

## MINUTES

### BROWNS PLAINS LANDFILL COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE GROUP MEETING OF

29 March 2011

**ATTENDEES:** P Menon (Logan Waste Services - LWS)  
B Lee (LWS)  
L Boyd (Community Representative)  
John Armstrong (Community Representative)  
S Willmet (Community Representative)  
S Weber (Community Representative)  
J A Lee (Community Representative)  
L Miller (Community Representative)

There were also two other attendees (residents) who accompanied Community Representatives.

The meeting commenced at 2.35pm.

#### **1.0 APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor C Dalley and Councillor L Bradley.

N Martin (Community Representative), D Moore (Community Representative) and M Sams (Community Representative) did not attend.

#### **2.0 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

S Willmet and L Boyd confirmed that the minutes of the meeting of 14 December 2010 were an accurate record.

#### **3.0 BUSINESS ARISING**

##### **3.1 Landfill Odour**

###### **3.1.1 Odour Survey**

The meeting reviewed odour survey data for the three-month period of November 2010 to January 2011.

The average number of odour incidents recorded by survey participants was 2.48 incidents/participant/month compared to 0.67 during the same period last year.

The duration of odour incidents recorded by survey participants was 13.53% of the month compared to 0.51% for the same period last year.

###### **3.1.2 Odour Complaints**

There were 12 complaints received during the three-month period of November 2010 to January 2011. This compares to three for the same period last year.

- 11/11/10 - 8.50am Hampden Cct - Odour from landfill - The Waste Operations Co-ordinator (WOC) investigated the complaint and confirmed the landfill as the source of the odour. Both deodoriser systems (2C & 2F) were activated. The cell filling activities were also rearranged to cover a particularly smelly section with inert refuse.
- 11/11/10 - 12.15pm - Tarrango Pl - Odour from landfill - see above for corrective action. The WOC phoned complainant and explained action taken and that the complainant seemed satisfied with the response.
- 11/11/10 - 11.40am Junee Crt - Odour from landfill - see above for corrective action. The WOC visited the complainant and explained action taken. The complainant was accepting but not particularly satisfied with the advice.
- 12/11/10 - 3.38pm - Junee Crt - Landfill odour - The deodoriser systems had been on since lunch time. Deodoriser was also spread over the water near the tip face and efforts continued to fill that area as fast as possible. It was suspected the odour was a result of the change to hot weather and the fact the refuse is getting closer to the top of the batter. The cell filling activities were also rearranged to cover a particularly smelly section with the inert refuse which should aid the situation.
- 15/11/10 - 10.16am - Tarango Place - Landfill odour - At 10.30am the Grounds staff checked the residential area and said there was a smell. The deodorising system in 2C was then activated. The system in the nearer stage 2F was not operational. The wet tipping area was almost completely covered and the active tipping face was kept to a minimum. At 12.30pm the Environmental and Risk Management Co-ordinator (ERMC) investigated and could not detect any significant odours in Tarango Pl (neither the landfill nor the deodorising system). Only the deodorising system could be detected in St James Cct. The ERMC phoned the complainant back at approx. 3pm and explained the action being taken, however he was generally dissatisfied.
- 16/11/10 - 11.50am - Tarrango Place - Landfill odour - at 12.30pm the ERMC investigated and confirmed a strong odour from the landfill. The deodorising system in stage 2C was activated. The system in the nearer stage 2F was not operational. The wet tipping area was almost completely covered and the active tipping face was kept to a minimum. The ERMC phoned the complainant back at 12.45pm and explained the action being taken. The complainant was not happy but understood that action was being taken to address the problems.
- 16/11/10 - 11.48am - Junee Court - Landfill odour - Same response as above. Resident was contacted at 12.50pm and advised of action being taken.
- 30/11/10 - 12.30pm - Colombard Pl - Landfill odour both today and yesterday - The deodorising systems in 2C & 2F were immediately activated. The ERMC investigated at 12.30pm and confirmed a moderate odour from the landfill present. The active tipping face was kept to a minimum and the wet weather area was completely covered. The ERMC spoke with the complainant at approximately 12.45pm and explained the action being taken. The resident seemed satisfied with the information provided.
- 29/12/10 - 12.30pm - Berkley Drive - Landfill odour - The odour was confirmed and the odour control system was deployed.
- 30/12/10 - 12.35pm - St James Cct - Landfill odour - The odour was confirmed and the odour control system was deployed.

