

**West's Road RDF & Waste Management  
Community Reference Group  
AOC  
24<sup>th</sup> Meeting  
Accepted Notes  
29 June 2017  
Conference Rooms C & D**

**Present:**

Cr Peter Maynard	- Councillor (Iramoo Ward), Wyndham City Council
Cr Walter Villagonzalo	- Councillor (Chaffey Ward), Wyndham City Council
Karen Hucker	- Community representative
Jacqui Scott	- Community representative
Kimi Pellosis	- Community representative
Lindsay Swinden	- Community representative
Lisa Field	- Community representative
John Faranda	- Ratepayer/business representative (Werribee South Ratepayers Association)
Harry Van Moorst	- Environment group representative (WREC)
Michelle Lee	- Planner, Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group (MWRRG)
Stephen Thorpe	- Director City Operations, Wyndham City Council
Simon Clay	- Manager Refuse Disposal Facility, Wyndham City Council
Liza McColl	- Business Analyst Refuse Disposal Facility, Wyndham City Council
Bruce Turner	- Independent Chair

**Visitors:**

nil

**Apologies/ absent:**

Cr Tony Hooper	- Councillor (Harrison Ward), Wyndham City Council
Peter Haddow	- Community representative
Julian Menegazzo	- Adjoining landowner representative
Caroline Lavoie	- Community representative

The meeting commenced at 4.30 pm. No conflicts of interest were declared

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Bruce welcomed members to the meeting.

**a. Introduction of new members**

Liza reported that the expression of interest process to renew the membership of the CRG and fill current vacancies had concluded. Council supported the recommendations of the interview panel and appointed three people to the CRG: Lisa Field (ratepayer/business group representative), Caroline Lavoie (community representative) and Karen Hucker (community representative and returning member). Caroline is currently overseas and passed on her apologies.

All members of the group introduced themselves to Lisa. Lisa introduced herself and gave a brief overview about *Transition Wyndham* and her personal commitment to reduce emissions and 'Take 2' pledge. Lisa said she intended to be a conduit of information between the community, members of

Transition Wyndham and the CRG, and hopes to learn from each and every member of the CRG. She noted that she has no set agenda and that her experience and interest is community engagement and health.

## **b. Thank you to outgoing members**

John Faranda was thanked for his contribution to the group. John has been a member of the group since its inception in 2013. John was a ratepayer/business group representative on behalf of Ratepayers of Werribee South Inc. This ratepayer/business group representative is now Lisa Field on behalf of Transition Wyndham.

## **2. Notes and actions from the previous meeting**

The notes from the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, circulated prior to the meeting, were accepted.

An 'action tracker' document with the status of outstanding actions from previous meetings was handed out. Bruce ran through outstanding actions:

### **ONGOING ACTIONS – FROM MEETINGS PRIOR TO 27 APRIL 2017**

<i>Action M15-2.1</i>	<i>Update the CRG page on the WCC web site.</i>	Closed. All CRG meeting notes for the last 12 months are now available on the WCC website. This will be updated after every meeting. The web site review will occur after the Community Engagement Strategy. Refer Agenda Item 10.
<i>Action M17-6.1</i>	<i>Simon to look at including Connie Menegazzo in the survey team and to plot historical complaints and survey results compared to time of delivery and other operating and atmospheric conditions at the landfill</i>	Completed. Discussions with Connie held in June. Agreed to explore options on best arrangement for Connie to add and receive value from this.
<i>Action M17-7.1</i>	<i>Provide data on recycling from the transfer station</i>	Commenced. A new report will commence from the August 2017 meeting.
<i>Action M18-6.2</i>	<i>Circulate the auditor's report on the phytocap trial when it becomes available</i>	Report not yet available. Simon waiting on design documentation which is 6-8 weeks away.
<i>Action M19-5.1</i>	<i>Circulate a copy of the Wyndham Vale Buffer Study and ESO to the CRG members</i>	Buffer Study circulated. ESO not yet available for public circulation. Refer Agenda Item 4.
<i>Action M20-5.1</i>	<i>Simon to ask Elio for a status update and a timeframe for expected outcomes related to strategic land use planning</i>	New odour modelling completed as part of the Works Approval application. Refer Agenda item 4a.
<i>Action M20-7.1</i>	<i>Simon to give priority to installing noise attenuation barriers at the active tip face.</i>	Commenced. Refer Action M23.8.1 regarding Hay bales. Action closed.
<i>Action M21-4.1</i>	<i>Simon to provide regular updates on the progress with extinguishing the hot spot.</i>	Completed. Hot spot update circulated 24 May 2017. Refer Agenda Item 7a. Copy attached.

