

**West's Road RDF & Waste Management
Community Reference Group
38th Meeting
Accepted Notes
31st October 2019
Council Chamber**

Present:

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Bruce Turner | - Independent Chair |
| Cr Peter Maynard | - Councillor (Iramoo Ward), Wyndham City Council |
| Julian Menegazzo | - Adjacent Landowner representative |
| Lisa Field | - Resident group representative |
| Paul Von Harder | - Community representative |
| Lindsay Swinden | - Community representative |
| Jenny McMahon | - Acting Director City Operations, Wyndham City Council |
| Peter Gordon | - RDF Operations Manager, Wyndham City Council |
| Liza McColl | - Business Analyst Refuse Disposal Facility, Wyndham City Council |

Apologies/ absent:

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Cr Walter Villagonzalo | - Councillor (Chaffey Ward), Wyndham City Council |
| Cr Tony Hooper | - Councillor (Harrison Ward), Wyndham City Council |
| Hayley Scott | - Community representative |
| Mason Asadi | - Environmental group representative |
| Karen Hucker | - Community representative |
| Karthik Viswanathan | - Community representative |
| Stephen Thorpe | - Director City Operations, Wyndham City Council |
| Simon Clay | - Manager Waste Management and Disposal, Wyndham City Council |

Guests:

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Hayley Jarvis | - Team Leader Waste Strategy, Wyndham City Council |
|---------------|--|

1. Welcome and Introductions

Bruce welcomed everyone to the meeting. This meeting constitutes an Assembly of Councillors. Bruce asked if there were any conflicts of interest to be declared. No conflicts of Interests were declared.

2. Notes and actions from the previous meeting

The notes from the 37th meeting, circulated prior to the meeting, were accepted and will be published on the Council's website. An 'action tracker' document with the status of outstanding actions from previous meetings was handed out. Bruce ran through outstanding actions:

| ACTIONS FROM MEETINGS PRIOR AUGUST | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Action Reference | Action Details | Status |
| M24-5.2and M26-9.1 | 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). | Pending. Lend Lease to be invited to December meeting. |
| M27-7.2 | <i>Simon to circulate the auditor's report on the phytocap when this is available, before it is submitted to EPA for approval.</i> | Pending. Update to be provided at today meeting. Refer Agenda item 7e. |
| M32-8.1 | <i>Liza and Simon to propose amendments to the CRG's Terms of Reference to make its statutory roles explicit (at such time as the ToR has to be amended for other reasons).</i> | Pending. To be undertaken as part of the Committee Review. |
| M32-8.2 | <i>Liza and Simon to reconfigure the complaints register back to 1 July 2017 and circulate to the CRG for comment (re format, information captured etc).</i> | New Complaints Register format and process to be discussed at today's meeting. Refer Agenda item 7c. |
| M34-4.1 | Liza to prepare a list of performance measures and draft survey questions and send them around to the CRG members for input. | Pending. Not completed due to other priorities – cell 5 construction. |
| M34-4.2 | Findings of Market Research to be shared with the group at a future meeting. | Completed in part. Stephen provided an overview, including notes which have been incorporated in these minutes. A more detailed presentation to be made by Darren Ray at the December meeting. |
| M36-3.1 | Karen to provide details of the case study of responsible building site management in Tarneit (Alchemy) to assist with Council's law enforcement on building sites. | Completed. Contacts exchanged 2 September 2019. |
| M36-3.2 | Darren Ray to be asked to circulate (or provide for circulation) a copy of Council's submission to SV's review relating to a container deposit scheme. | Completed. Documents circulated to RDF members on 17 September 2019. |
| M37-3.1 | Bruce to pass on Khartik's case study suggestion and question about the bin surveys to Hayley Jarvis | Completed in September. |
| M37-6.1 | Links to discussion paper and Council's submission on the Circulation Economy to be circulated to the CRG. | Completed 17 September 2019. |

