

# MEMO

**TO:** Board of Directors **FROM:** Dara Lynott  
**CC:** **DATE:** 10 March 2003

**SUBJECT :** Technical Committee Report on objections to the Proposed Decision on Waste Application Register No. 53-2 Noble Waste Disposal Limited

## Application details

Applicant:	Noble Waste Disposal Limited
Location of Activity:	Fassaroe, Bray, Co. Wicklow
Reg. No.:	53-2
Licensed Activities under Waste Management Act 1996:	Third Schedule: Classes 11, 12, 13 Fourth Schedule: Classes 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13
Proposed Decision issued on:	12/12/02
Objections received:	Mr. Jim O Callaghan, on behalf of the applicant (08/01/03)
Submissions on objections received:	None
Inspector:	Breege Rooney

## Consideration of the objections and submissions on objections

The Technical Committee (TC) Dara Lynott (Chairperson), Malcolm Doak and Helen Maher met on 26/02/03 to consider all of the issues raised in the objections. This report details the Committee's comments and recommendations following the examination of the objections received.

The Committee determined, following their assessment, that the Conditions of the Proposed Decision adequately address a number of the questions raised. However where, in the opinion of the Committee, objections have not been addressed satisfactorily by the Proposed Decision the proposed amendments have been detailed below.

## OBJECTIONS

### **Objection Number 1 From Mr. Jim O Callaghan (on behalf of the applicant)**

*Objection 1, Item 1 – The operation of the facility is unduly restricted (Conditions 1.6.1, 1.6.2 and 1.6.3)*

#### **Technical Committee's Evaluation**

The Objector states that at the time of the application the compost trial was described as being limited in terms of quantities and operating periods. On the basis of the information submitted the requirements for the Composting trial were specified in

Condition 5.4.1.1 of the Proposed Decision and the trial was limited to 2,000tpa. With regard to the specific objection to Condition 1.6 the Technical committee was of the view that the hours of operation are adequate for the scale of compost trial detailed in the application.

No details of any compost trials have been submitted to the Agency; however on page 10 of the objection it is stated that up to 10,000tpa will be composted in the future. It is the view of the Technical Committee that a composting operation of this scale was not outlined in the application and that such a scale of operation would require a further review application. In the course of that application the hours of operation could be reviewed.

***Recommendation***

*No change*

***Objection 1, Item 2*** – *That the presence of carbon dioxide in the monitoring boreholes above the trigger levels not be classified as an incident.(Condition 1.7.d, 6.3.1)*

**Technical Committee’s Evaluation**

It was noted by the Technical Committee that Condition 6.3.1 related to carbon dioxide levels in service ducts and manholes and not to boreholes. This is primarily a safety issue for personnel working in these areas and not an environmental one. It is a standard condition in waste licences.

**Recommendation**

*No change*

***Objection 1, Item 3*** – *EMS should be updated and not redrafted as this is an existing licensed facility.(Condition 2.3.1)*

**Technical Committee’s Evaluation**

The Committee agreed with this assertion that the site management structure will not require “establishment” but rather just an update of existing structures.

***Recommendation***

**Amend the existing Condition 2.3.1 to delete the words “establish and”**

***Objection 1, Item 4*** – *Objects to the requirement to provide impermeable handstand in all areas of vehicle movement.(Condition 3.5.2)*

**Technical Committee’s evaluation**

The technical committee agreed that providing handstand for vehicle movement during the restoration of the landfill is impracticable.

***Recommendation***

**Amend the existing Condition 3.5.2 to delete the words  
“All areas with vehicle movement”**

***Objection 1, Item 5 – Remove the provision for a wheel wash.(Condition 3.8.1)***

**Technical Committee’s evaluation**

The Technical Committee considered that due to the extensive restoration programme and associated soil requirements, that a wheelwash is necessary.

***Recommendation***

*No change*

***Objection 1, Item 6 – Remove the requirement to install additional landfill gas monitoring wells.(Condition 3.17.1.1)***

**Technical Committee’s Evaluation**

The technical committee determined that the facility had a number of locations where coverage of gas monitoring wells was not sufficient to allow for a satisfactory assessment of landfill gas migration. It was also deemed necessary to install the additional 5 wells to adequately characterise landfill gas in the post closure phase. The information collected will be required to determine the most appropriate restoration and aftercare programme.

***Recommendation***

*No change*

***Objection 1, Item 7 - Remove the requirement to install one additional leachate monitoring well.(Condition 3.17.3)***

**Technical Committee’s Evaluation**

The Technical Committee determined that the facility did not have suitable coverage of leachate wells to allow for a satisfactory assessment of leachate generation and migration. The installation of an additional well will assist in characterising leachate in the post closure phase and the effectiveness of the restoration and aftercare programme. The Technical committee also noted that requirement of Condition 3.17.5 to replace damaged or unsuitable wells.

***Recommendation***

*No Change*

**Objection 1, Item 8** - Amend the capping system to reduce the thickness of the top soil and subsoil layers to a minimum of 500mm. (Condition 4.4.2)

**Technical Committee’s Evaluation**

The Technical Committee determined that Condition 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 allow for flexibility in determining the type of capping system. Part (vi) of Condition 4.4.1 allows for recommendations to be made on the final capping following a report on the extent and type of capping already in place.

**Recommendation**

No Change
-----------

**Objection 1, Item 9** – Extend the restoration programme to 5 years.(Condition 4.8)

**Technical Committee’s Evaluation**

The Committee noted that there is no restriction on the licensee in taking in clean material to complete the restoration of the site. It is the committee’s understanding that the Final profile has yet to be agreed and that this will have an impact on the time required to restore the facility. The requirement to restore the site is a consequence of past activities and this should be accomplished within the three-year time frame.