### **NEW ACTIONS FROM LAST MEETING – 27 APRIL 2017**

<i>Action M23-3.1</i>	<i>Council to revisit the minutes of the CRG's original discussion of the Rehabilitation Master Plan and clarify the current status of the Master Plan - to be included on the Agenda for the</i>	Completed. Refer item 6 on Agenda
-----------------------	---	--------------------------------------

	<i>next meeting.</i>	
Action M23-3.2	<i>Council to investigate the status of the Road Reserve along the NE corner of the site.</i>	Not completed.
Action M23- 3.3	<i>Council to look at broadening the space for perimeter planting where possible.</i>	Completed. It is not possible to broaden the perimeter planting at this stage, however the landscaping plan has been revised to thicken the perimeter planting.
Action M23-3.4	<i>Council to explore the potential use of the rail reserve land on the northern boundary for landscaping purposes.</i>	Closed. This land is currently leased partly by VicTrack to Australian Rail Track Corporation and partly to V-Line. Both organisations have verbally advised that we can submit a formal proposal, but it is unlikely to be supported due to safety regulations and policies and practical considerations about landscaping within the rail corridor. CRG members agreed that it was not worth spending a lot of time on this given the initial feedback.
Action M23-3.5:	<i>Council to look at the opportunity to use locally indigenous species, for educational purposes, eg at the entrance to the RDF.</i>	Progressing. Landscape plan currently under review.
Action M23-3.6	<i>Simon to distribute a copy of the S22 notice and the Conference Chair Report to the CRG members.</i>	Completed. Copy of Notice emailed to CRG members on 6 May 2017.
Action M23-3.7	<i>Simon to distribute a copy of Council's response to the EPA S22 notices to the CRG members.</i>	Refer Agenda item 5.
Action M23-4.1	<i>Liza to review minutes of past meetings to determine exactly when the community members started on the CRG to determine the membership renewal order. Liza to send out letters to all members to confirm their membership renewal dates.</i>	Completed. CRG members were sent letters confirming their membership renewal dates on 4 May 2017.
Action M23-4.2	<i>Liza to follow up with Council's communication team about whether the EOI online form can be changed to allow it to be saved and completed in stages.</i>	Completed. Council's online form system does not currently allow this to happen. Communications team was grateful for the feedback and will include this function in the new system upgrade.
Action M23-5.1	<i>The Residual Procurement Initiative to be made a standing item on the Agenda and the Manager of the Residual Procurement Project to be invited to a future CRG meeting.</i>	Refer Agenda Item 3.
Action M23-7.1	<i>The Audit Report to be listed on the agenda for the June meeting, providing CRG members with more time to read the report. CRG members are welcome to suggest questions/ issues of particular interest for discussion.</i>	Not completed. CRG members discussed whether to list this on the Agenda for the August meeting or to hold a Special Meeting. Replaced by new Action M24-2.2 (below).
Action M23-7.2	<i>Simon to provide a report on work underway to address/respond to the Audit Report findings.</i>	Not completed. Refer above Action M23-7.1.
Action M23-7.3	<i>CRG members who are interested in this</i>	Refer Agenda Item 9 – Member Report.

