1. **PRESENT**

   Cr P J Raison, Chairperson  
   Mayor D J Burgess  
   Cr J W Hall  
   Cr S P Wilkinson  
   Cr B J Taylor

2. **IN ATTENDANCE**

   Mr R Peate, Chief Executive Officer  
   Mr N Cook, Waste Management Coordinator,  
   Mr G Hill, Director Infrastructure Services,  
   Mrs T Lawes, Infrastructure Services Support Officer (Minute Secretary).

3. **COMMENCEMENT AND WELCOME**

4. **APOLOGY**

   Was received from  
   Cr moved that the apology be received.  
   Seconded Cr

5. **CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

   (Page 322 – 19/10/2017)  
   moved that the Minutes of the Mid Murray Council Waste Management Advisory Committee meeting held on 19 October 2017 be taken as read and confirmed.  
   Seconded
6. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

6.1.1 Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Proposal to Implement Mass Balance Reporting - Update

Background

A report was provided at the 19 October 2017, Waste Management Advisory Committee meeting, regarding the EPA’s proposal to introduce a Mass Balance Reporting (MBR) system. The report advised members that the State Government, through the EPA, is proposing to introduce a mass balance reporting system for licensed waste facilities including transfer stations, resource recovery facilities and landfills which receive 5,000 tonnes or more of waste per annum. Under the proposal these facilities will need to report on the monthly tonnages of materials that the site receives, stockpiles, uses on site or transfers from the site for sale or disposal. The proposal also sets out associated record keeping, weighbridge, video monitoring and site survey requirements. Mid Murray Council currently pays the EPA solid waste levy based on a population method with a threshold of 10,000 tonnes per annum.

This report is to update members and keep members informed regarding the status of the proposed MBR system.

Discussion

Attached with this report are several pieces of correspondence directly relating to the MBR proposal.

Attached are comments and feedback submitted to the EPA (on 30/10/2017) and also the Local Government Association (LGA), highlighting some of the concerns of Mid Murray Council in relation to the proposed MBR system.

Also attached is correspondence from the LGA on behalf of Councils’, expressing concerns regarding some elements of the proposal. The LGA comments were sent to the EPA on 13/11/2017.

There is further correspondence attached, received from the EPA on 14/11/2017, confirming that Parliament passed the Environment Protection (Waste Reform) Amendment Bill 2017. Proposed Mass Balance Reporting and changes as highlighted previously, are contained within the Bill.

So it would seem that the Mass Balance Reporting system is inevitable. To what extent and the impact it will have on Council is not yet known. Waste Management Advisory Committee members will be kept informed of any changes or variations as consultation by the EPA is undertaken.

Refer Appendix 6.1.1

Recommendation

Moved __________________ Seconded __________________

That the Update - Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Proposal to Implement Mass Balance Reporting System report be received and noted.

Neil Cook
Waste Management Coordinator
7. **BUSINESS**

7.1 **Financial Report for Waste Management Services**

A copy of the detailed income and expenditure statements for the period to end of 30 November 2017 had been attached. Director Infrastructure Services will speak to the current Financial Statements.

Refer Appendix 7.1

Notes to the Financial Report

1. Depreciation has not yet been applied to the Cambria Landfill; this will be done at the end of the financial year.

2. Full Cost Attribution (FCA) has not been applied and is not shown in the current expenditure. FCA will be implemented later in the year (within the next couple of months) and will be ultimately calculated/run on a monthly basis.

3. Income for the Cambria Landfill is 316% ($41,095) over its original forecast.

**Recommendation**

Moved __________________ Seconded __________________

That the Financial Report for Waste Management Services be received.
8. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS

8.1 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT

Cr moved that the report be received.
Seconded Cr

8.1.1 Recycle Right Household Recycling Program Grants 2017-2018 – Office of Green Industries SA (GISA)

Background

GISA has recently advised that Grants are now open and available for the 2017-2018 Recycle Right Household Recycling Program. Grants close at 5pm, Monday 27 November 2017. To be eligible for funding, projects must achieve at least one of the following objectives:

• Improve the quality of recyclables by removing contamination and reducing residual waste to landfill.
• Improve the use of the kerbside bin system, decreasing recyclable materials in the residual waste bin and increasing use of the green organics bin and / or the yellow recycling bin.
• Projects must contribute at least 50% of funding (excluding in-kind contributions) from sources other than Green Industries SA funds.
• Projects are to be initiated before 1 July 2018.

Discussion

Under the guidelines, funding will be available for amounts from $3,500 to a maximum of $20,000 per project.

The Waste Management Coordinator submitted an application for funding through the Program on 23/11/2017. The funding submission is for the purchase of 40 High Density Polyethylene bins with lids. Each bin would be hot stamped with Council’s logo. If successful, the purchase of 40 bins will be used to accommodate recyclables at each of Council’s 10 waste Transfer Station facilities. Appropriate signage would also be installed to identify individual recycle materials and to acknowledge the Recycle Right Program.

The submission is for a funding contribution of $9,942.40 from GISA and Council’s contribution would also be $9,942.40. The total amount of $19,884.80 would enable Council to purchase very much needed recycling bins to be placed at waste Transfer Station facilities. Cost for the bins and hot stamp logo will be $18,884.80. A further $1,000.00 would be required for the purchase and installation of appropriate signage. Total project amount is $19,884.80.

Council currently provides second hand timber produce bins at Transfer Stations for customers to place glass, plastics (PEP etc), metal containers and deposit drink containers. The bins require constant maintenance, have no lids and are not a practical or efficient recycle materials container. Council will need to purchase suitable recycle bins in the very near future to replace the outdated timber bins therefore, the Recycle Right Household Recycling Program Grants is seen as a good opportunity to at least share some of the expense in purchasing of the bins.

Attached to this report are photographs of the timber bins currently being used, along with photos and specifications of plastic bins with lids available from AIM Sales and known as Nally Megabins. Bins with lids are valued at $461.45 each, with a one off cost for hot stamp logo of $426.80. The bins come with a 10 year warranty on outdoor weathering. Pricing has also been sourced from other suppliers, with AIM Sales being able to provide a quality product which is also less expensive than its competitors.
8.1 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT CONT’D

8.1.1 Recycle Right Household Recycling Program Grants 2017-2018 – Office of Green Industries SA (GISA) cont

Conclusion

If successful with the funding application, Council will have the option of either sourcing its contribution amount of $9,442.00 from within the existing 2017-2018 operational budget, or by allocating the contribution amount through a budget review process.

For the information of members.