3. Members' Report

Lisa Field

Lisa shared that she recently attended the Waste Expo and Conference Sessions. Lisa found the sessions called 'From Landfill to WtE: EU's Mistakes and How Not to Repeat Them' given by a speaker from Poland (post minutes note – this was Michael Pacha from Bioelectraka, a Polish Waste Management Company, who operate Alternative/Advanced Resource Recovery Facilities. They have an Australian company which has a permit to build and operate an Advanced Resource Recovery Facility at the Shoalhaven landfill in NSW. Link to website <http://bioelektra.com.au/#>). Lisa explained that Michael spoke about the evolution of waste management practices in Europe from the 1950's to today, particularly in Poland which he described as a 'crime scene'. He tried to impart the message that Australia must learn from the European experiences and avoid the same mistakes. One of the biggest lessons must be more stringent controls on businesses, producers and/or manufacturers of products. Producers need to held accountable and be responsible. The waste from packaging is a huge issue. Lisa is of the view that this is a key issue that is not being addressed by Australian Governments. Lisa expressed her disappointment with the Victorian Ministerial Keynote speech given by The Hon Lily D'Ambrosio MP, Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change; Minister for Solar Homes, Government of Victoria. She felt it was all sounding essentially like 'business as usual'. Lisa encouraged members of the CRG to attend the Expo in future years.

Julian Menegazzo

Julian advised that he and his wife, Connie, had recently been woken up at night on a few occasions over the past few weeks, by noise which he believed was coming from the landfill. Julian had registered complaints with RDF management and knew that they were looking into the matter. Julian noted that he had also been woken up by noises on a night where the landfill operation had been closed but was not sure what that source was. Peter thanked Julian for his reports and noted that Julian's very detailed information about the time and type of noises was very helpful to determine the source. Peter has commenced an investigation into the possible sources of noise. He has looked into the weather station and confirmed the complaints were made on nights with no to little wind. He has also come in between 3am and 5am to observe night time operations first hand and spoken to all staff.

Peter advised that actions taken to date and proposed actions include:

- Constructing a bund between the active tip face and the Menegazzo properties.
- Moving the containers that are used for a sound wall to ensure that they are between the active tip face and the Menegazzos.
- Changing to the configuration of the tip face to ensure that the night shift operate in a location furthest away from the Menegazzo properties or between them and the noise barriers.
- Engaging a professional and independent consultant to conduct noise surveys to provide empirical data.

Paul Von Harder

Paul shared that the Sanctuary Lakes Resident's Group are currently developing a Local Community Recycling Program Initiative that would encourage residents of Sanctuary Lakes to collect their recyclable plastics rather than put them in the council blue bin. The group would sort and sell the plastic with the funds going back into the community for local projects. They are currently working through the detail such as who they would sell the plastics to, with an awareness that markets and total costs needs to be considered. Paul noted that he had recently seen a program where a company took plastics for recycling furniture and other products and thought that this may have some potential. Paul would appreciate Simon Clay's time to be a sounding board to discuss the details of the program. Hayley noted that she may also be able to provide some advice.

Bruce asked Paul how this had a better outcome than having the plastics going into the Council recycling bin. There was discussion of the market for plastic waste. It was noted that dealing with this waste is a cost for Council (so no lost income if residents seek an alternative). Hayley noted that there is a group currently recycling plastic bottle tops, which has been a great response to this issue. The CRG members expressed general support for community initiatives like this one, wishing Paul well with working out the details.

Paul asked Council to confirm his understanding that all kerbside bins are required to have a lid, so that the driver of the collection truck knows what waste is in the bin and to prevent the contents of the bin from blowing out or being picked out by birds etc. Council confirmed that this is the case. Paul shared that there is a bin in his neighbourhood that has not had a lid for two years and it is overfilled most weeks. Paul often has to pick up litter as a result. Paul said that he has reported this to Council in the past and spoke to the bin owner. He is feeling a bit frustrated by the ongoing situation. It was noted that the usual process is that the truck driver should be reporting this to trigger a bin lid replacement. It was noted that the owner may have been provided with a new lid/bin but chosen to take it off again. Liza and Paul agreed to speak after the meeting to exchange specifics so that Liza could look into this further with Council's waste collections team.

Action M38-2.1 Liza to follow up with Simon and ask him to contact Paul to discuss the local recycling initiative.

Action M38-2.2 Liza to get details from Paul about the missing bin lid and raise issue with council's waste collection team.

4. Council's Waste and Litter Strategy Implementation

Hayley gave a presentation about the status of Council's Waste and Litter Strategy Implementation. A copy of the presentation is attached.