	<i>groundwater issue to review the detail of the audit – if questions/ issues remain, these can be discussed at the next meeting.</i>	
Action M23-7.4	<i>Simon to include a label on the 'Waste Received by Month' graph to show that the amounts are cumulative and include a label on the 'Landfill Gas Capture Volumes' to show that the gas is measured in standard cubic metres.</i>	Completed. Refer Agenda Item 7b.
Action M23-7.5	<i>Simon to ensure that the CRG's support for the proposed capital works projects to be formally conveyed to Council, as part of the community input into the draft budget.</i>	Completed. The Council will be adopting the budget in July 2017. The final draft budget contains the following RDF projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cell 5a construction - \$15m</li> <li>• Landscaping - \$150K</li> <li>• Bulldozer - \$1.2m</li> <li>• Compactor - \$1.25m</li> <li>• Litter net fence/cages - \$500K</li> <li>• Leachate management infrastructure - \$500K</li> </ul>
Action M23- 8.1	<i>Simon to continue to investigate noise attenuation measures on site and consider Julian's offer of hay bales.</i>	Action closed Arrangements currently being made to transport hay to RDF. Shipping containers will also be used on site to mitigate noise.
Action M23.8.2	<i>Simon to circulate a copy of his email response to Julian about the waterway diversion to all members of the CRG.</i>	Completed. Copy of email sent to CRG members on 1 May 2017.

**Regarding Action M18-6.2** The group agreed that it seemed that the design was taking too long and that the phytocap still needed to be trialled. Simon noted the groups frustration and said he would aim to have the report for the next meeting.

It was agreed that the temporary capping and rehabilitation of closed cells was critical. Simon explained that the phytocap is proposed for cells 1-3. A traditional cap will be used in cells 4a, b and c. A phytocap design must be approved by an auditor before it goes to EPA for approval. EPA require a 3-5 year trial to be done to show that the phytocap will meet the same performance standards as the traditional cap. Simon indicated he intends to install a phytocap over all of the area of cells 1-3 rather than just test a small area and have to wait 3-5 years to extend to other parts of the cell. All being well, this will maximise the amount of rehabilitation completed.

Harry noted his view that phytocapping is a risky business and that it needs a drainage layer below it, in case it fails. Harry asked whether the option of including a phytocap with a drainage layer could be included in the report.

*Action M24-2.1 Simon to ask the design consultant of the phytocap to pay specific attention to the potential failure of the phytocap and the necessary precautionary measures.*

**Regarding Action M23-7.5**, Jacqui asked why the construction budget for a cell had nearly doubled in such a short time. She noted that the construction cost for Cell 4a was approximately \$7 million whereas the budget for Cell 5a is \$15 million. Simon explained that one of the main reasons for the increase is the EPA requirement to add a double layer of a high quality geomembrane material for added protection against groundwater contamination. This has added approximately \$120K per hectare.

**Regarding M23-7.1,** Harry noted that he had lots of questions and issues to raise about the Audit report and would like to discuss them tonight or as soon as possible.

*Action M24-2.2 Harry and Simon to meet to discuss the Audit Report to identify what might be brought to the next meeting for discussion.*

### **3. Strategic waste management and resource recovery**

#### **a. Collaborative Residual Procurement Project Update – Michelle Lee**

Michelle advised that a Project Manager was recently appointed. His name is Paul Clapham. Paul will attend the next CRG meeting and present the project plan.

MWRRRG have met with councils to have initial high level discussions about the project and to get councils to start to think about whether they are prepared to support alternative waste treatment projects (such as waste-to-energy). The next step will be to form a Working Group of Councils that are interesting in progressing this initiative.

There was a discussion about the use of the word 'residual' in the project title. Michelle noted Harry's view that the word 'residual' was confusing, and might send the wrong message; implying that residual waste was being procured. Michelle said that this was the technical name of the project but that a title such as 'alternative waste processing or treatment' could be considered to help with community engagement and clarity.

Harry noted his support for the project but also his view that it really needs to progress to inform the Landfill Services Contract scheduled for renewal in 2021. Harry said he was concerned that the new Landfill Services Contract will only have waste to landfill as opposed to allowing waste to alternative treatment options. Michelle advised that the landfill contract will be flexible and have option to allow waste to be diverted from landfill. Michelle also noted that the Landfill Services Contract is relatively short term (3 plus 3 plus 3 years) and would not lock in landfill only. She also noted that even with alternative waste treatment options, there will still be a requirement for landfill for some residual waste.