**Recommendation**

No change
-----------

**Objection 1, Item 10** – delete the requirement for waste profiling for civic waste facility users. (Condition 5.2.5)

**Technical Committee’s Evaluation**

The committee agreed that waste profiling is not usually done for private individuals using a civic waste facility.

**Recommendation**

<b>Amend the first sentence of Condition 5.2.5 to read:</b> <i>Other than waste accepted at the civic waste facility, waste shall only be accepted from known customers or new customers subject to initial waste profiling and waste characterisation off-site.</i>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Objection 1, Item 11** - Increase the volume of composting permitted from 2,000 tpa to 10,000 tpa. (Condition 5.4.1.1)

**Technical Committee’s Evaluation**

The requirements for the Composting trial were specified in Condition 5.4.1.1 of the Proposed Decision. These requirements, including a limit of 2,000tpa, were determined on the basis of the information submitted during the application. No details of any composting trials have been submitted to the Agency; however, the objection stated (page 10) that up to 10,000tpa will be composted in the future. It is the view of the Technical Committee that a composting operation of this scale was not described or detailed in the application and that such a scale of operation would require a further review application.

The Technical Committee consider that the final volume to be composted would be dependant on the success of the trial and the restrictions outlined in Schedule A in relation to overall annual tonnage accepted at the facility and the ultimate use of finished compost.

**Recommendation**

**Amend Condition 5.4.1.1 to add the following sentence.**  
*Following completion of the composting trial the licensee shall submit to the Agency for review a report on the outcome of the trial. The report shall include as a minimum the scope of the trial, location, throughput, and the composting system employed.*

**Objection 1, Item 12** - *That the licence limits the potential uses of stabilised waste (compost) by defining such material as a waste and not a product. There is no apparent reason to apply classes to the compost produced at the facility as use of the material is not specified in the PD (Condition 5.4.1.2).*

**Technical Committee’s Evaluation**

The Technical Committee determined that the conditions as written allow for an assessment to be made by the Agency as to the quality of the compost. Schedule F sets out the requirement for compost testing in order to determine the compost quality. Material that meets the standard for Class 1 and Class 11 compost is no longer deemed a waste. However the committee agrees that material that does not meet this standard can be classed a biowaste and can be used for other forms of recovery. The Committee considers that clarification was needed in the requirements for Biowaste.

**Recommendation**

**Amend Condition 5.4.1.2. as follows:**  
 Compost produced by the facility shall be analysed in accordance with the requirements of *Schedule F: Standards for compost quality.*

**Amend Section 2. "Trace Elements" of Schedule F to include an additional column on Stabilised Biowaste as follows:**

Parameter (mg/kg, dry mass)	Compost Quality Standards <small>Note 3</small>	Stabilised Biowaste
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	---------------------

	Class 1	Class 2	
Cadmium (Cd)	0.7	1.5	<b>5</b>
Chromium (Cr)	100	150	<b>600</b>
Copper (Cu)	100	150	<b>600</b>
Mercury (Hg)	0.5	1	<b>5</b>
Nickel (Ni)	50	75	<b>150</b>
Lead (Pb)	100	150	<b>500</b>
Zinc (Zn)	200	400	<b>1500</b>
PolyChlorinated Biphenyls (PCB's)	-	-	<b>0.4</b>
Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH's)	-	-	<b>3</b>
Impurities >2mm <sup>Note 4</sup>	<0.5%	<0.5%	<b>&lt;3%</b>
Gravel and Stones >5mm <sup>Note 4</sup>	<5%	<5%	<b>-</b>

**Objection 1, Item 13** – The PD restricts the type of material that can be used for restoration of the facility by specifying that the recovered material can only come from uncontaminated sources.(Condition 5.4.3.1)

#### Technical Committee's Evaluation

This licence is for a non-hazardous transfer station, the committee notes that Schedule A of the License specifies the type of waste that can be taken into the facility, Schedule A2 requires any waste used for restoration to meet the requirements of the EU Decision on waste acceptance at landfills. The Schedule also allows other wastes to be used for restoration with the agreement of the Agency; however, Condition 5.4.3 would appear to unnecessarily restrict incoming waste in that the material must come from uncontaminated sources off-site without taking into consideration the recovery processes available on-site.

#### Recommendation

**Amend Condition 5.4.3.1 as follows:**

*Delete the last sentence*

**Amend Table A.2 Note 2 as follows:**

*Delete the word "Draft" and replace "1 May 2002" with "December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2002"*

**Objection 1, Item 14** - The installation of Dust Curtains is impracticable and suggest evaluating the need for them after the transfer of waste processes indoors.(Condition 7.4.3.1)

#### Technical Committee's evaluation

The Technical Committee agreed that it would be useful to evaluate the need for Dust Curtains after the completion of other Dust Control measures.

***Recommendation***

**Replace Condition 7.4.3.1. with the following:**

All doors in the waste transfer building shall be kept closed where possible.

**Insert new Condition 7.4.4**

An evaluation of the dust control measures implemented shall be completed and submitted as part of the AER.

**Amend Schedule G to add the following report**

Dust Control Measures Evaluation Report

*Objection 1, Item 15 – PD should allow for the revision of monitoring frequencies based on monitoring data.*

**Technical Committee’s evaluation**

The Technical committee noted that Condition 8.2 allows for such revision.

***Recommendation***

No change.

*Objection 1, Item 16 - The requirement to provide an alternative water supply based solely of 3<sup>rd</sup> party results is unreasonable.(Condition 9.4.4)*

**Technical Committee’s Evaluation**

According to the application there are no residents in the vicinity of the facility who use private wells. In view of this the Technical committee considered that the condition was not required.

***Recommendation***

**Delete Condition 9.4.4 and renumber subsequent conditions.**

Signed:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dara Lynott  
Technical Committee Chairperson