

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

**Present:**

Cr Walter Villagonzalo	- Councillor (Chaffey Ward), Wyndham City Council (left the meeting at 5:40pm)
Jacqui Scott	- Community representative
Kimi Pellosis	- Community representative
Lisa Field	- Community representative
Lindsay Swinden	- Community representative (arrived at meeting at 5:00pm)
Julian Menegazzo	- Adjoining landowner representative
Harry Van Moorst	- Environment group representative (WREC)
Peter Haddow	- Community representative
Simon Clay	- Manager Refuse Disposal Facility, Wyndham City Council
Stephen Thorpe	- Director City Operations, Wyndham City Council (left meeting at 5:40pm)
Liza McColl	- Business Analyst Refuse Disposal Facility, Wyndham City Council
Bruce Turner	- Independent Chair

**Visitors:**

**Apologies/ absent:**

Cr Peter Maynard	- Councillor (Iramoo Ward), Wyndham City Council
Cr Tony Hooper	- Councillor (Harrison Ward), Wyndham City Council
Karen Hucker	- Community representative
Caroline Lavoie	- Community representative
Michelle Lee	- Planner, Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group (MWRRG)

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

**1. Welcome and introductions**

Bruce welcomed members to the meeting and noted the apologies.

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

The notes from the 26<sup>th</sup> meeting were accepted.

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

<b>ONGOING ACTIONS – FROM MEETINGS PRIOR TO 31 AUGUST 2017</b>		
Action M17-7.1	<i>Provide data on recycling from the transfer station</i>	Officers currently working setting up online performance dashboard as discussion at Meeting 25. Recycling data will be included in dashboard.
Action M18-6.2	<i>Circulate the auditor's report on the phytocap trial when it becomes available</i>	Auditor report not yet received
Action M19-5.1	<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.
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>	Indigenous species to be used generally. Locally indigenous species to be used, subject to availability. Werribee Blue Box most suited to a river flat habitat. Closed
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>	No update on the project is available. Michelle Lee passed on her apologies for today's meeting. Closed
Action M23-7.2	<i>Simon to provide a report on work underway to address/respond to the Audit Report findings.</i>	Not completed.
Action M24-3.2	<i>Council to provide the CRG with an update on the status and timeline for the redevelopment of the Transfer Station.</i>	Deferred. Transfer Station Redevelopment Plan needs to be reconsidered.
Action M24-5.2	<i>Council to invite Lend Lease 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).</i>	Lend Lease to attend the CRG's February 2018 meeting, when the Councillors are present.
Action M24-5.3	<i>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.</i>	Discussions with VicRoads progressing. Site investigations commenced. Underground services (high pressure oil pipeline) present may influence/constrain types trees that can be used.
Action M24-6.1	<i>Council to outline the 'process' for development of a long-term plan for the rehabilitation/ future use of the site at the next meeting.</i>	To be discussed today at Agenda Item 6
Action M24-7.1	<i>Simon to keep the CRG informed of the 'RDF Artist-in-Residence Program'.</i>	To be discussed tonight at Agenda item 7
Action M25-2.1	<i>Simon to distribute Phytocap Design Report to CRG committee members for comment before it goes to the auditor. Simon to provide auditor with CRG's comments for consideration, including Harry's request for further information about contingencies for a cap failure.</i>	Melissa Salt attended last meeting. Simon to provide update and discuss any business arising. Closed