#### **b. Council staff to attend August meeting to update CRG on Wyndham Environmental Strategies. Discussion about what the CRG would like to hear about.**

The CRG members agreed that they would like to get an update on the Environment Strategy and the Waste and Litter Strategy. CRG members would like Council staff to advise what the performance targets are for each strategy, how we are tracking and whether the timelines for implementation of the strategies are being met. The focus should be on what is most relevant to the business of this CRG.

*Action M24-3.1 Council officers to be invited to present an update on the achievement of performance targets in Wyndham's Environmental Strategies at the August CRG meeting.*

#### **c. At-Call Hard Waste Tender**

Simon advised that the Council's At-Call Hard Waste Service was tendered two weeks ago. The At-Call Hard Waste Service provides residents of Wyndham with the ability to have hard waste collected from their home, at no additional cost, on two occasions each year. A new service provider should be appointed by October/November 2017. There will be a provision in the new contract to move to three hard waste services, at some point in the future, as per the recommendation in the Wyndham Waste and Litter Strategy. Simon reminded the group that the Strategy also recommends that the 'tip' vouchers be reduced from 2 to 1 vouchers.

There was a lively discussion and different views about the loss of the tip vouchers. This led to a discussion and questions about the Transfer Station. It was highlighted that customers are generally paying for recyclables currently, because these are charged by volume at the weighbridge before the transfer pit. Lisa noted that when she takes recyclables to the RDF and advises the staff on entry, she is not charged. Simon explained that most people bring in mixed loads, with a range of recyclable and non-recyclable materials and that it is up to customers and staff to remove recyclable items or it will all go to landfill. There was general agreement that there should be incentives for people to sort out recyclables from loads going to the tip. This would involve reconfiguration of the Transfer Station layout.

Harry recalled that the Council has previously prepared a plan for the redevelopment of the Transfer Station which had been discussed with the CRG. He requested an update on the status and timelines of the redevelopment. He suggested that the Transfer Station (TS) redevelopment, or at least finding a better way of using the existing TS setup to ensure all recyclables are separated, should occur before any changes to the vouchers were made. All agreed there should be no recyclables ending up in the pit (to go to landfill). Stephen undertook for Council to come back to the CRG with a response regarding the implications of the reduction in tip vouchers.

*Action M24-3.2 Council to provide the CRG with an update on the status and timeline for the redevelopment of the Transfer Station.*

*Action M24-3.3 Council to identify the implications of the loss of the tip vouchers on the Transfer Station and whether there are any alternatives only charge for the waste going to landfill.*

#### **4. Strategic planning context**

##### **a. RDF Buffer Study Update**

Liza advised that a Planning Scheme Amendment cannot proceed at the current time, because the buffer study forms the strategic basis for the application of any new statutory planning controls and the RDF buffer study will need to be updated to incorporate new odour modelling, prepared as part of the Works Approval Application (refer to Agenda item 5a for discussion about odour modelling).

##### **b. Werribee Junction Precinct Structure Plan (WJPSP)**

Liza noted that the Victorian Planning Authority (VPA) is scheduled to commence the preparation of the Werribee Junction Precinct Structure Plan (WJPSP) on the 1 July 2017 (tomorrow). The WJPSP includes the RDF site and large land holdings of farmland, all now within the Urban Growth Boundary. The WJPSP will consider and determine the future use and development of this area of land. The VPA will work closely Wyndham City Council and other stakeholders to prepare the plan over the next few years. Council will ensure that the CRG is kept engaged in the PSP process/progress.

