

25 JAN 2016

REF. 2015/0426-03/011

Our reference: SF15/27494: DOC15/510629-02;  
Contact: Andrew Helms (62297002)

The General Manager  
Bathurst Regional Council  
Private Mail Bag 17  
BATHURST NSW 2795

Attention: Ms Loretta McLean

20 January 2016

Dear Mr Sherley

**RE: Development Application No.2015/0426 – Proposed Resource Recovery facility,  
Stewarts Mount**

I refer to your letter and the accompanying development application, received by the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) on 14 December 2015, relating to a proposal to establish a resource recovery facility at Stewarts Mount (the proposal).

The proposal is Development Application No.2015/0426 (the DA) and is considered to be Integrated Development under the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act* 1979 as an Environment Protection Licence will be required in addition to development consent. Bathurst Regional Council has requested that the EPA consider the DA and accompanying Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and provide comment where appropriate.

The EPA has reviewed the information provided in the EIS and has determined that some additional information and clarification of issues associated with potential noise, water, waste and odour impacts of the proposed development is required before the EPA could consider issuing General Terms of Approval (GTAs) for the proposal. The EPA has specified its requirements for additional information in Attachment A to this letter.

In light of the above request for additional information, the EPA notes that the deemed refusal clock will be stopped from the receipt of this letter until the information is provided. It would also be appreciated if you could forward the additional information to the EPA once it has been received to ensure consideration of this proposal in a timely manner.

If you have any queries or wish to discuss the matter further please contact Mr Andrew Helms at the Central West (Bathurst) Office of the EPA by telephoning (02) 6332 7604.

Yours sincerely

  
**DARRYL CLIFT**  
**Head Central West Unit**  
**Environment Protection Authority**



## ATTACHMENT A

### **Additional information required by the EPA for assessment of the Proposed Resource Recovery Facility – Stewarts Mount**

The EPA has completed a preliminary review of the information provided and considers that additional information about the proposed development is essential for the EPA to consider issuing general terms of approval. Additional issues may be identified following a review the requested information.

#### GENERAL:

The EIS has no detailed plans/drawings of the proposed layout of the facility – only generalised areas overlain on publicly available aerial imagery.

- *The EPA requests that a detailed plan of the proposed facility be provided which includes more accurate representations of the proposed areas of operation including all traffic/haul routes, locations of all equipment and plant, stockpile areas (waste and final product), composting windrows, workshops, fuel/dangerous good stores, offices (including any mobile offices in old quarry).*

#### NOISE

The EPA has reviewed the noise section of the EIS and notes that no specific noise impact assessment has been prepared for the proposed facility. The proposed operating hours for the facility are stated as being between 5:00 am and 6:00 pm Monday to Friday and from 7:00 am to 1:00 pm on Saturdays. The EPA is not prepared to licence the proposed operations, particularly when a portion of those operations are undertaken during the night time period as defined under the NSW Industrial Noise Policy (INP), without a noise impact assessment having first been completed. An assessment in accordance with the INP needs to be undertaken to demonstrate that operations will be compliant with the project specific noise limit as determined under the INP.

- *The EPA requests that the proponent prepares a noise impact assessment in accordance with the NSW Industrial Noise Policy.*

Section 12.2 of the EIS states that activities will be confined to the former quarry void. A number of additional plant and activities are mentioned throughout the EIS (e.g. chipper, trommel, windrow turner and windrow blower) however the locality of this equipment and likely hours of operation have not been clearly stated.

- *The EPA requests a full list of all mobile plant and equipment to be used at the facility and where this plant and equipment is intended to be operated. Please include any internal haul trucks and water pumps as appropriate.*
- *Please also confirm the hours and average duration of operation for the Gore Covered System air blowers, the likely noise emissions from these units and any noise mitigation measures that will be utilised (or available to be applied).*

#### WATER

Details have been provided in the EIS of water management within the former quarry void however no information has been provided of the proposed water management mechanisms around the workshop (including truck washout area), weighbridge, office area and final product stockpiles other than it being unlikely "...that clean stormwater will be released..." from this area (EIS Section 12.4.2).

- *The EPA requires that the proponent provides detailed information on surface water management in this portion of the premises including all proposed clean/dirty water management areas (with an appropriate figure), all proposed water storages (with associated capacities), and any likely dirty water discharge points from the premises. The site water balance should be amended to incorporate this portion of the premises.*

Section 12.4.2 states that the contact water dams and compost pads will be designed to minimise any leaching with clay stockpiled on site should there be a need to repair the drains, pads or containment dams. Section 8.0 ("Potential Pollutants") of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) states that care must be taken to construct engineered clay hardstand pads and to appropriately line the bed and banks of on-site dams with compacted clay. Section 5.0 ("Layout of the GRP") of the EMP references permeabilities to be achieved.

- *The EPA requires more information on the specifications of the proposed pad and dam liners with respect to permeability and how the proposed permeabilities will be achieved/verified. The proponent should also state what materials will be used to line these features.*

Groundwater monitoring from the on-site bore is proposed to demonstrate that contamination is not occurring. Little detail is provided on groundwater in the EIS including where this on-site bore is located and what aquifer(s) it intercepts. Please note that the EPA requires that all pads, drains and dirty water ponds are appropriately designed and managed (see above) to minimise the potential for groundwater contamination rather than for monitoring of groundwater to be the main measure of successful containment of contaminants on-site.

