AGENDA FOR A MEETING OF THE WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CAMBRAI
ON THURSDAY 19 OCTOBER 2017
COMMENCING AT 1-00 P M

1. PRESENT

Cr P J Raison, Chairperson
Cr J W Hall
Cr S P Wilkinson
Cr B J Taylor
Cr B P Schmitt.

Mayor Dave Burgess

2. IN ATTENDANCE

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

PM

4. APOLOGY

Was received from Mr R J Peate, Chief Executive Officer.

Cr moved that the apology be received.
Seconded Cr

5. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

(Page 311 – 25/07/2017)

moved that the Minutes of the Mid Murray Council Waste Management
Advisory Committee meeting held on 25 July 2017 be taken as read and confirmed.
Seconded

6. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

7. BUSINESS

7.1 Financial Report for Waste Management

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

Refer Appendix 7.1
8. DEPUTATION/PRESENTATIONS

8.1 Walker Flat & Districts Holiday Home Association

Arrangements have been made for Mal Whitford from the Walker Flat & Districts Holiday Home Association, to attend the meeting at 1-00 pm to discuss the Mid Murray Council Individual bin collection Service for the Southern Area.

Refer Waste Management Coordinator’s Report Item 9.2.3.

8.2 Confidential Item – Barossa Regional Procurement Group (BRPG) – Waste Collection Services Tender

Arrangements have been made for Mr Trevor Hockley and Ms Debra Scott, Procurement Officer, Barossa Regional Procurement Group to attend the meeting at 1-00 pm to discuss the Barossa Regional Procurement Group (BRPG) – Waste Collection Services Tender.

Refer Confidential Report Item 9.3.1.
9. **REPORTS FROM OFFICERS**

Cr moved that the report be received.
Seconded Cr

9.1 **INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES REPORT**

9.1.1 **Financial Reporting for Waste Management Services**

**Report Purpose**

To advise and inform Elected Member about past expenditure and discuss the format how the financial reporting will continue to be presented.

**Discussion**

At the previous Waste Management Advisory Committee meeting, members raised concerns about the lack of commentary given to the format of financial information presented and further concerns rose how the 2016/17 expenditure exceeded the budgeted amount. Investigations into the previous 4 financial years on the department operational expenditure have revealed a decrease in net operational expenditure as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,930,397</td>
<td>$1,856,066</td>
<td>$1,635,689</td>
<td>$1,549,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operating budget for Waste Management Services for 2016/17 was set at $1,193,922 well below previous year’s expenditure for some unknown reason. Council had not reduced or ceased any waste services to roll back this level of expenditure to warrant such a reduction. In fact the recent financial year (16/17) Council introduced in October a putrescible waste collection service for the southern areas of Council and removed the bin banks. The introduction of this service and the removal of the bin banks had no affect on the operating budget.

This financial year’s operating budget is $1,442,100 (excluding Capital) and to date (end of September) there has been an expenditure of $290,844 which is on track to meet the operating budget.

Refer Appendix 9.1.1.

**Recommendation**

Moved __________________ Seconded __________________

(1) That the Financial Reporting for Waste Management Services be received.
9.1 INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES REPORT CONT’D

9.1.2 Transfer Station Annual Visits Statistics

Report Purpose

To advise and inform Elected Members of analysis for the number of visits received at Transfer Stations during the 2016/17 financial year.

Discussion

An analysis has been undertaken for the transfer station visits for the past and previous financial years to gain a better understanding of the actual cost in operating and the level of patronage being received by the community. In the attached Appendix are 3 tables which can be viewed in more detail:

- 2014/15 to 2016/17 annual visit for each transfer station and yearly totals
- 2015/16 Monthly Visits for each Transfer Station
- 2016/17 Monthly Visits for each Transfer Station

Refer Appendix 9.1.2.