*Action M24-4.1 Liza to send CRG members the link to the Victorian Planning Authority website, which contains more information about the Precinct Structure Planning process.*

#### **5. EPA Works Approval Application**

##### **a. Council's Response to EPA for Further Information**

Simon advised that Council's response to two EPA S22 notices has involved a significant amount of additional work and studies, including a Stormwater Management Plan, revised odour modelling and a Landfill Gas Risk Assessment. Simon explained that the Stormwater Management Plan needed to be revised because the piggy back cells have been removed from the application.

EPA requested the odour modelling be redone using the AERMOD model. The previous modelling was prepared using the AUSPLUME model. Simon noted that the results of the air modelling are very similar to the previous odour modelling.

The odour sources that were modelled were the Transfer Station green waste drop off area, the Veolia green waste operation, 2 leachate ponds (eastern and central locations) and the operating tip face (cell 4c). Two additional odour modelling points were added. The odour rates used were the same as in the earlier (2011) modelling. The odour rates used are higher than the rates used in the modelling for the Melbourne Regional Landfill. Simon acknowledged concerns about the use of data from winter because the odour rates are generally lower. He noted, however, that winter is when the atmospheric conditions result in the highest odour concentrations close to the ground, with more likely off-site impacts. The weather conditions used were from 2008-2012.

The modelling included additional scenarios of increased tonnage and a larger than normal tip face (at maximum amount that is allowed). Harry commented that the modelling should have included a tip face exceeding the maximum amount allowed, as has happened on a number of occasions.

Council's response will be lodged with EPA next week and shared at the same time with the CRG. A response to the late WREC submission will follow at a later date. EPA is proposing to then hold a second public meeting to discuss the additional information.

Harry noted that he expects EPA to give the community the same amount of time to digest the material as the Council had to prepare it, or at least 21 days.

*Action M24-5.1 Simon to distribute a copy of Council's response to EPA S22 notices to the CRG members.*

#### **b. Discussion about developer of Harpley Estate joining the CRG**

Simon explained that Lendlease, as the developer of the Harpley Estate made a submission on the Works Approval Application. The Harpley Estate is a large residential development site located approximately 850m from the north-east corner of the RDF. Lendlease is concerned about the potential amenity impacts on the future residents of the Harpley Estate.

Simon said that there have been discussions with Lendlease about the potential for an additional community representative position to be created on the CRG, for a member of the new community to be engaged in discussions about the RDF. Lendlease suggested that a representative from Lend Lease would be best to represent the community at this stage, as there will not be residents for several years until the site is developed.

Council was interested to know the CRG members views on this suggestion. There were mixed views about the idea of Lendlease joining the CRG. Stephen pointed out that Lendlease is managing the development of the site, but is not the landowner. Karen suggested a key aim is to have future residents of the Harpley Estate not complaining about the RDF. The group agreed that attending to the potential needs and concerns of future residents is important. Harry proposed that Lendlease be invited to discuss the matter directly with the CRG, before deciding on the best approach, and this was supported by all.

*Action M24-5.2 Council to invite Lendlease to a future meeting of the CRG to discuss how best to represent the interests of future residents of the Harpley Estate in the CRG process (and wider community engagement).*

#### **c. Proposed landscaping on Bulban Road**

A landscaping concept plan has been prepared for Bulban Road to address concerns about the view of the RDF from the Harpley Estate (as discussed in previous item). The concept proposes to landscape a 100m strip of the southern road reserve on Bulban Road. It is proposed to construct mounds with trees and landscaping on top. The proposed landscaping will improve the foreground view from the estate. There was general support for the proposed landscaping of Bulban Road as a way to decrease the visual impact of the RDF. However, members of the CRG felt that landscaping to improve views from Princes Freeway is a higher priority. The constraint of available land for landscaping was noted; Bulban Road is Council-owned, whereas the Freeway is VicRoads land. It was suggested that landscaping could be done on the private land directly adjacent to the Princes freeway.