- *The EPA requires further information on groundwater under the project site including but not limited to the nature/occurrence of groundwater aquifers beneath the project site, groundwater users in the vicinity of the project site, and details of the on-site bore (including location, construction details [if known], aquifer depth intersected and any other available details on water quality, depth, yield).*

## **WASTE**

No specific references to the nature/type of waste that will be brought on to the site have been provided in the EIS – just broad categories of waste type. Procedures have been established to vet incoming loads for highly odorous waste and the handling of organic/food/liquid wastes however it is not clear that all scenarios have been considered/covered off. The EPA requires that the following information be provided:

- *Details of the exact types of incoming waste, their source (or likely source) and likely odour (or potential to be odorous);*
- *Confirm the maximum quantities of waste (solid and liquid) that are likely to be held on site at any one time (other than that already blended into a compost windrow);*
- *How are the stockpiles of odorous/potentially odorous waste going to be managed (prior to blending) particularly over weekends or other situations where that type of waste is not likely to be used in a compost 'recipe' for a number of days. Effectively the proponent needs to demonstrate that the existing EMP procedures are sufficiently robust to deal with a contingency whereby there is an equipment breakdown (front-end loader or Gore Covered System cover failure for example), staff shortages or other event that prevent the immediate handling of odorous wastes;*
- *Details of how liquid waste will be stored on-site (e.g. in above ground tanks within the Waste Receiving and Processing area [WR&P]?);*
- *Confirm that the area of land dedicated to WR&P is of a sufficient size to receive, store and mix, as appropriate, the incoming waste to the facility;*
- *Confirm whether the vehicles transporting waste to the facility are Bettergrow (or partner organisation) vehicles, contractors to Bettergrow or contractors to the waste provider. What*



*percentages of the approximately 35 truck to site each day would be undertaken by the different transporters as described above?*

## **ODOUR**

The odour assessment is based on emission data from a facility operated in New Zealand. The assessment does not provide supporting information to verify that the emissions are likely to be representative. Where emissions data from an existing facility is used, data must be demonstrated as representative of conditions likely to exist at the proposed facility. Consideration should be given to factors including but not limited to similarity of process, similarity of waste material received (compost batching and recipe) and treated, climatic conditions and potential for temporal waste and emission variability.

The assessment concludes that the proposed Gore-Tex aerated cover system has been used throughout the world demonstrated to be associated with very low emission. On this basis, the EPA expects that a wealth of supporting data exists, including data representative of the proposed material and composting conditions, to provide additional verification of the modelled emissions.

Where a range of emission estimates exist, the EPA recommends adopting a conservative upper bound emission profile (rather than average profile) to provide additional confidence that offensive odour is unlikely to occur.

### **Nomination of reasonable and feasible controls for all potentially significant emission sources**

The assessment nominates two main odour emission controls:

1. Gore-Tex covered aerated windrows
2. Aeration of the contact water ponds

The assessment contended that the application of Gore-Tex covered aerated windrows will effectively control odour emissions from the composting process. The EPA advises that forced aeration does not necessarily lead to reduced odour flux – particularly in the early stages of composting. The EPA recommends that the proponent conduct additional evaluation of the need to implement filtration technology on the proposed covered and aerated windrows.

The assessment does not nominate emission controls for several potentially significant odour sources, such as the waste receiving and processing area, shredding, the product screening and storage area and the loading area. Where these process areas are not adequately controlled, through measures such as complete or partial enclosure, there is potential for increased odour emission and generation of excessive leachate.

The assessment advises that grease trap waste will be unloaded to a green waste storage bund. Grease trap waste has the potential to generate significant odour emissions. No detail is provided in the assessment as to the adequacy of grease trap waste storage and handling practices. Additionally, the assessment does not detail how other potentially odorous waste, such as oily water will be received, stored and processed prior to composting.

The EPA recommends that all potentially significant emission sources be catalogued with proposed emission controls benchmarked against best management practice.

### **Identification of contingency control measures**

The odour assessment advises that in the event of unacceptable odour levels, odour suppressants could be applied to windrows, contact water ponds and the receiving area. Odour suppressants, such as foams, have limited effectiveness at controlling offensive odour.

The EPA recommends that the proponent be advised that should the project proceed, the proponent will have a regulatory obligation under s129 of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act – no offensive



odour. If the project results in offensive odour, retrofit of contingency odour control measures may be required. The project should be designed so as not to preclude the retrofit of additional odour controls – such as air filtration.

Further, Section 12.1.2 of the EIS states that “Prior to unloading, incoming resources will be scrutinised for odour generation”. Workplace Procedure 1 details the processes to be followed regarding waste receipt and unloading at the premises, however this procedure does not specifically comment on any process for dealing with/rejecting odorous loads. The EPA requires more detail on how incoming waste identified as being highly odorous will be dealt with. Should scrutiny of waste for odour generation occur at the source rather than at the gate to avoid need for waste if rejected, based on high odour characteristics, having to be returned to the source.

#### Assessment of particulate emissions

No assessment of potential impacts from the emission of particulate matter has been provided. The EPA recommends that the assessment be updated to assess the potential impact of particulate matter emissions from the proposed facility.