- 18/01/11 - 9.48pm - Mrs Flanigan - Sharni Court - Landfill odour - No action was taken due to the time of the complaint and distance of the complainant from the landfill.
- 31/01/11 - 4.25pm - Peter Sams - 25 Volstead Road - Landfill odour - The odour control system was activated.

J A Lee asked for contact details to lodge odour complaints, both during the week and after-hours. B Lee provided the relevant details.

L Miller reported that odours were particularly bad on 26 to 28 February 2011. S Weber added that odours were also bad on 24 February 2011, and during several very recent evenings to the extent that it was waking people up.

J A Lee reported that over recent years they had experienced very occasional odours, but over the last six months it had been common for odours to be experienced for days in a row, to the extent that it was becoming embarrassing.

P Menon then used an aerial photo of the site to demonstrate where landfilling was currently occurring, and the height of the filling, which is contributing to the odours. He also indicated the location of the odour control system for the site, and mentioned that recent checks had revealed that it was not working as it should. Water from sedimentation dams was used for the spray in order to conserve reticulated water, but this was resulting in clogging of some of the spray nozzles.

S Weber asked if use of the dam water would be contributing to the odour, and P Menon advised that it would not. She sought confirmation that contaminated water from the buried wastes would not be entering the dams, and P Menon provided that.

S Weber also asked about the capacity of the water tank as she'd been told by the LWS On-Call Officer that it would only run till 9.00pm. P Menon advised that it was more a question of the pump running out of petrol than the tank running out of water, and his understanding was that it should run till 10.00pm if fully loaded at 4.00pm each day. He also advised that refueling of the pump at night was not possible because of safety concerns resulting from the location of the system.

S Weber asked if it would be possible to improve the performance of the system.

**Action: LWS to investigate improved performance of the odour control system through:**

- ***Replacement of blocked nozzles; and***
- ***Checking capacity of water tank; and***
- ***Increasing fuel capacity to allow longer running time.***

J A Lee expressed surprise at the low number of complaints. Further discussion followed on how the odour monitor system worked and S Weber volunteered to take part.

**Action: LWS to ensure S Weber is provided with Odour Survey Forms.**

J A Lee asked if more cover over the landfilled waste would help reduce odours. P Menon replied that 30 cm should be enough.

P Menon also mentioned that a number of odour complaints made about the landfill had been traced back to poultry farms near Green Road. Community representatives were skeptical that poultry farms could be affecting their homes given their proximity to the landfill.

S Weber asked about the development of future landfill cells on the site and these were demonstrated by P Menon.

J A Lee acknowledged that a good job had been done on odour control in the past but given recent odours residents now feel they need to know what action is being taken in this regard.

S Weber asked about LWS's relationship with the EPA as her husband is considering making a complaint to them. P Menon advised that the EPA is now known as the Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) and that they are the State Government Department who issue a licence for and regulate the landfill.

L Boyd advised she has not recently experienced any odour at her residence.

S Weber asked how wind direction is monitored at the landfill. P Menon advised that a weather station is used.

S Weber asked if the odour control sprayer could be automated, so that it activated when the wind blew in a particular direction. P Menon advised that this had been looked at but there had been some technical difficulties. In addition, he wanted staff to remain mindful of the issue and was concerned that an automated system could result in complacency.

S Weber expressed a view that more money should be spent on odour control rather than ibis control. P Menon advised that the landfill licence requires LWS to take action to control bird numbers on the site.

### 3.2 Environmental Performance

B Lee advised that, apart from odour complaints, there were no other significant environmental complaints or incidents recorded at the Browns Plains Landfill during the period of November 2010 to January 2011.

### 3.3 Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DERM)

There was no contact with DERM officers during the period of November 2010 to January 2011.