Refer Appendix 8.1.1 photographs of proposed and existing bins for recyclables.

Recommendation

Moved __________________ Seconded __________________

That the Recycle Right Household Recycling Program Grants 2017-2018 – Office of Green Industries SA (GISA) report be received.
8.1 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT CONT’D

8.1.2 Closure of Nuriootpa Landfill – Impact to Mid Murray Council (MMC) Waste Facilities

Background

This report is for the information of members and is designed to update members regarding any significant impacts to MMC waste facility operations due to the closure of the Nuriootpa Landfill facility in the Barossa Council area.

The Nuriootpa Landfill facility which services the Barossa Valley area was closed in July 2017 and ceased being a public and commercial waste receiving facility. The facility is owned by Cleanaway Waste Management Services and was previously used as a waste and landfill facility servicing businesses and residents of the Barossa Valley and the Barossa Council.

Discussion

Coinciding with the closure of the Nuriootpa Landfill facility, there has been an increase in the amount of waste being received at MMC waste facilities. Council is able to identify particular trends, waste streams and waste received at individual waste Transfer Station facilities through records captured in the Cambrai Landfill weighbridge database.

Below are total tonnages for waste to landfill received at the 3 Transfer Stations located closest to the Barossa Council region – Truro, Tungkillo and Cambrai – for the period 1 July to 1 November 2017 and also for the same period in 2016 for the purpose of comparison. The below data is for materials which go to landfill only, it does not include materials which are recycled or reused.

Also provided below are comparisons for the same periods for contractor’s waste disposal (general contractors only, not including Council waste disposal or Solo) to the Cambrai Landfill facility.

Gary Mavrinac, Director for Development and Environmental Services at the Barossa Council will be attending the meeting to further discuss any formal arrangements and encouraging Barossa Council residents the possible patronage of transfer stations.

Cambrai Landfill

Since the closure of the Nuriootpa Landfill facility, Council has experienced a significant increase in activity at the Cambrai Landfill facility. Five (5) new accounts have been approved since July 2017, to allow contractors to dispose of waste materials at the landfill facility. While there has been a slight increase in disposal of asbestos and building materials (C&D) and green waste, the majority of material received is hard waste / commercial waste / putrescible waste.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Waste / Domestic Waste / Hard Waste / Putrescible Waste only:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2016 – 1/11/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2017 – 1/11/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in material disposal at the Cambrai Landfill does generate an increase in revenue (for the 4 month period above – 395 tonne @ $130 per tonne = $51,350) and Council staff are working hard to ensure contractors using the facility are able to work around disposal times which suit their own operations. As indicated by the number of transactions above, individual disposals have increased dramatically.
8.1 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT CONT’D

8.1.2 Closure of Nuriootpa Landfill – Impact to Mid Murray Council (MMC) Waste Facilities cont’d

With the increase in activity at the Landfill site, Council staff are required to dedicate more time to operating the facility, because much of the material being delivered by recently acquired contractors is generated from construction and demolition sites and delivered in skip bins, Council staff need to sort and separate various recycle materials and contaminants. There is also a greater need to spread, compact and cover the waste on a daily basis.

**Transfer Stations**

Weighbridge data confirms a significant increase in waste received at the Truro and Tungkillo Transfer Stations since the closure of the Nuriootpa Landfill. The table below identifies the quantity of household putrescible waste received in 40 cubic meter bins and brought back from Truro, Tungkillo and Cambrai waste Transfer Stations, for the period 1 July to 1 November 2016 & 2017. The waste is recorded via weighbridge entry prior to disposal in the Landfill cell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Truro</th>
<th>Tungkillo</th>
<th>Cambrai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2016 - 1/11/2016</td>
<td>13.9 tonne</td>
<td>23.2 tonne</td>
<td>31.3 tonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2017 - 1/11/2017</td>
<td>30.6 tonne</td>
<td>36.7 tonne</td>
<td>35.3 tonne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council has received enquiries from non MMC residents regarding waste disposal at MMC facilities which neighbour the Barossa Council area. As such, monitoring will be ongoing and Council may look at the option of introducing a specific waste Transfer Station Fee structure for non residents. If a non resident fee were to be introduced, the opportune time would be when Council gate fees are adjusted from 1 July 2018. Council advertises new fee schedules in July of each year to coincide with increases in the Solid Waste Levy, therefore, minimal additional advertising costs would be incurred.

As an example, attached with this report is a copy of the Barossa Council 2017 – 2018 Transfer Station Fees & Charges, which contains both resident general waste fee and also a non resident fee.

**E-Waste**

Attached with this report is an article from the October 4 edition of the Barossa Valley Leader – Letters to the Editor. In the article the author advises readers that the nearest E-waste receiving facility is located at Cambrai Transfer Station. The author goes on to suggest that the Barossa Council should perhaps look at supplying a storage vehicle so the E-waste material could be conveyed to Cambrai in bulk.

Council is not restricted to where it sources E-waste materials (the only requirement is that there is no fee). E-waste can be received from either residents or non residents. Commercial quantities of non landfill materials are generally not accepted by MMC. Certainly, large volumes of E-waste from other Council areas should not be encouraged.

Individuals wishing to dispose of E-waste at Transfer Stations however, whether they are resident of MMC or not, is acceptable under the guidelines of the Product Stewardship. While acknowledging there is a cost for Council staff to handle and transport the product, consideration also needs to be given to one of the alternatives or consequences of not accepting E-waste at Transfer Stations – that is, Council having to address it as illegal dumping.
8.1 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT CONT’D

8.1.2 Closure of Nuriootpa Landfill – Impact to Mid Murray Council (MMC) Waste Facilities cont’d

Conclusion

The Waste Management Coordinator will continue to monitor activities at Council’s waste Transfer Stations and Landfill facility and will also liaise with the Barossa Council to determine if they have any immediate or future plans regarding waste management initiatives to service their residents.

Refer Appendix 8.1.2 Copy of correspondence

Recommendation

Moved __________________ Seconded __________________

That it be recommended to Council that

(1) The Closure of Nuriootpa Landfill – Impact to Mid Murray Council (MMC) Waste Facilities report be received.

(2) A separate fee structure for non residents using Council owned Transfer Stations be implemented in February 2018

Or

(3) A separate fee structure or some other means of payment for non residents using Council owned Transfer Stations be implemented 1 July 2018
8.1 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT CONT’D

8.1.3 Feedback and Requests from Holiday Homes Associations Regarding the Southern Rural Collection Service

Background

Holiday home and rural community associations have been given the opportunity to provide comments and feedback to Council in relation to the Individual Waste Bin Collection Service (rural collection service) for the southern area.