5. Strategic waste management and resource recovery (Industry)

a. MWWRG Update – Annual Report 2018/19

Michelle Lee gave a presentation that was recently given to the Board of the Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group about the organisations achievements in the 2018/2019 year. A copy of the presentation is attached.

b. New Environment Protection Act and regulatory changes

Liza informed the group that the State Government is proposing changes to the *Environment Protection Act 1970* and subordinate legislation. The changes are significant based on moving to a performance based model. A performance based model involves a lot more self-regulation with greater accountability and fines for non-compliance. Unfortunately, the consultation period for comments on the changes finished the day after this meeting. However, EPA is yet to develop most of the tools and subordinate legislation to implement these changes so there will be additional consultation. Council is still working through the impact that these changes will have on the operation of the RDF. The permit for the landfill operations will transfer into the new system. However under the new legal framework, Council will need to prepare an application for the transfer station to continue to operate.

Liza asked the CRG whether they would like more details and information about the changes to the EP Act. If so, Council can organise something for the December CRG meeting.

Michelle Lee noted that she had attended a fantastic session organised by EPA Vic and suggested that the EPA may be able to help. There was general interest in having a presentation/ session on this topic at the next meeting.

Action M38-5.2 Michelle Lee to provide Liza with contact at EPA, who may be able to help with information for the community about changes to the Environment Protection Act.

Action M38-5.1 Liza to organise a presentation/interactive session on the changes to the Environment Protection Act for the CRG meeting on 5 December 2019

6. RDF Strategy

a. Recap of new RDF Strategic Plan 2019-2025

Council extended its thanks to the CRG for their involvement in the development of the Plan. The new RDF Strategic Plan has been published and is now available on the Council's website and in hard copies. The Plan will provide a framework for action and officers are currently developing an implementation plan. The group recalled the six goals of the Plan:

1. Become a best practice landfill. (Including the move to a baled landfill operation within the next two years).
2. Implement resource recovery at the RDF. (Noting the focus will be on metals and organics)
3. Recover energy from waste after resource recovery (Noting that this is likely to be after resources are removed)
4. Strengthen the governance of the RDF (Including the assessment of whether to establish the RDF as a Local Government Business Enterprise, similar to Western Leisure Services)
5. Integrate Kerbside Collection and Waste Treatment and Disposal Services.
6. Advocate to State and Federal governments

Action M38-6.1 Liza to send CRG members a link to the Strategic Plan on Council's website and provide Lindsay with hard copies of the RDF Strategic Plan.

b. CELL 1A reclamation trial outcomes

Liza provided an update of the preliminary findings of the Waste Reclamation Trial (WRT) conducted at the RDF in August 2019. A handout summarising the results was distributed at the meeting and a copy of the handout is attached to these notes. Simon is currently preparing a full project evaluation report which will be presented to Council and at a future CRG meeting.

The purpose of the WRT was to determine whether it was feasible to excavate and reuse the waste in Cell 1A and to predict the cost benefit. Cell 1A is unlined and waste was deposited between 1975 and 1995 (20-40 years old). Reclamation of waste from this cell will reduce the potential for ongoing contamination of groundwater, reclaim resources with economic value and potentially provide land for development (eg for the baling facility). The trial involved excavating waste from six different 'test pits' across the cell. The waste excavated from test pits was put into a screening machine, which separated the materials into 'fines', 12-30mm fines and oversized material. The three different materials were then further sorted and classified by 'type' and 'amount of each type'.

The report in the attachment outlines the results of two test pits and shows that the majority of the waste was soil, rock, brick and concrete (91%, 97%). These materials could be recovered and reused for cover material which would be a significant economic benefit. However, asbestos particles, mostly in the form of broken pieces of cement sheeting, were found in the screened waste from all pits and the risks and costs associated with having to handle extensive amounts of asbestos would mostly likely make a full scale reclamation project unviable. The asbestos found in the test pits was appropriately handled by occupational hygienists.

Lisa asked whether waste reclamation projects had been undertaken in Australia and suggested that the results from the trial at the RDF should be shared with others to improve the knowledge of reclamation projects and issues. Liza said that Simon would be the best person to answer this and the suggestion of sharing our learning was a terrific idea.

Action M38-6.2 Simon to provide the CRG with details of other reclamation projects and possibility of sharing our results with industry.

7. RDF Operations (Best Practice)

a. Performance Dashboard – tonnage, landfill gas

Liza presented graphs showing the tonnage of waste to landfill and the amount of landfill gas produced – copies of graphs are attached. The graphs show that incoming tonnage is still considerably less than the same time last year. The amount of landfill gas has increased since the installation of two new engines in the power plant. Peter asked whether it was possible to show the amount of electricity produced in ‘number of average houses powered’ to make the information more relevant and easy to understand.