<i>Action M25-7.1</i>	<i>Simon to consider CRG's feedback in further consideration of the composting trial at the RDF and consult further with the CRG about any decisions on whether to agree to the trial/ EPA R&amp;D approval application.</i>	To be discussed tonight at Agenda Item 7
<i>Action M25-7.2</i>	<i>If the composting trial proceeds at the RDF, CRG members to be given opportunity to review R&amp;D application before it is submitted to EPA.</i>	To be discussed tonight at Agenda Item 7
<b>NEW ACTIONS FROM LAST MEETING – 19 OCTOBER 2017</b>		
<i>Action M26-4.1</i>	<i>Liza to distribute a copy of Melissa's presentation with the minutes from the meeting, to all members of the CRG.</i>	Completed. Distributed on 27 October 2017 Closed
<i>Action M26-4.2</i>	<i>CRG members to forward Simon/Liza any further questions that they would like Melissa Salt from Tonkin, to provide an answer to.</i>	No further questions received to date. Closed
<i>Action M26-4.3</i>	<i>Cell Rehabilitation to be made a standing agenda item.</i>	Not specifically listed on today's agenda, but can be discussed at Agenda Item 7 – RDF Operational Update.
<i>Action M26-7.1</i>	<i>Liza to circulate a copy of the APS to all CRG members.</i>	Completed. Distributed 14 December 2017. Members are able to raise questions
<i>Action M26-8.1</i>	<i>Liza to ensure that all future CRG meetings avoid single-use plastics.</i>	Completed
<i>Action M26-9.1</i>	<i>Liza to invite Lend Lease to December meeting.</i>	As per M24-5.2 – Lend Lease to attend February Meeting when Councillors are present

### 3. Strategic planning context

Standing Agenda item – nothing to report

### 4. EPA Works Approval

Simon reported that the Western Region Environment Centre, in conjunction with Environment Justice Australia, had lodged an appeal to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal to review EPA's decision to grant Council a Works Approval. The appeal effectively suspends the Works Approval.

VCAT has scheduled a Practice Day hearing for 19 January 2018, a compulsory conference in late March to discuss points of agreement and resolve concerns and the Hearing, if needed for five days in May 2018.

Simon outlined the consequences of the appeal:

- Council does not have the necessary approval to commence the construction of cell 5a.
- The amount of airspace in the remaining cell 4c is limited, so contingencies will need to be made until such time that new airspace is made available, including the diversion of waste from other Councils to other landfills. Most of the waste will go to MRL.
- Reduction in revenue and financial contribution to the Council's budget
- Estimated impact is in the order of \$14-\$25 million dollars; \$100K - \$200K per week.
- Council will not be able to accept waste. The RDF could close.
- Council's resources are focused on the appeal, so there are limited resources available to pursue the Council and communities vision of moving towards AWT.

- The appeal makes it very hard to plan and seek partners in AWT – they are looking for guaranteed supply of waste.

Harry noted that the Council has asked that WREC be struck out of proceedings.

Lisa commented that she felt the appeal process appeared to be a waste of energy and contrary to community engagement.

Jacqui asked what the capacity of the current cell is and how long it would take to build a new cell. Simon advised that the current cell would be full by November 2018, based on current filling rates, and that it takes approximately eight months, all going well, to construct a new cell (design work can be done prior to this).

Simon advised that Council is still progressing with the design and construction tender, with commencement of works, not able to commence until the Works Approval is approved by VCAT.

Harry noted that Council has asked to meet to discuss the appeal but it has not been clear about what it is prepared to negotiate. The issues that WREC would like to discuss are changes to the height and the capacity of the landfill.

Stephen commented that Council had looked at the economics of the landfill and concluded that the volume included in going above ground level is needed to make the RDF viable, given the total whole of life costs of a landfill cell.

Jacqui asked Council to provide more information on the 'break-even' point where the volume just covered the costs of construction and operation of a cell. (NB this calculation was done some time ago with Jacqui's involvement).

There was a discussion of whether Council should make a profit from the RDF, or simply aim to break even. Stephen noted that his advice to the Council would not be to run it at break-even because this would provide no value for the Wyndham community. The constant increase in construction costs due to ever-strengthening environmental standards also needs to be considered. He noted that Council could and may need to divest the asset, if it gets too hard to run. This would mean Council would sell it to another private landfill operator.

Stephen noted that the approval of long term airspace potential is what Council requires to secure alternative waste technologies (AWT). He also noted that the capacity of AWT (some 300,000 tonnes per annum) will only take up the growth of waste over the next 10 years so there will still be the need for landfill to take the excess. Landfilling will also continue for industrial and commercial waste because they will not pay the higher fees that will be charged for AWT.