Representatives of Council’s Waste Management Advisory Committee also met with representatives of the WF&DHHA at the Cambrai Office on 19 October 2017, to discuss various issues in relation to the Collection Service.

Discussion

Detailed below is a summary of items discussed with the WF&DHHA and for Council to investigate, with the view of resolving any highlighted issues.

Mid Murray Council (MMC) Meeting with Walker Flat & Districts Holiday Homes Association (WF&DHHA) – 19/10/2017
Cambrai Office 1.00pm

In Attendance:
WF&DHH Association – M Whitford (President)
F Kradolfer
Mid Murray Council - Waste Management Advisory Committee Members

Purpose: To discuss various waste management related issues including the current southern area individual bin collection service trial.

Items discussed:

• Environmental management: Large amount of recyclable materials to be disposed off and Transfer Station not always accessible. Concerns regarding amount of recyclable materials residents accumulate. Council to consider a future recycle collection service to complement the waste collection.
• Current Transfer station operating times not suitable – consider a period on Sunday which would better suit residents.
• Consider extra collections during holiday periods to cater for extra waste.
• Consider more than one bin for use during busy periods.
• Consider extra free trailer vouchers to be used during busy periods (holidays & long weekends).
• Council to address waste management for the 14 vacant allotments at the end of Rob Loxton Road - contact land owners and advise of their responsibility regarding waste generated from the sites.
• Council to also address concerns regarding development and regulatory requirements (illegal development & potential new development) at the vacant allotments.

Resolved that:
Council will collate and identify the issues raised at the meeting and will provide to the Walker Flat & Districts Holiday Home Association a summary of items raised at the meeting, prior to the Associations AGM to be held on 19 November 2017.
8.1 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT CONT’D

8.1.3 Feedback and Requests from Holiday Homes Associations Regarding the Southern Rural Collection Service cont’d

Conclusion

The Waste Management Coordinator emailed the above summary to the WF&DHHA secretary, Mr D Whitbread, on Friday 10 November 2017. Mr Whitbread acknowledged receipt of the email and summary notes.

Many of the items highlighted by the WF&DHHA are echoed by other associations who have provided feedback regarding the rural collection service, including larger settlements of Teal Flat, Caurnamont and the East Front Road area. While feedback from associations is very much in support of the rural collection service and the continuation of the service, similar requests to provide extra collections during holiday periods and on long weekends have been received by Council as part of the feedback.

In relation to the above requests from the WF&DHHA and also received as feedback from other associations, Council will need to decide the level of service it will provide to holiday homes associations. In particular, Council will need to decide if additional collections will be provided during busy holiday periods, whether additional bins will be provided, or if additional “free” disposal via trailer vouchers at the Transfer Stations should be provided, and how that would be managed.

Regard should be given firstly to the availability of Council’s waste collection contractor to undertake any additional collections, as additional collections for these areas would be considered a variation to the existing waste collection service and would attract significant additional costs.

It would also be relevant to consider that no other collection areas, either township or previously introduced individual waste bin collection service areas, have previously or are currently provided with extra collections, additional bins or free transfer station vouchers. It should also be noted that Mid Murray Council do not currently charge residents for the southern rural and holiday home waste collection service. Other Council’s with similar collection services charge an annual service fee and apply further charges for any additional bins supplied to individual properties.

Alexandrina Council which also has a large number of holiday homes scattered along its waterways, which are used to their full potential during peak holiday periods. Alexandrina Council is part of the Fleurieu Regional Waste Authority (FRWA) who has implemented successfully a fortnightly 120ltr putrescible waste collection and a 240ltr recycling collection. However during a six week period over the Christmas-New Year / January Long Weekend, Alexandrina Council operates a weekly putrescible waste collection to all residential properties due to the population expanding to double its size during this period. Furthermore the larger holidays home are encouraged to purchase a second putrescible waste bin for $150 / annum which can be picked when the service is being provided. It was suggested while speaking to a representative from FRWA-that implementation was easy, it was more difficult to educate property owners to change habits.

Property owners and residents at Mid Murray Council have the option of arranging additional waste collection services provided by commercial waste collection contractors. As such, additional collections could be arranged by individuals and / or holiday home associations directly with the collection contractor.
8.1 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT CONT’D

8.1.3 Feedback and Requests from Holiday Homes Associations Regarding the Southern Rural Collection Service cont’d

Any changes to current waste Transfer Station operating times should be further investigated once Council makes a final decision regarding the introduction of an individual waste bin collection service for the northern area. At that point, Council would have a rural and holiday home collection service throughout the entire district which would likely determine suitable operating times based on transfer station attendances and material disposal rates. Likely, that would require an adjustment of current operating schedules such that weekend operations would change for several sites.

The Waste Management Advisory Committee have the opportunity to discuss and resolve the above requests and issues in relation to the rural collection service, such that the following recommendations can be adopted, or further recommendations can be made.

**Recommendation**

Moved __________________ Seconded __________________

That it be recommended to Council that

(1) The Feedback and Requests from Holiday Homes Associations Regarding the Southern Rural Collection Service report be received.

(2) Council endorses the decision at this stage not to provide additional waste collection services during holiday periods or on long weekends, no additional bins are supplied by Council during holiday periods and no additional free waste transfer station trailer vouchers are supplied for residents’ waste disposal during holiday periods.

(3) Further consideration and investigations be undertaken regarding waste Transfer Station operating times for all facilities, once a final decision has been made regarding a potential northern areas individual waste bin collection service.

(4) Council notify holiday homes and progress associations located within the southern individual waste bin collection service area that additional collection services, additional waste bins or free waste Transfer Station trailer vouchers will not be provided by Council.

Neil Cook
Waste Management Coordinator
8.2 CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

8.2.1 FUTURE LEVELS OF SERVICE - BAROSSA REGIONAL PROCUREMENT GROUP (BRPG) – WASTE COLLECTION SERVICES TENDER

Confidential item pursuant to Section 90 –

90(3)(b) – information the disclosure of which -

(i) could reasonably be expected to confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom the council is conducting, or proposing to conduct, business, or to prejudice the commercial position of the council; and
(ii) would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest;

90(3)(d) – commercial information of a confidential nature (not being a trade secret) the disclosure of which -

(i) could reasonably be expected to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied the information, or to confer a commercial advantage on a third party; and
(ii) would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest;

90(3)(k) – tenders for the supply of goods, the provision of services or the carrying out of works.