*Action M24-5.3 Council to pursue opportunities for screen planting along the Princes Freeway (in the road reserve in collaboration with VicRoads and/or on private land) to improve the view from the freeway.*

## **6. RDF Rehabilitation Post Closure - Concept Plan**

Bruce advised the group that three RDF Rehabilitation Post Closure concepts were presented to the CRG on 18 February 2015 – a 'Botanic Garden' concept, a 'People's Park' and an 'Ecologically Sustainable Park'. The notes from that meeting state that *"There was a great deal of discussion over the concepts. There was some concern about the formality and water demands of the Botanic Garden concept. However, there was agreement that both the Ecologically Sustainable and Peoples Park were concepts that could be supported. Some members suggested a blend of the two might be possible as they complemented each other. Others, such as Karen and Julian, said they favoured the Ecologically Sustainable concept; Karen explained this would provide a good communication and education tool for people coming into Werribee by road and rail. John commented that it was important to avoid stagnant water"*.

Simon noted that the concept plans were very conceptual and general in nature and for this reason there wasn't any real conflict between the current proposed landscaping and these plans. Stephen noted that the proposed landscaping should probably be seen as a functional mitigation measure to improve view lines now, rather than a long-term landscape plan. The landscaping may be sacrificial and may change over time as the function of the site changes.

Stephen noted it seems to have been proposed that the site will have some form of use as open space in the future. He noted that there had not been any formal decision made by Council in relation to the future long-term land use of the site. Therefore the 2015 plans do not have any official status. Simon noted that the use of the site may change over time as there is a move towards alternative waste technologies. The closed landfills themselves could also potentially be used for alternative green industries, eg wind farms. Stephen indicated that Council needed to do more work on this matter and come back to the CRG for a discussion of desired outcomes/ uses for the site in the long-term.

Lindsay commented that if there were to be progressive rehabilitation to create a park, there would be a need to consider how this use would relate to the ongoing operation of the landfill, or just the transfer station if that were to continue operating in the longer-term.

There was agreement that there was a need to keep the long-term future use of the landfill in mind, however the focus and priority must be on the rehabilitation of existing closed cells in the short term. Harry requested that the report on the phytocap trial be finalised as soon as possible (see detailed notes of this discussion recorded in Item 2 under Action M18-6.2).

Karen noted that there was an upcoming forum on land regeneration and the Eden Project, which is an extraordinary landfill regeneration and community engagement project in the UK. She undertook to circulate details of the forum.



*Action M24-6.1 Council to outline the process for development of a long-term plan for the rehabilitation/future use of the site at the next meeting.*

*Action M24-6.2 Karen to email details of the upcoming forum on the Eden project to all CRG members.*

## **7. RDF Update**

Simon handed out a report with key highlights and issues (refer attached). Simon noted the following additional activities not listed in the report:

- Some footage used in a recent episode of the ABC's 'War on Waste' was filmed at the RDF.
- The Mattress Recycling Service will be re-tendered in July. Mattress recycling services were previously undertaken on site at the RDF. The new service will require all mattresses to be recycled off site.
- An Artist-in-Residence program will soon commence at the RDF. Two artists will create an artwork, using the RDF for inspiration and potentially materials. Their work will be on display at the Wyndham Art Gallery in November. The Wyndham Art Gallery is located in Watton Street, Werribee.

*Action M24-7.1 Simon to keep the CRG informed of the 'RDF Artist-in-Residence Program'.*

*Action M24-7.2 Liza to fix the labelling error in the Commercial Recyclable Audit pie chart (in the report provided at the meeting).*

### **a. 'Hot Spot' temperature probe results**

As per the report handed out the meeting, further, and hopefully final, injections into the 'hot spot' are scheduled for early July. The temperature will be retested toward the end of July.

### **b. Performance dashboard**

- **Incoming tonnage**

The graph in the report shows that the amount of waste received at the landfill this financial year is expected to be approximately 45,000 tonnes more than last financial year.

- **Recycling tonnages**

Reporting on the amount and types of materials that are currently recycled at the RDF will commence from the August 2017 meeting.

- **Greenhouse gas emissions & capture**

LMS Energy will install additional generators to maximise gas capture once a new contract between Wyndham Council and LMS Energy is finalised. Contract negotiations are nearing completion.