A summary of Transfer Station operations are as follows:

- 2016/17 Operating Budget for all Transfer Station was $557,200
- 2016/17 Operation Income from Transfer Stations was $12,904
- 2016/17 Transfer Station received 11,638 visits
- Transfer Station average service cost for each visitor was $46.77
- Approx. Service cost for one putrescible MGB/year $92, service by contractor (4100 MGM's)
- The introduction of a rural putrescible waste collection service in the southern areas of Council has seen a reduction in patronage at Mannum, Tungkillo and Walker Flat transfer stations
- Bowhill Transfer Station is the least patronage site of 8.7 visits per week in comparison to Mannum which receives 83 visits per week, being the most patronized transfer station.
- Bowhill Transfer Station patronage numbers has been consistence over the past 2 financial years
- Significant difference in patronage in Summer/Spring to Autumn/Winter with lesser numbers
- Decrease of 1528 visits to transfer stations in 2016/17 (13,166-11,638)
- Below graph is the number of types of visits (11638 to all Transfer Stations
- Token card visits represents 217-314 individual customers visiting regularly every 2-3 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Token Card</td>
<td>5653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailer Voucher</td>
<td>2578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recyclables/No Charge</td>
<td>1575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.1 INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES REPORT CONT’D

9.1.2 Transfer Station Annual Visits Statistics cont’d

Recommendation
Moved __________________ Seconded __________________
That the Transfer Station Annual Visits Statics be received as information.

Greg Hill
Director Infrastructure Services
9.2 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT

Cr moved that the report be received.
Seconded Cr

9.2.1 Incineration and Energy from Waste

Background

As a result of discussions at previous Waste Management Advisory Committee meetings, the following information and correspondence has been obtained from the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) in regard to the activity of Waste Incineration and producing Energy from Waste.

Discussion

In response to the Waste Management Coordinators query regarding Incineration and Energy from Waste, Brian White, Senior Environment Protection Officer – EPA Waste Reform, provided the following information:

Schedule 1 of the Environment Protection Act 1993 lists all activities of prescribed environmental significance that require a licence such as ‘Waste or Recycling Depots’ (landfills and waste transfer stations etc) and ‘Incineration’. It is possible to seek development approval and subsequently an EPA Licence to operate an incinerator. There is one such facility operating for the disposal of Medical Waste (clinical and related waste) in SA – it is privately owned and operated:

Waste Incinerators can be purchased as modular facilities, however, the combustion furnace is usually the cheapest component. Air pollution control technology makes up the bulk of the expense. You will also have to consider what type of fuel the facility will use and the associated cost, ie natural gas? A ‘small’ waste incinerator will cost several million dollars to construct, around $5 million would be a fair estimate for something capable of treating up to 4500 tonnes of waste per year. You then have to consider operational costs including maintenance of air pollution control systems, monitoring systems, general plant wear and tear, ongoing assessment, classification and disposal of bottom ash and fly ash which may then require treatment as high-level contaminated waste prior to landfill disposal, and payment of the waste levy - which will still apply.

While Council could certainly investigate incineration technology as an alternative to landfill, I think you would be dismissing it based upon cost alone fairly quickly. Social consent in the form of community acceptance is another important consideration.

The next question is whether-or-not energy could be generated from the combustion or other thermal treatment of waste in order to generate energy in the form of heat or electricity and gain some revenue in the process. The addition of a heat exchanger and steam or gas turbine to an incineration process adds to the cost, and the primary revenue stream for an Energy from Waste facility is the gate fee. The revenue gained from sale of heat or electricity produced is supplementary.
9.2 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR'S REPORT CON'D

9.2.1 Incineration and Energy from Waste Cont'd

The most efficient facilities of this type in the world presently recover a maximum of about 30% of the heat energy produced as electricity. Energy from Waste Facilities based on less than 100,000 tonnes of waste per year are not generally viable.

The EPA, through the landfill guidelines encourages regional councils to develop and participate in regional waste management strategies to find the most cost-effective solutions for managing waste. Of course, with respect to the Waste Management Hierarchy, waste avoidance/minimisation, reuse and recycling are always the best options. I would think that Mid Murray Council’s options regarding residual municipal solid waste would include landfilling into a geo-synthetic clay lined cell as you currently are at Cambrai, or to investigate whether it would be beneficial to construct a transfer station to facilitate the transport of waste to another regional or major landfill facility.

I would be happy to have further discussions with yourself or Council if at all required. You can also contact your Licence Coordinator Marian Lang, who can assist you with general waste management and operational issues with regard to Council’s site-specific circumstances.

Regards,

Brian White
Senior Environment Protection Officer
Waste Reform
Phone (08) 8204 8124
Environment Protection Authority
GPO Box 2607, Adelaide, S.A. 5001, AUSTRALIA

Conclusion

As detailed in the correspondence from the EPA, it would not be a viable option for Council to implement either the process of Incineration of waste materials or to convert Waste to Energy given the amount of waste generated and the costs associated with either option.

For the information of members.
8.2 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT CON’D

9.2.2 Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Proposal to Implement Mass Balance Reporting

Background

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.