Time: P M
Cr moved that

(1) Under the provision of Section 90(2) and (3)(b), (d) and (k) of the Local Government Act 1999 an order be made that with the exception of Mr Russell Peate, Mr Greg Hill, Mr Neil Cook, and Mrs Tracey Lawes, all other persons present and the public be excluded from attendance at the meeting in order to receive a report and to consider matters under Section 90(3)(b), (d) and (k).

(2) The Mid Murray Council Waste Management Advisory Committee is satisfied that pursuant to Section 90(3)(b), (d) and (k) of the Act, the information to be received, discussed or considered in relation to the agenda item are tenders for the provision of Waste Management Services.

(3) Accordingly, on this basis, the principle that meetings of Mid Murray Council Waste Management Advisory Committee should be conducted in a place open to the public has been outweighed by the need to keep the discussion confidential because the information to be disclosed and discussed has the potential to impact adversely on each of the tenderers as competitive commercial information will be disclosed.

Seconded Cr
8.2 CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

8.2.1 FUTURE LEVELS OF SERVICE – BAROSSA REGIONAL PROCUREMENT GROUP (BRPG) – WASTE COLLECTION SERVICES TENDER

P M

Cr moved that pursuant to Section 91(7) of the Local Government Act 1999, the Mid Murray Council Waste Management Advisory Committee orders that Confidential Minutes Pages of the meeting held on 7 December 2017, the Infrastructure Services Report item 8.2.1 (Confidential Item – Future Levels of Service - Barossa Regional Procurement Group (BRPG) – Waste Collection Services Tender Waste Collection Services Tender) and attachments and all discussions relating to the matter which was considered in confidence pursuant to Section 90(2) and (3)(b),(d) and (k) remain confidential and not available for public inspection until the Waste Management Services Contract is executed by both parties.

Seconded Cr

Greg Hill

Director Infrastructure Services
9. **CORRESPONDENCE**

Cr moved that the correspondence be received.
Seconded Cr


A copy of the email had been provided to all members.

Refer Appendix 9.1

9.2 **Release of EPA Energy from Waste Discussion Paper – Circular 45.4**


A copy of the Circular had been provided to all members.

Refer Appendix 9.2

10. **OTHER BUSINESS**

11. **NEXT MEETING** – To be decided.

12. **CLOSURE**

P M The Chairperson declared the meeting closed.
RE: EPA proposal to introduce Mass Balance Reporting (MBR) System.

Mid Murray Council (MMC) operates ten (10) waste transfer station facilities located throughout the district on a 7 day roster and one (1) waste landfill facility located at Cambrai. The waste management team, dedicated to operating all facilities as well as kerbside waste and recycle collections and rural & holiday home collections, is limited to 4 operators (generally with 1-2 rostered off at any given time) and one coordinator. MMC currently pays the Solid Waste Levy on a population method, at under 10,000 tonnes per year. To say the introduction of Mass Balance Reporting would have a huge impact for MMC would be an understatement!

While the landfill does have an approved weighbridge on site which is capable of recording materials entering the facility, this facility is an unmanned site. To provide the extensive record keeping, reporting and data collection as indicated in the Explanatory Paper, Council would need to dedicate staff full time to man the site and monitor and report on waste materials coming in, going out, being used on a daily basis (ie- daily cover), processed and stored for end processing. Any tracking would also require further Council resources be directed, or redirected would be more correct, to comply.

Further, none of Council’s facilities including the Landfill, have the luxury of electricity at the site. The weighbridge is operated via a stand alone solar system. The solar system is currently operating at its full capacity and any additional infrastructure (ie cameras) would likely require upgrading of the solar system – this would obviously come at a significant cost. Also, not sure if the current software program will support other programmes being installed – Council has a software support contract with the weighbridge supplier.

The introduction of MBR would require:

- additional on ground staff – with associated ongoing costs
- additional infrastructure – with associated ongoing costs
- additional administration - with additional ongoing costs
- increase in gate prices and landfill disposal
- additional software programmes

* Would the proposal to introduce MBR also lead to other streams of waste material (ie clean fill, C & D etc) attracting the Solid Waste Levy?

While MMC does understand the need to control waste and waste movement and supports the EPA in establishing reforms to ensure this happens, with the current EPA proposal the effect it will have on smaller rural Councils if the threshold of 5,000 tonnes is introduced as indicated, would be severe and would likely require the need for budgets from other essential services to be redirected.

If Mass Balance Reporting is to be introduced, I would urge the EPA to reconsider the proposed threshold amount of 5,000 tonnes and set the limit at 10,000 tonnes per year. This would allow smaller Councils with limited budgets, staff and infrastructure to fulfil their commitments while still capturing the required information from organisations dealing with larger amounts of material and movement of material.
Dear Ms Nairn

Mass Balance Reporting consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Explanatory paper: mass balance reporting dated September 2017.

I understand that the Environment Protection Authority’s (EPA) proposed introduction of mass balance reporting represents one part of a broader waste reform agenda. The Local Government Association (LGA) agrees that the introduction of mass balance reporting, in some form, is critical to achieving further growth and development in the waste industry and is also a necessary precursor to the achievement of many of the other objectives that form part of the EPA’s waste reform agenda. I also note the strong industry support for these reforms and commend the EPA for its ongoing work in this area.

While broadly supportive of the proposal, the LGA has concerns in relation to two particular aspects relating to (1) the impacts on small regional councils; and (2) the need for additional information on the implementation of mass balance reporting. These are discussed further below.

I note that the EPA is proposing that its mass balance reporting system apply to waste operations that receive 5,000 tonnes of waste or more per year. It is proposed that waste operations that meet this threshold must, within 28 days after the end of each month, provide the EPA with a report containing 7 different types of data and this report must be submitted in the form and manner approved by the EPA. It is further proposed that these reports be verified through video monitoring systems, volumetric surveys and annual stocktakes. The LGA’s view is that both the reporting requirements and the verification requirements will result in increased costs for councils and require further consideration.

Impacts on small regional councils

The LGA has received submissions from small regional councils, in particular Mid Murray Council and the District Council of Ceduna, to the effect that the mass balance reporting proposal in its current form will have very significant cost implications for them to the extent that these cost implications may render their waste management activities unviable.

In general terms, it must be remembered that small regional councils do not start from a “level playing field” in relation to waste management because of the high transport costs involved in recovering recyclable materials. These high transport costs have the effect that, despite the solid waste levy, it will often still be cheaper for councils to dispose of waste to landfill locally than to pay the transport costs involved in accessing recycling centres in metropolitan areas. If the ultimate objective of the mass balance reporting proposal is to achieve increased recycling and resource recovery, care must be taken in the implementation of the proposal to ensure that it does not have the opposite effect.

