

PLANTAGENET LOCATION 5633, WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITY

1732. Hon. M.G. House to the Minister for the Environment and Heritage

- (1) With regard to the proposed septate disposal facility on Plantagenet Location 5633, has the Water Corporation's application been referred to all relevant Government departments for comment and approval?
- (2) Was the information advertised by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and the Water Corporation different in both design and location to that which is now being advertised by the City of Albany?
- (3) If so, will this be treated as a new application and so be referred to the DEP and readvertised by the DEP for public comment?
- (4) Will the Minister confirm whether consulting engineers, Halpern, Glick and Mounsell Pty Ltd, or Sinclair, Knight and Herz Pty Ltd, completed the design drawings?
- (5) Will the Minister confirm whether soils tests have been carried out on the site?
- (6) If so, why were the soil test results not included in the proposal submission that went to the EPA?
- (7) As the area for the treatment site has a Seven Mile Creek tributary coming directly from it, as indicated on the consultant's Plan GD03-1-1, will an HDPE liner be added to the Facultative Dam?
- (8) Has approval been given by the EPA and the Department of Agriculture for the removal of remnant vegetation?
- (9) Will the hydraulic and nutrient capacity of the existing treatment system at Plantagenet Location 5633 be exceeded by 2002/3?
- (10) Will the expected additional nutrient load breach the ministerial commitment given by the Water Corporation in its PER on the tree farm at Location 5633 to the EPA?
- (11) Has a detailed cost analysis study been undertaken that compares the costs of this proposal to other services being offered by the private sector in the area?
- (12) Has odour modelling for this project been done that takes into account the expected volume of waste to be available for the plant and the fact that approval has been granted for a liquid waste disposal facility on the adjoining property?
- (13) As the No 2 Treatment Plant at Timewell Road has not been upgraded as the PER specified it should be, what is the waste water quality from the Timewell Road plant with regards to -
  - (a) BOD;
  - (b) Suspended Solids;
  - (c) TDS;
  - (d) total Nitrogen;
  - (e) phosphorous; and
  - (f) pH?

Dr EDWARDS replied:

- (1) I have been advised that the Water Corporation's proposed septage treatment plant has been referred to the City of Albany, Water and Rivers Commission, Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) and Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).
- (2) No, the Water Corporation has submitted two proposals to the DEP for approval. Both proposals are essentially the same, except that the latter proposal has two large anaerobic treatment ponds instead of four smaller ponds detailed in the original proposal. I have been advised that the Water Corporation proposes to construct the facility with the two larger ponds and this proposal was advertised by the City of Albany.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) The Minister for the Environment and Heritage has been advised that the original design work and drawings were undertaken by Halpern Glick Maunsell Pty Ltd (in the first Works Approval) and were reviewed and revised by Sinclair Knight Merz (in the second Works Approval).
- (5) Yes, soil testing was conducted in October 2001.

- (6) The DEP already had background data on soil characteristics on the site from previous soil testing, conducted as part of the PER for the woodlot. The DEP also specified soil criteria in the Works Approval.
- (7) No, a HDPE liner is not required as the quality of clay at the site is suitable for use in lining the facultative pond.
- (8) No, the area of remnant vegetation to be cleared is less than one hectare in size, and specific approval from the EPA and Department of Agriculture is not required.
- (9) Yes - should the Water Corporation take no action to reduce nutrient concentrations, and/or increase the size of the irrigation area.
- (10) It is not expected that the additional nutrient load will breach the Ministerial Commitment in the PER, based on the understanding that the Water Corporation undertakes woodlot area expansion and/or nutrient reduction works at the wastewater treatment and woodlot site.
- (11) No cost survey has been conducted as it not the role of the EPA or DEP to undertake such analysis.
- (12) Yes, odour modelling was conducted as part of the first Works Approval. Due to the separation distance to the northern proposal (at least one kilometre), it is unlikely that either proposal will impact on each other.
- (13) The water quality results from the 2000/2001 annual report for Timewell Road are:
  - (a) BOD in the range 10 – 60 mg/L, with an average of 28 mg/L;
  - (b) Suspended Solids in the range 20 – 75 mg/L, with an average of 48 mg/L;
  - (c) TDS in the range 720 – 990 mg/L, with an average of 890 mg/L;
  - (d) Nitrogen in the range 39 – 70 mg/L, with an average of 52 mg/L;
  - (e) Phosphorus in the range 7.7 - 14 mg/L, with an average of 10.5 mg/L; and
  - (f) pH in the range 7.4 – 7.7, with an average of 7.6.