Karen noted the opportunity for collect waste heat in the future.

- **Complaints**

Simon noted that the underlined non-compliances in the report handed out at the meeting are also complaints. The six complaints received during May-June were in relation to odour and noise. The odour complaints were caused by the need to disconnect the leachate pumps to do re-profiling works on Cell 4a. The complaint regarding noise was received from Julian. A new noise attenuation measure, including Julian's hay bales will be implemented soon.

### **c. EPA Compliance Summary (landfill gas, daily odour, leachate)**

Simon noted that the RDF has a monthly non-compliance issue with the licence in relation Cell 4a and leachate. The report handed out at the meeting highlighted the significant works undertaken to reprofile Cell 4a and construct the new leachate pond, to address the non-compliance. The proposed construction of a new sewer connection in the coming year will also address this. When asked, Simon advised that the new plant equipment proposed in the budget could have helped with these works.

## **8. Community Engagement**

Liza advised that a Community Engagement Strategy for the RDF will be prepared, in accordance with the recommendation of the 20B Conference Report (on the current Works Approval application).

Interest was sought from up to three members of the CRG to form a working group with Liza to help develop the strategy. Thank you to Lisa Field, Karen Hucker and Jacqui Scott for volunteering to be on the working group. A very quick live poll was used in the meeting, to ask CRG members to describe the current RDF community engagement activities. The answers gave a quick glimpse that the preparation of a community engagement strategy has merit.

## **9. Members' Report**

There was insufficient time for a members' report.

## **10. Other business**

There was no other business.

## **Next meeting**

The next meeting is at 4.30 – 7.00 pm on Thursday 31 August 2017.



## CRG Meeting 29 June 2017

### Key Highlights and Issues

Non Compliances reported to EPA since last meeting:

- 8 June 2017 – odour – likely source was either leachate sump disconnected from gas extraction system whilst we completed some earthworks, or area of erosion on Cell 4B from the heavy rain in April (now remediated)
- 5 June 2017 – landfill gas – elevated levels of methane measured in 3 service pits located on site. No elevated readings in any onsite buildings
- 5 June 2017 – exceedance of 300 mm leachate level in Cells
- 2 June 2017 – odour – same causes as 8 June odour
- 30 May 2017 – elevated sub surface methane in monitoring bore B29 to the north of Cell 2B
- 4 May 2017 – odour
- 4 May 2017 – lack of cover
- 4 May 2017 – night time noise
- 2 May 2017 - elevated sub surface methane in monitoring bore B29 and carbon dioxide in B27 to the north of Cell 2B
- 2 May 2017 - exceedance of 300 mm leachate level in Cells
- 2 May 2017 – odour – odorous waste load (hides)

### Complaints

- 13 June 2017 – odour – not able to be validated

The underlined non-compliances were also complaints.

### Hot Spot update

Drilling of 16 additional injection wells and plumbing into the pumping system has been completed. Final plumbing works to allow filling of tanks being done 29 June. Liquid injection to commence 3 July.

## New Leachate pond



Compacted clay liner currently being installed. HDPE liner installation expected to commence 10 July with practical completion mid August. Commissioning will follow Auditor sign off and EPA approval.



## Reprofiling Cell 4A

Reprofiling works on the upper section of Cell 4A has been completed as shown in the photos below.

Before



During



After



### **Alternate Daily Cover**

The alternate daily cover system (Tarpomatic) has been approved for use by the EPA for an initial period of 12 months. The unit was delivered to site on 22 June.

### **Waste Audit at Tip Face**

A preliminary audit of commercial waste disposed at Wyndham Refuse Disposal Facility was undertaken during March and April 2017. The audit involved isolation of selected loads and sorting of the waste using an excavator with grab. An average of 6 loads were sorted per day which represented approximately 10% of the incoming commercial waste vehicles.

The composition of those loads sorted is summarised below and should be viewed as indicative only. A further visual audit of all commercial waste loads was undertaken in mid June and the results are currently pending.

## Overall proportion of recyclables in commercial waste – Pie Chart