More specifically, the proposal will have significant cost implications for small regional councils because their current waste operations lack both the infrastructure and the staff required to achieve compliance
with the new reporting requirements. These councils would be required to make a very significant investment in both infrastructure and staffing at these facilities and such an investment would be difficult to justify to regional communities given that they do not see any direct benefit for their communities flowing from the new reporting requirements.

For these reasons, small regional councils have requested that the threshold for the application of mass balance reporting requirements be raised from 5,000 tonnes per annum to 10,000 tonnes per annum.

The LGA understands that the EPA is aware of, and sympathetic to, the significant cost implications for small regional councils but is unlikely to support a blanket increase in the threshold for the application of mass balance reporting requirements to 10,000 tonnes per annum. However, the LGA notes that initial consultation on the Waste Reform Discussion Paper contemplated the possibility of a different threshold applying to metropolitan and regional areas. The LGA requests that the EPA consider whether the feedback from the current consultation process may support a differential threshold of 5,000 tonnes per annum for metropolitan areas and 10,000 tonnes per annum for regional areas.

The Explanatory Paper indicates that the proposed threshold of 5,000 tonnes per annum would have the following effect:

- the vast majority of material flow in the state will be captured as:
  - 96% of waste generated in South Australia is sent to transfer stations and resource recovery facilities that receive more than 5,000 tonnes of waste per year; and
  - 98% of waste disposal occurs at landfills that receive in excess of 5,000 tonnes per year.

- This threshold will avoid realisation of fears about the potential for undue burden on small operations, as by number:
  - about 25% of licensed resource recovery facilities, transfer stations and landfills would be subject to mass balance reporting requirements; and
  - about 58 licensees would be subject to mass balance reporting.

The LGA would be interested to understand what effect raising the threshold to 10,000 tonnes per annum in regional areas would have on the sited figures. It seems likely that raising the threshold in regional areas only would not detract from the EPA’s goal of capturing “the vast majority of material flow in the state”.

Alternatively, if the EPA takes the view that raising the threshold in regional areas in this way would detract from the EPA’s goal of capturing the vast majority of material flow, the LGA requests that the EPA consider whether transitional provisions may be appropriate so that:

1. a differential threshold as set out above applies for a period of time (for example, five years) to allow small regional councils time to plan for the application of mass balance reporting requirements to their waste operations; and

2. the EPA can work with the LGA and small regional councils to support councils to make the necessary upgrades to infrastructure (including providing access to funding from the Green Industry Fund) and changes to staffing arrangements to allow for a smooth and efficient transition to the application of mass balance reporting requirements. Small regional councils request that this work includes discussion of the transport costs involved in resource recovery and any relief or assistance that may be available in this regard.
Information on implementation

Separately, and as set out above, the LGA’s view is that both the reporting requirements and the verification requirements associated with the mass balance reporting proposal will result in increased costs for councils. The LGA’s view is that further information on the implications of these requirements for councils generally is needed before a thorough assessment of the proposal can be made.

I understand that the EPA has advised that:

- nineteen councils and waste management authorities will be subject to mass balance reporting;
- all councils with waste facilities were notified of the Mass Balance Reporting consultation;
- the EPA sought advice on potential costs from councils through consultation on the Waste Reform Discussion Paper and has taken the feedback received into account;
- the EPA anticipates further input from councils on potential costs through this consultation; and
- the EPA will be required to produce a regulatory impact statement (RIS) prior to developing the relevant regulations that will include detailed information on anticipated costs.

The LGA’s key concern is that it does not have the relevant information available to it to enable it to assess the impact of the proposal on local government generally. The LGA does not know which 19 councils will be affected by the proposal and has no efficient way of engaging with these councils. Further, while the EPA may have received advice from additional councils on potential costs, it has not made this information publicly available and it is not available to the LGA. Whilst I understand that a RIS will be prepared, again, I understand that the usual practice is for a RIS to be kept confidential and therefore this document will also not be available to the LGA.

Therefore, the LGA requests that the EPA take two actions to address its concerns. Firstly, the LGA requests that the EPA contact the affected councils and seek their permission for the list of affected councils to be provided to the LGA. This will enable the LGA to engage with these councils efficiently in relation to the proposal and to seek information directly from councils on the potential costs involved. Secondly, the LGA requests that the EPA undertake to make relevant information contained in the RIS available to the LGA on a confidential basis, again, to enable it to engage effectively on this issue.

Additionally, the LGA requests that, should the costs of either the reporting requirements or the verification requirements prove substantial for councils beyond the small regional councils discussed above, the EPA remain open to the possibility of allowing councils to access funding from the Green Industry Fund to assist with meeting these costs.

I look forward to continuing to work with you to progress a positive waste reform agenda that will support the sustainable growth and development of the waste industry in South Australia.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Smith
Acting Executive Director Public Affairs

Telephone: (08) 8224 2055
Email: stephen.smith@lga.sa.gov.au
Tracey Lawes

From: EPA:News <EPANews@sa.gov.au>
Sent: Tuesday, 14 November 2017 5:23 PM
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For Official Use Only

The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) is pleased to announce today that Parliament has passed the Environment Protection (Waste Reform) Amendment Bill 2017 without amendment.

Commencement of the Environment Protection (Waste Reform) Amendment Act 2017 will be set by proclamation.

Implementation of the Bill will result in modernised and strengthened powers under the Environment Protection Act to:

- better support a strong, legitimate resource recovery sector through enabling better regulation of waste material flow and stockpiling, providing for the assessment of resource recovery proposals, enabling further clarity around when material is or is not ‘waste’ and enhancing compliance powers including through the ability to expiate licence condition breaches and new default penalties for breach of reporting deadline licence conditions
- improve the EPA’s ability to prosecute illegal dumping cases by addressing car owners’ responsibility for illegal dumping, enabling tracking device use, expanding authorised officer powers to enter certain premises and mark materials that are likely to be illegally dumped, and allowing for improved monitoring of material.