Liza advised LMS (the landfill gas contractor) has a new program called ‘Joule’ that has real time information about the amount of landfill gas being captured at the RDF and converted to electricity. It is quite graphic and she thought that it used ‘number of houses’ powered as a metric.

Action M38-7.1 Liza to present the LMS Joule portal program to the CRG at a future meeting.

b. Cell 4c landfill gas migration

Peter informed the CRG that there is currently landfill gas migrating off site from cell 4c. Peter advised that there are elevated levels of gas in the monitoring wells on the eastern boundary of the site. This is a non-conformance under the Licence and has been reported to EPA. Council has met with EPA to discuss options for remedial and corrective action. Officers are currently working with LMS Energy, to consider the effectiveness of installing additional landfill gas wells to increase the amount of landfill gas being extracted.

c. Complaints register

The new format complaints register was presented to the CRG members. Complaints will now be presented to the CRG on this cumulative register, rather than stand alone. The register has a lot more detail about the nature and circumstances around the complaints and the actions taken. There was a discussion about whether the CRG wanted the Council to present all of this detail at each meeting. The CRG members at the meeting indicated that it would be their preference for the complaints register to be distributed with the agenda, with the Chair giving members and Council the opportunity to either ‘note’ or ‘discuss’ any complaint or issues. It was noted that Karen Hucker was particularly interested in the complaints register and that the planning permit requires the CRG to review all complaints.

Peter noted that all of the complaints received since the last meeting were in relation to noise, as reported by Julian earlier tonight at Agenda Item 3 Members Report. He assured the group that Council was doing everything it could to identify and reduce any unacceptable noise generated from the RDF.

Action M38-7.2 The Complaints Register is to be distributed with the agenda for each meeting from now on. The complaints register is to remain as a regular item of the agenda. The Chair will ask the members whether they would like to talk about any complaints or issues rather than going through each complaint in detail at the meeting.

Action M38-7.1 Liza to speak to Karen Hucker directly about the new format complaints register and process.

d. Cell Development - Cell 5, Cell 6

Cell 5 has been constructed in two stages. Stage 1 was completed in June 2019. Stage 2 is still under construction. Construction should be finished by the end of this year and be operational by March 2020. The design for cell 6 is currently being finalised and will be presented at the next meeting. The design needs to be submitted to EPA for approval, prior to any construction. Peter Maynard asked if

there had been significant increases in costs for these new cells. Liza responded that costs had increased compared to older cells due to a new requirement to install double liners.

e. Rehabilitation

Liza provided an update on the status of the design for rehabilitation of cells 1b to 3. As previously discussed with the CRG, a draft design for a phytocap has been prepared and submitted to the auditor. The auditor raised some concerns about the design that were based on assumed soil characteristics.

In response to the Auditor's comments, and because Council now has a considerable amount of soil on site that could actually be used in the cap, Council is going to take samples and assess characteristics of the soil. The design will then be reviewed and revised if needed. The soil testing will provide much more accurate design parameters. The properties of the soil used in a phytocap are a major determinant of success.

8. Litter Fence Alternative Proposal

The group recalled that the RDF Works Approval had a requirement for an 8-10m high litter screen to be built around the perimeter of the site. The CRG has previously been presented with a design for the litter screen for a 1.5km section on the eastern and northern perimeter of the site, adjacent to cell 5. The estimated cost to build the litter screen was \$4million. The CRG had previously indicated that they were not supportive of spending this level of money on a litter screen, especially since they knew that Council was looking into moving to a baled landfill operation. The CRG members had indicated their preference to spend that money on moving to a baled landfill operation to reduce the source of the litter rather than managing the litter.

Liza explained that Council had to go back to EPA to ask for an amendment to the works approval if it was not going to proceed with the 8-10m high perimeter litter screen. She advised the CRG that Council is proposing to continue to use the current type of perimeter litter screen, which is a series of litter nets that are approximately 6m high strung between of posts in concrete block footings. Other litter control techniques on site include litter cages at the actual tip face, closing or reorientating the tip face on windy days and a litter crew of up to 5 people (2 full time and 3 casual as needed).

The CRG endorsed the alternative 6m maximum perimeter litter screen proposal.

Next meeting

Thursday 5th December 2019, at 4:30pm-7:00pm, Wyndham Civic Centre, Conference Rooms A & B.