## **5. Discussion about Waste to Energy and Alternative Waste Technologies at the RDF**

Simon informed the group that the State Government has prepared a Waste to Energy Discussion Paper. Submissions are due by 24 December 2017. Simon noted that the paper is a good starting point and seeks to get some clarity from the community about which technologies they will support.

Lisa noted that she attended a consultation session on the paper (which was poorly attended). She noted that AWT is lower down on the waste hierarchy. Reducing and Recycling waste are higher. Lisa noted that you don't want to set up AWT and not do the higher waste treatment options.

The group had a discussion about the various AWT technologies. Simon noted that there are a range of thermal processes available to treat waste including:

- Adding air = incineration
- Reducing air = gasification
- No air = pyrolysis

Simon noted that no AWT option is free of environmental emissions.

Concerns were raised about incineration, in terms of impact on air quality and treatment of residual waste. It was noted that the State Government will continue with the three waste bin system, so AWT is only for 'residual' waste (diversion from landfill).

Harry noted the EPA guidance document on AWT that makes it clear that it has to be for residual waste.

Harry noted his view that gasification and pyrolysis are better than incineration when working well. Lisa asked why gasification is better than incineration. Harry advised that gasification is able to destroy 99.999% of toxins (eg dioxins) going into the air.

Simon noted that all treatments produced residual waste (10% - 15%). The residual waste materials need to be treated/disposed., however it is usually a lot more benign than the original waste.

Bruce commented that this was a complex matter and he could understand why the government was trying to consult and improve the communities understanding and knowledge. There is a common interest in waste as a resource and having facilities to recover as much of the useful portion on sites like the RDF (which can also take the residual).

Lisa noted that the State Government had also released a consultation paper on the proposed future ban of E-waste. Submissions are due on 24 December 2017. There was also consultation on a plastic bag ban.

Kimi noted that Victoria University are running a forum on making the most of household waste.

Simon noted that the MWRRG are doing work around how they might help Council procure alternative waste technologies. MWRRG have recently been on a study tour to see facilities in the UK. The MWRRG recently gave a presentation about what they saw on the study tour and they have also prepared a separate discussion paper on Advanced Resource Recovery technologies. One of the facilities that they saw was a Council owned and operated facility in Milton Keynes. Council borrowed \$140 million pounds to build the facility which has mechanical sorting, anaerobic digestion and gasification for the residual waste.

*M27-5.1 – Simon to see whether he can circulate a copy of the MWRRG presentation and Discussions Paper on AWT and Case Study on the Milton Keynes Facility.*

## **6. Process for development of long term vision for rehabilitation of the site (Action M24-6.1)**

In the absence of Stephen who had raised this topic in a previous meeting, Simon commented that part of the site would remain operational and could be a resource recovery hub. Lisa asked

what was holding us back from pursuing AWT on the site. Simon said it was basically the gate fee. Bruce added that Government policy and community awareness/ acceptance were other important factors.

This item will be revisited in future meetings.

## 7. RDF Update

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

The next temperature probe will be undertaken in February/March 2018.

### b. Performance dashboard

#### Incoming tonnage

A graph showing incoming tonnage by month was handed out at the meeting (refer copy attached).

The graph shows a continuing trend of total tonnes of waste received below last year's figures. Some of this waste was Whitehorse, which is no longer coming to the RDF. Another reason for a decrease in tonnage is aggressive/competitive pricing from Melbourne Regional Landfill.

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

#### Landfill Gas

A graph showing the landfill gas capture at the RDF for the last two months was handed out at the meeting (refer copy attached). Simon noted that the total volume of landfill gas declined in September/November.

Harry asked for figures for emissions quality and destruction efficiency. There were questions about what flaring means for air quality?