Further information about the Bill is available at: www.epa.sa.gov.au/reformingwaste or please contact Tiana Nairn on 8224 9926 or e-mail tiana.nairn@sa.gov.au

Environment Protection Authority
GPO Box 2607, Adelaide, S.A. 5001, AUSTRALIA

From Monday 13 November you’ll find us on level 2 of the GHD building on the corner of Victoria Square and Grote Street. Our mailing address and phone numbers remain unchanged.
Commencement of the Environment Protection (Waste Reform) Amendment Act 2017 - Circular 48.6

To
Chief Executive Officer
Corporate Services Staff
Elected Members
Environment Staff
Information - Technology Staff
Policy and Strategic Planning Staff
Recycling - Waste Management

Date
28 November 2017
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Emily Heywood-Smith
Email: emily.heywoodsmith@lga.sa.gov.au

Response Required
No

Summary
The Environment Protection Authority has reached another milestone in delivering its waste reform agenda with the commencement of the Environment Protection (Waste Reform) Amendment Act 2017 (Waste Reform Act) on 28 November 2017. The Waste Reform Act will have implications for councils and the LGA is working through these with councils and the EPA.

The Waste Reform Act represents one part of a broader waste reform agenda. While the Act includes amendments to many aspects of the regulatory framework for waste in South Australia, it also confers a number of new powers on the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) and it is these new powers that will have direct implications for councils.

In particular, the Waste Reform Act confers new powers on the EPA to:

- Make regulations to implement mass balance reporting (the system requiring waste operators to report to the EPA on the mass of different waste streams received, processed and dispatched from the waste operation);
- Impose new conditions on environmental authorisations relating to stockpiling (effectively introducing the concept of stockpiling limits); and
- Impose conditions on environmental authorisations requiring financial assurances in expanded circumstances.

While the Waste Reform Act confers these new powers on the EPA, the Act itself does not contain the details around how these reforms will be implemented. Therefore, it will not be possible to determine the implications for councils until the regulations/ principles/policies providing the details are developed. The EPA is actively consulting the LGA and councils themselves on development of these reforms.

More information is available on the EPA Reforming Waste Management page.

If you have any queries on the Waste Reform Act or the EPA’s consultation process, please contact Ms Emily Heywood-Smith, Senior Policy Officer, Local Government Association on ph: 8224 2033 or email: Emily.heywoodsmith@lga.sa.gov.au.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COA</th>
<th>Job Description</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Variance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4000315</td>
<td>Waste Man Employ Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000315</td>
<td>Waste Man Wages &amp; Salary</td>
<td>142,500</td>
<td>42,769</td>
<td>-69.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000315</td>
<td>Waste Man Employee Insurance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000315</td>
<td>Waste Man Vehicle Exps</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>8,426</td>
<td>-61.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000315</td>
<td>Waste Man Salary Other</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td>-56.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000345</td>
<td>Waste Man Gen Op Exps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000345</td>
<td>Waste Man Gen Op Other Exps</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>81,269</td>
<td>-47.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000345</td>
<td>Waste Site Capping &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-98.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000345</td>
<td>Waste Man Monitoring</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>11,815</td>
<td>-56.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000345</td>
<td>Waste Mgt Southern Area Trial</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-98.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenditure Total</td>
<td>366,500</td>
<td>149,285</td>
<td>-59.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000585</td>
<td>Inc Waste Man Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Income Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000607</td>
<td>Waste Man Cap Infra New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital New Expenditure Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaste Management General Total</td>
<td>366,500</td>
<td>149,285</td>
<td>-59.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010345</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Gen Op</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010345</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Other</td>
<td>130,500</td>
<td>77,752</td>
<td>-40.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010345</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Salv Cont</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010345</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Leachate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010345</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Asbest Plt</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-92.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010345</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Matresses</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>-96.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010345</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Tyres</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>-28.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010345</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Concrete</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010345</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Metal Recycling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010345</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Cardboard &amp; Plastic Recycling</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>-42.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010345</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Dem And Constr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010355</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Maint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010355</td>
<td>Disp Fac Camb Maintenance</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>-1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenditure Total</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inc Disp Fac Camb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inc Disp Fac Camb</td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
<td>(54,095)</td>
<td>-316.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Income Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inc Waste Cambrai Cap Renewal Land</td>
<td>465,000</td>
<td>9,101</td>
<td>-98.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambrai Landfill Cell Extension</td>
<td>465,000</td>
<td>9,101</td>
<td>-98.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Renewal Expenditure Total</td>
<td>850,500</td>
<td>39,277</td>
<td>-95.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaste Disp Facility Cambrai Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4020345</td>
<td>Waste Man Recycling Gen Op</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4020345</td>
<td>Waste Man Rec Other</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>50.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4020345</td>
<td>Waste Man Rec Collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4020345</td>
<td>Waste Man Drum Muster</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>-65.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Expenditure Total</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>6,348</td>
<td>-9.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4020521</td>
<td>Inc Rates Sep Waste Manage Levy</td>
<td>(207,400)</td>
<td>(208,778)</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inc Waste Man Recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inc Waste Man Rec Asbestos</td>
<td>(16,000)</td>
<td>(6,039)</td>
<td>-62.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inc Waste Man Rec Steel</td>
<td>(19,000)</td>
<td>(29,475)</td>
<td>-55.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inc Waste Man Rec Other</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>(2,979)</td>
<td>48.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Income Total</td>
<td>(244,400)</td>
<td>(247,272)</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaste Management Recycling Total</td>
<td>(237,400)</td>
<td>(240,924)</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Current Budget</td>
<td>YTD Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4030345</td>
<td>Waste Man Organics Gen Op</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4030345</td>
<td>403559 Waste Man Organics Other Gen Op Exps</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4030345</td>
<td>403600 Waste Man Green Waste Proc</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenditure Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>Waste Man Trans Stat Gen Op</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>404559 Waste Man Trans Stat Gen Op Exps</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>404600 Waste Man Blanch</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>14,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>404601 Waste Man Bowhill</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,700</td>
<td>12,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>404602 Waste Man Cadell</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>15,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>404603 Waste Man Cambray</td>
<td></td>
<td>65,500</td>
<td>18,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>404604 Waste Man Mannum</td>
<td></td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>45,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>404605 Waste Man Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td>71,600</td>
<td>28,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>404606 Waste Man Swan Reach</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,700</td>
<td>14,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>404607 Waste Man Truro</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,700</td>
<td>16,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>404608 Waste Man Tungkillo</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>13,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040345</td>
<td>404609 Waste Man Walker Flat</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,100</td>
<td>15,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040355</td>
<td>Waste Man Trans Stat Maint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040355</td>
<td>404699 Waste Man Trans Stat Maint</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenditure Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>551,200</td>
<td>197,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040585</td>
<td>Inc Waste Man Trans Stat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040585</td>
<td>404949 Inc Waste Man Trans Stat</td>
<td>Inc Waste Man Trans Stat</td>
<td>(64,000)</td>
<td>(30,066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040600</td>
<td>Inc Waste Man Trans Stat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040600</td>
<td>404100 Inc Bowhill Trans Stat Upgrade Cap</td>
<td></td>
<td>(47,600)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Income Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(47,600)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040637</td>
<td>Waste Man Cap Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040637</td>
<td>404208 Bowhill Transfer Stn Upgrade Cap Exp</td>
<td></td>
<td>95,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital New Expenditure Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040637</td>
<td>Waste Man Cap Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040637</td>
<td>404208 Bowhill Transfer Stn Upgrade Cap Exp</td>
<td></td>
<td>95,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vaste Management Transfer Stations Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>534,800</td>
<td>167,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050345</td>
<td>Waste Man Domestic Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050345</td>
<td>405600 Waste Man Coll Residential - Putrescible</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>76,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050345</td>
<td>405601 Waste Man Coll Open Space - Putrescible</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050345</td>
<td>405602 Waste Man Coll Bin Bank - Putrescible</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>14,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050345</td>
<td>405603 Waste Man Coll Residential - Recyclable</td>
<td></td>
<td>260,800</td>
<td>40,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050345</td>
<td>405605 Waste Man Coll Bin Bank - Recyclable</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>2,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050345</td>
<td>405606 Waste Man Illegal Road Dump</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>3,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenditure Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>444,300</td>
<td>138,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050385</td>
<td>Inc Waste Mgt Collection Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050385</td>
<td>405900 Inc Waste Mgt Commercial Bins</td>
<td></td>
<td>(26,000)</td>
<td>(9,312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Income Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(26,000)</td>
<td>(9,312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vaste Management Collection Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>418,300</td>
<td>129,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,954,700</td>
<td>244,532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return to Agenda
Nally Megabins are the Australian Standard, Robust Plastic Pallet Bins