The Waste Management Coordinator briefly reported on the EPA intention to introduce a mass balance reporting system at the 25 July 2017 meeting of the Waste Management Advisory Committee. At that stage no official notification had been received by Council and advice from the EPA was that further information would follow.

The proposal to introduce mass balance reporting was first brought to Council’s attention as part of the EPA Waste Reform Discussion Paper in 2015 and again as part of the Explanatory Paper for the Waste Reform Bill in 2016. Consultation/information sessions were also held in 2015 and 2016 which Council attended. Councils were invited to make comment regarding the mass balance reporting system along with other initiatives the EPA were seeking to introduce. Mid Murray Council provided comment opposing the proposal to reduce the non reporting threshold from the current 10,000 tonnes to 5,000 tonnes per annum, as well as feedback and comment regarding the increases to the solid waste levy and how the levy fund is managed.

Discussion

Appendixes with this report are previous correspondence with the EPA prior to official release of the proposal, mass balance reporting explanatory paper and correspondence from the Local Government Association (LGA) regarding an information session to be held by the EPA on Monday 25 September and an invitation to provide feedback regarding the proposal.

The Waste Management Coordinator did attend the recent EPA information session and will provide feedback to both the LGA and EPA.

Refer Appendix 9.2.2 Copy of correspondence

Conclusion

Council is currently operating under the proposed 5,000 tonne per annum threshold proposed by the EPA. However, if Council is successful in attracting further waste materials from other sources, then it would be likely Council would also come under the requirements of mass balance reporting and associated changes.

Council does have the ability to provide records via the weighbridge system located at the Cambrai landfill facility however, under the current proposal Council would also be required to install video monitoring systems at the site. As the Cambrai landfill facility does not have access to electricity, the weighbridge is operated by a stand alone solar power system. This system is designed to operate at its current capacity only. To be able to operate a video surveillance system (possibly 3 cameras) would require a major upgrade and would be at significant cost. Further costs would be associated with a significant increase in administration required to provide records and reports to the EPA.
9.2 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT CON’D

9.2.2 Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Proposal to Implement Mass Balance Reporting Cont’d

The Waste Management Coordinator will include the above issues and request clarification when submitting comments to the EPA. The Waste Management Coordinator will also request information from the EPA regarding the level of assistance (money and/or infrastructure) being offered by the EPA to enable transitions to occur. Comments will also be provided to the LGA to be included with feedback gathered from other Councils.

Recommendation
Moved __________________ Seconded __________________ 
that it be recommended to Council that;

(1) the report regarding the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Proposal to Implement Mass Balance Reporting be received and noted.

(2) the Waste Management Coordinator continues to liaise with the EPA regarding the Proposal to Implement Mass Balance Reporting and associated requirements and that comments be provided to the EPA and the Local Government Association.
9.2 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT CON’D

9.2.3 Conclusion - Trial Individual Bin Collection Service for Southern Area

Report Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on progress of the trial putrescible collection service for the southern rural area of Council and decide whether to continue or cease the service.

Background

The collection service began on 24 October 2016 and was scheduled to run for a 12 month period, with completion being October 2017. However Council has continued the service while staff obtains feedback from community groups about the overall performance of the Southern Rural Collection Service.

Discussion

With the Southern Rural Collection service has been in operations for 12 months, the individual putrescible 240lt bin collection service is believed to be operating routinely and efficiently in the views of Council staff. The service is to all residential properties in rural and shack areas of the southern section of the Council (South of the Angas Valley Road).

At July Waste Committee Meeting it was decided that Council staff would summarise and report back to the next Waste Committee Meeting with:

1. Feedback received from customers during the trials period, summarised from captured in Council’s records system and the collection contractor, including any reduction in illegal dumping.

2. In August 2017, The Waste Management Coordinator has contacted the Progress Association in the South Area and requested their feedback about the Southern Individual Waste Bin Collection Service.

In reference to the first point, there were a number of customer requests received when the rollout of the Southern Rural Collection commenced, this was mainly due to MGB’s not delivered, incorrect pick up sites or general enquiry about the service (the Waste Coordinator will elaborate further in the meeting). Only a few actual objections were received about the introduction of the collection service where it was cited as being an inconvenience or their MGB will be stolen. Below is a table showing Council expenditure for Roadside Illegal dumping and for the past 4 years, supporting the introduction of rural collection service has reduce roadside illegal dumping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>$1970.95 to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>$3051.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>$18,007.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>$18178.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore Council has no longer has the additional expense of collecting hard waste which was dumped at bin banks in the southern area, however continue to pick up hard waste at bin banks in the northern area, especially in the Morgan area.