*M27-7.1 Action – Simon to provide information on gas composition and air quality.*

### d. Complaints and Non-Compliances

**Non-compliance in relation to landfill gas levels continues. Council is awaiting EAP approval to commission the new leachate pond. The new leachate pond is expected to reduce leachate levels and off-site gas levels.**

Two noise complaints in relation to night time noise have been received from neighbouring property (Julian). Upon investigation of both occasions by Simon, it was found that the tip face had not been using the shipping containers and hay bale noise barriers, allowing a clear line between the tip face and Julian's property. Simon provided the RDF operational management team with strict instruction about the need to use the noise barriers. Simon thanked Julian for the feedback.

Lindsay asked whether the hay bales had been effective. Simon noted that noise monitoring before and after the hay bales showed changes in noise levels when the hay bales were in place.

Julian noted that the night time noise will eventually affect the residents of the Harpley Estate. Simon noted that undercover baling of waste could help to eliminate the need for working at night at the tip face.

There was a discussion about how to progress the baling project. Simon explained that he was waiting for a consultant to submit a feasibility study report. Preliminary reports show that it is feasible. A

business case has been submitted to Council for funding of the design stage. Harry asked if Council could seek a grant for this.

#### **e. RDF Artist in Residence Program**

The Artist-in-Residence program at the RDF had concluded and culminated with the Wadda Looda exhibition. Lisa and Harry noted that they attended the exhibition. Lisa liked the exhibition. The art was conceptual in nature and the message or idea that she saw in the art pieces was that rubbish is what connects us to the land in the modern day world. Harry didn't feel the art said much.

Simon advised that he would be happy to participate in the Artist-in-Residence Program again in the future. Simon explained that the Council does not provide any direction on the art.

#### **f. Cell Rehabilitation and Phytocap Design**

Simon advised that he needed to do a final review of the phytocap documentation before it can be submitted to the auditor for review. Bruce noted that the phytocap was discussed at the previous meeting and noted that the CRG members seemed quite comfortable with the use of a phytocap. Bruce acknowledged that Harry missed the meeting where the phytocap was discussed but that a copy of the design went out with the agenda for this meeting and everybody was provided with an opportunity to raise comments at and after the meeting. No comments were received. Council is therefore proceeding upon the basis that there is general support for the use of the phytocap.

Simon clarified that a conventional cap will be used on cells 4 and 5.

*Action M27-7.2 Simon to circulate the auditor's report on the phytocap when this is available, before it is submitted to EPA for approval.*

### **8. Members' Report**

It was noted that China has recently reduced/banned the importing of plastics and rubbish, which may have a significant impact on the recycling industry in many countries, including Australia.

Lisa attended the Energy from Waste forums with Caesar Melham MP and Community members. She noted an incredibly poor attendance. She went on to report that she had been talking to her mechanic about his waste and asked whether businesses can receive Council waste management services. Lisa's mechanic and many other commercial businesses have no recycling services. They are open-minded and care about the environment but they don't have any options (eg the mechanic is sending 20litre oil drums to MRL). The waste that these businesses generate is a resource not a waste. Lisa said she is incredibly passionate about helping to find a solution to this. She suggested an idea about running a project in an Industrial Estate, looking at their current and future waste management needs and services. It was suggested that the industrial estate south of Synnot Street in Werribee could be a good area to start.

Julian shared the experience of a friend who runs a joinery and pays \$70K to dispose of waste each year. Simon commented that this person could talk to Council as the RDF separates and shreds wood. He also noted that the City of Bendigo has a commercial waste collection with a 90% uptake by businesses.

Lisa said ideally Council would have information on waste options for new businesses.

There was enthusiasm for the idea of a meeting or discussion between representatives of Council, local businesses and a waste collection/ processing company about the opportunity to establish commercial waste collection.

*Action M27-8.1 Simon to discuss with Council's waste strategy team the potential to initiate a dialogue around the opportunity for waste management services for businesses in Wyndham.*

## **9. Other business**

### **Next meeting**

The next meeting is at 4.30 – 7.00 pm on Thursday 22 February 2018. It was noted that this meeting will be in Conference Rooms A and B (downstairs). A Council staff member will need to greet CRG members in the foyer and accompany them through the security doors.