### 3.4 Ibis Update

There were no complaints received regarding ibis during the period of November 2010 to January 2011. Numbers of ibis recorded at the site were as follows:

2010	Tip Face	Tip Face Surrounds	Trees	Dam and Other Places	Total
June	1280	580	160		<b>2020</b>
	770	430	800		<b>2000</b>
	850	200	900		<b>1950</b>
	830	610	700		<b>2140</b>
July	300	0	500		<b>800</b>
	0	0	600		<b>600</b>
	0		850		<b>850</b>
	120	30	530		<b>680</b>
August	Not available - records were in a vehicle that was stolen				
September	Average of daily count recorded by contractor (Nature Call)				<b>276</b>
October - average of daily count recorded by contractor (Nature Call)	145	80	101		<b>326</b>
November - average of daily count recorded by contractor (Nature					<b>130</b>

<b>2010</b>	<b>Tip Face</b>	<b>Tip Face Surrounds</b>	<b>Trees</b>	<b>Dam and Other Places</b>	<b>Total</b>
Call)					
December - average of daily count recorded by contractor (Nature Call)					<b>149</b>
January - average of daily count recorded by contractor (Nature Call)					<b>150</b>

B Lee reported that the ibis control program, which commenced on the site in early-July 2010 appears to be continuing to be very effective in reducing ibis numbers on the landfill site. While there were up to 2,000 birds on site in June 2010, these numbers have dropped to around 150 in December and January.

One of the attendees who accompanied a Community Representative commented on the control measure that sounded like a "bomb going off", and the fact that it was disturbing.

***Action:*** LWS to request that the ibis control contractor limit use of "bomb" control measure.

### **3.5 Fire Ant Update**

P Menon reported on ongoing discussions with Biosecurity Queensland (BQ) officers in relation to greenwaste movements from the Browns Plains Landfill as a result of the site being in an area that was declared part of the Fire Ant Restricted Area in April 2010.

A number of meetings were held with BQ throughout November and December 2010. The purpose of the meeting was to come up with an option to allow material to be moved off-site from Browns Plains. It was considered that a possible process could entail:

- Unprocessed greenwaste to be stockpiled in windrows.
- After a minimum of seven days lures would be placed at intervals around the perimeter of the windrow and checked for ants within an hour.
- If ants are present on the lures, they must be sent to BQ for identification
- If there are no fire ants among the ants trapped, the greenwaste could then be ground on-site and removed to a composting facility.
- Greenwaste (intended for processing elsewhere) to remain on site no longer than 28 days.
- If fire ants are detected at the lures - the material would have to remain on-site until treatment got rid of the infestation - or - the material could be ground and left on-site.

A new Fire Ant Approved Risk Management Plan based on the process described above was issued to LWS on 24 December 2010. The first round of luring windrows was successfully completed in late-December 2010.

As anticipated, none of the luring has revealed the presence of fire ants and material again commenced moving off-site from early-January 2011.

### **3.6 Invitations to Odour Complainants**

At the Group's September 2009 meeting it was recommended that Council direction be sought on the proposal to send landfill odour complainants an invitation to join the Group. The matter was considered by Council at its meeting of 27 October 2009 when it resolved that written invitations to join the Group be sent to residents who make odour complaints about the landfill.

There were 12 complaints made during the November 2010 to January 2011 period. Invitations were issued to all but two of the complainants because in those cases:

- The address was not fully recorded; and
- The complainant was already a member of the Group.

It was noted that many of the invitees had accepted the invitations.

#### **4.0 GENERAL BUSINESS**

##### **4.1 Exit From Site**

S Weber commented that vehicles turning right when exiting the landfill sometimes cause a safety hazard for motorists travelling along Browns Plains Road. P Menon advised that the right-hand turn is blocked when there a major events at the Indoor Centre, but that has been the only occasions.

##### **4.2 Site Entrance**

J A Lee said residents had heard that there was a possibility of the site entrance being moved to Bayliss Road. P Menon advised that the option had been considered in the past but there were currently no plans to do so.

#### **5.0 CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING**

The meeting closed at 3.30pm. The next meeting of the Group is due in June 2011. A date and time will be advised in due course.