A.I.M. Sales distributes the Nally Plastic Megabin Australia wide and is able to offer competitive pricing. The Megabin is the original Australian pallet size bulk bin. Designed for fruit & vegetable movement and retail high performance the Megabin has developed into the bin choice for all sorts of products.

Features & Advantages

- Rounded corners & smoother interior surfaces results in less bruising & damage to your produce.
- Emptying Megabins is easy using the AIM Forward Bin Tipper.
- Multiple vents in sides & base provide superior airflow so products cool faster adding valuable shelf life to your produce.
- Unique design with rounded entry has a larger forklift entry height than wooden bins.
- Smooth non-absorbent surface is not affected by dipping operations.
- Unique moulded label holders for cards & tags.
- Easy, clean ownership with identification with hot foil stamping.
- Interlocking foot design permits fast & safe stacking.
- 40% lighter in weight than wood bins & weight is constant as they don’t absorb moisture.

Available in vented & non vented version with lids, tipping bars, liquid bumps, hot stamping and sequential numbering.

Contact us for Pricing on Megabins. Call us on 02 6964 4688

A.I.M Sales
18 Battista St
PO Box 5084
Griffith 2680
Phone: +61 2 6964 4688
Fax: +61 2 6964 9644
Email: info@aimsales.com.au
**Nally MegaBin® Specifications**

![Dimensions](image_url)  
**Nally MegaBin 780**  
- Overall Width: 1165mm  
- Overall Height: 780mm  
- Internal Depth: 1082mm  
- Weight (approx): 44kg  
- Cubic Capacity: 755 litres (approx)  
- Styles: Solid and Vented  

**Nally MegaBin 730**  
- Overall Width: 1165mm  
- Overall Height: 730mm  
- Internal Depth: 1082mm  
- Weight (approx): 42kg  
- Cubic Capacity: 715 litres (approx)  
- Styles: Solid and Vented  

**Nally MegaBin® Features**

**Stacking**
- 5000kg on level ground in cold storage  
- 3800kg on level ground at temperatures less than 35°C for less than 1 month  
- 3400kg on level ground at temperatures less than 35°C for more than 1 month.

**Warranty/Buy Back**
- 3 Year Warranty on wear and tear  
- 10 Year Warranty on outdoor weathering  
- Sustainability buy back option available

**Optional Features**
- All models available vented or solid  
- Hot foil stamping with custom logos  
- Sequential Numbering  
- Barcoding  
- Extended height rackable feet  
- Lid available  
- Tipping Bars

**Materials**
- High Density polyethylene (HDPE)  
- UV Stabilised  
- Fully Recyclable  
- Food Grade Approved

**Construction**
- Double wall corner and centre posts  
- Two hand holds for lifting  
- Rounded internal corners  
- Smooth interior surfaces  
- Non-absorbent surface  
- Multiple vents provide superior air flow

**Fork Lift Entry**
- 143mm opening with patented slide entry.  
- 90mm Pallet Jack clearance when empty  
- Two hand holds for lifting
FEES & CHARGES

SPRINTON TRANSFER STATION

Located on the SPRINTON to WILLIAMSTOWN ROAD, approx 4km out of Springston sign post/entrance on Left hand side

**CASH OR CHEQUE ONLY - EFTPOS facilities are not available and credit will not be given**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening Time</th>
<th>RESIDENT GENERAL WASTE FEE</th>
<th>NON RESIDENT FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECOND SATURDAY of each month 9.00am - 3.00pm (ONLY UP TO 5 TONNES AT THIS SITE AT A TIME)</td>
<td>TYPE OF VEHICLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Boots &amp; Small Wagons</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utes &amp; Small Trailers up to 6 x 4 to water level</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utes &amp; Small Trailers up to 6 x 4 above water level no hurdles</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utes &amp; Small Trailers up to 6x4 above water level with hurdles</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailers, Utes &amp; Tandem Trailers to water level (exceeding 6x4)</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailers, Utes &amp; Tandem Trailers above water level (exceeding 6x4) no hurdles</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailers, Utes &amp; Tandem Trailers above water level (exceeding 6x4) with hurdles</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Tickets</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The public is advised that the following will not be accepted at the Springslon Transfer Station:-

PERMAPINE POSTS, TYRES, LOOSE PAPER, PLASTIC, CONCRETE AND CAR BODIES

FRIDGES & FREEZERS must have gas cylinders and doors removed before dumping

To dump ASBESTOS, CHEMICAL CONTAINERS, POISONS, PAINT TINS contact THE EPA - 1800 623 445

MULCH is available for purchase - Untreated $35, FOR A 6x4 TRAILER LOAD

GREEN WASTE:

$25 FOR A 6x4 TRAILER LOAD (TO WATER LEVEL)
$30 FOR A 6x4 TRAILER LOAD (EXCEEDING WATER LEVEL)
$60 FOR A TRUCK UP TO 5 TONNE GMV
$100 FOR A TANDEM TRUCK LOAD

Or Kuchel Landscape Supplies for Green Waste 8562 2177
M-F 8am – 4.30pm, Sat 9am – 2.30pm, Sun - closed

Concerned bird lover

Dear Sir,

Once again I find the attitude as expressed by various councils towards our Little Corellas to be absolutely appalling, ignorant and baseless. Barossa Council's Mr Jimmie Tarley outlined the campaign to rid the district of one of our most beautiful bird species as reported in The Leader September 27, on page 9: Council Increases Little Corella Controls.