The second point from the previous Waste Committee Meeting as follows-Council received 20 written responses, across Younghusband, Walker Flat, Caloote Landing and Caurnamont:
9.2 WASTE MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR’S REPORT CON’D

9.2.3 Conclusion - Trial Individual Bin Collection Service for Southern Area cont’d

In Favour (17 responses)
- Overwhelming success
- Would oppose the return of bin banks
- Working Well
- Nothing but praise and support
- Benefits fare exceed the negatives

Against (3 responses)
- Prefer bin banks to be reinstalled, leasing bins left out when property is unattended is undesirable (vandalism, theft, burglary)

Other comments, requests and suggestions:
- Additional collections requested during busy periods (ranging from 2 per week to daily, including weekends)
- Is there an option to provide additional Transfer Station Vouchers (up to 3 more)
- Will a recycle service be considered in the future
- Will green waste collection be considered in the future
- One bin does not cater for large amounts of waste in busy periods (e.g. 2 free bins, or ability to put out as many as required, even if they are not MMC issue)
- How will roads be maintained to accommodate contractor vehicles
- Vacant properties to be serviced
- Questioned value for money

Refer Appendix 9.2.3 – Example of the correspondence sent to Progress Association in August 2017 and the previous three (3) reports to this Committee – Sept 2016 to June 2017 to provide background

Conclusion
With the initial 12 month trial period now complete and extensive consultation done, Council will need to make the decision of whether or not to continue as a permanent service will need to be made.

If the collection service is to continue as a permanent service to manage rural and holiday home waste management requirements, Council will also need to decide whether a fee or service charge is to be introduced to recover the cost for the service. If a service charge is introduced, previously obtained legal advice confirms Council would need to adhere to requirements of the Local Government Act 1999 as well as Council’s own Public Consultation Policy.

Recommendation
Moved __________________ Seconded __________________
that it be recommended to Council that;

(1) The report regarding Conclusion - Trial Individual Bin Collection Service for Southern Area be received.

(2) Council elects to continue the Southern Rural Collection Service as permanent service, and that the service is no longer referred as a trial.

(3) Council will not impose any fees/charges for users of the Southern Rural Collection Service, or other waste collection services until obtaining illegal advice if such charges can be applied; OR

(4) Council elects not to continue with the Southern Waste Collection service and that arrangement be made for re-installing bin banks and collection of MGBs from rural residential properties.

Neil Cook
Waste Management Coordinator
9.3 CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

9.3.1 CONFIDENTIAL ITEM – 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, Ms Debra Scott BRPG Procurement Officer, Trevor Hockley 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
9.3 CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

9.3.1 CONFIDENTIAL ITEM – 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 19 October 2017, the Infrastructure Services Report item 9.1.3 (Confidential Item – Barossa Regional Procurement Group (BRPG) – Waste Collection Services Tender Waste & Recycling Collection Service 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
10. **CORRESPONDENCE**

Cr moved that the correspondence be received.
Seconded Cr

10.1 **Idyll Acres Rubbish Bin Collection**

Being email correspondence Mr Rob Morgan and the Waste Management Coordinator regarding the individual waste collection at Idyll Acres, as part of a potential individual waste collection service for rural and holiday home areas in the northern part of the district.

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

Refer Appendix 10.1

10.2 **Local Government Report – Waste Levy Bill**

Being an article regarding a Perth company facing a $20+ million waste levy bill (landfill)

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

Refer Appendix 10.2

10.3 **Mount Barker District Council Circular**

Being information from the Mount Barker District Council regarding a recent Four Corners Program aired on the ABC titled “Trashed: The dirty truth about your rubbish”

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

Refer Appendix 10.3

10.4 **News Release – Hon Ian Hunter MLC – Waste Industry Infrastructure Funding Boosts Jobs.**

Being a news release regarding Sixteen projects receiving grants of $2.17 million to improve the infrastructure of South Australia’s waste industry, creating up to 48.5 new jobs.

A copy of the News Release had been provided to all members.

Refer Appendix 10.4
11. **OTHER BUSINESS**

12. **NEXT MEETING** – *To be decided.*

13. **CLOSURE**

   P M The Chairperson declared the meeting closed.