Light, Mid Murray, Barossa and Gawler Councils are to spend $50,000 driving out the Corellas from presumably the bigger towns in their respective districts to what end, flocks of homeless birds being reduced to the status of refugees in their own land. Sure these little moss white feathered devils tip prune the gum trees, make a bit of a racket when settling down for the night but, for Heaven's sake, do they require the Police and other agencies to wage war on them?

Quoted from The Leader story is the chilling turn of phrase that the $50,000 is to be used to 'eradicate the corellas' from these council districts.

As a bird lover and sanctuary owner I am disgusted and ashamed that these innocent little birds are to be eradicated, driven away and persecuted by ignorant people who would be better off using their money and resources to deal with a far worse pest, feral and roosting domestic cats that destroy wild life and domestic birds.

David Forney, Bayonetts

E-Waste huge disgrace

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Barossa and surrounds. I have been doing some research on recycling and reuse of products and waste.

I stumbled over e-waste which is the recycling of electronic items such as phones, TVs and other electrical equipment.

I did a little bit more research into the subject and found that 20 to 50 metric tons of e-waste goes to landfill a year. You may be thinking, why is this a problem? Or what is the purpose in recycling e-Waste? The following statements will convince you.

When waste is sent to landfill toxins and dangerous chemicals leave the electronics and go into the atmosphere. These toxins can be dangerous to humans and the Earth.

The purpose of recycling e-waste is not only to protect us and the Earth, but recycle the value you may not know is in your electronic device.

If you know that your electronics have gold, silver, copper and lead and many other valuables that can be recycled to save the Earth.

Ask yourself one more question, do you have mobile phones or electronics lying around the house, unused or broken?

Did you know you have to travel to Cambrai which is 46 minutes from Nuriootpa in order to drop off your e-waste?

Why can't the Barossa have an e-waste recycling depot?

My proposal to The Barossa Council is to run an E-Waste recycling depot or at least have a vehicle that takes the community's recycling to Cambrai e-waste recycling centre monthly or even weekly.

But to make this possible we have to raise awareness in the community, as many people aren't informed about e-waste.

Marrus Madar

Letters to the Editor
For Official Use Only

The EPA is pleased to announce today’s commencement of the Environment Protection (Waste Reform) Amendment Act 2017.

The reforms will result in modernised and strengthened powers under the Environment Protection Act to:

- Support fair industry practices, a level playing field and a strong resource recovery sector through:
  - Improved and proportionate powers for tackling breaches of licence conditions.
    - These include the ability to expiate licence condition breaches for $1,000 and potential new default penalties for breach of reporting deadline, and other licence conditions,
  - Improved regulation of waste material flow and stockpiling,
  - assessment of resource recovery proposals, and
  - enabling further clarity around when material is or is not ‘waste’.

- Improve the EPA’s ability to prosecute illegal dumping by:
  - making car owners responsible for illegal dumping,
  - enabling tracking device use, expanding authorised officer powers to enter certain premises and mark materials that are likely to be illegally dumped, and
  - allowing for improved monitoring of material.

Further information about the Amendment Act is available at: [www.epa.sa.gov.au/reformingwaste](http://www.epa.sa.gov.au/reformingwaste) or please contact Tiana Nairn on 8224 9926 or e-mail tiana.nairn@sa.gov.au

Environment Protection Authority
GPO Box 2607, Adelaide, S.A. 5001, AUSTRALIA
Release of EPA Energy from Waste Discussion Paper - Circular 45.4
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Summary
The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has released an Energy from Waste (EfW) Discussion Paper entitled Enhancing resource recovery and discussing the place of energy recovery for targeted stakeholder consultation. The EPA is holding an information session dedicated to local government elected members and staff on 21 November 2017.

SA’s Waste Strategy 2015-2020 identifies a need for the EPA to enhance the clarity of the regulatory framework relating to EfW and to develop assessment criteria to better support industry investment decisions. The EPA has released an EfW Discussion Paper for targeted stakeholder consultation and is seeking feedback on the issues raised by 12 January 2018.

Separately to the questions raised in the Discussion Paper, the LGA is asking local government stakeholders to assist the LGA in developing its position by considering and providing feedback on the following key issues:

- The Discussion Paper asserts that, in applying the waste management hierarchy, disposal through an EfW facility is only desirable for the last remaining residual waste left following the removal of all reusable/recoverable material – is this assertion universally agreed?
- If an EfW facility was proposed for South Australia, how should we ensure that the proposed feedstock is limited to the last remaining residual waste?
- If an EfW facility was proposed for South Australia, how should we account or plan for future innovation in recycling and resource recovery?
- Is the waste management industry in South Australia mature enough for an EfW facility or does the rapid pace of change in waste management mean that it is too difficult to accurately assess the viability of an EfW facility at this point?

Feedback on the above questions can be provided to Emily Heywood-Smith, Senior Policy Officer, by 28 November 2017, at emily.heywoodsmith@lga.sa.gov.au.

The EPA is holding several information sessions/workshops to assist stakeholders in providing feedback on the Discussion Paper, including a session dedicated to local government Mayors, Elected Members and CEOs. For details of the information sessions and to register click on the links below:

- Adelaide CBD local government CE, mayors & elected members information session  – Tuesday 21 November 9–11 am, The Science Exchange, Adelaide
- Adelaide CBD general information session & workshop Wednesday 29 November 1–3 pm, The Science Exchange, Adelaide
- Mount Gambier information session and workshop Friday 8 December 10 am–12pm, City Hall, Main Corner, entry via Cave Garden
- Port Pirie information session and workshop Wednesday 13 December 12–2 pm, Port Pirie Council Chambers

Details of consultation sessions can also be found on the EPA website – Reforming Waste Management page.