

# STAFF REPORT

**TO:** Chair and Members Engineering Services  
**FROM:** Utilities Asset Engineer, David Stephenson  
**REFERENCE:** R377  
**DATE:** 12 July 2006  
**SUBJECT:** **MURCHISON LANDFILL DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS**

---

## 1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to inform the Engineering Services Committee of a review of options for the future operation of the Murchison landfill.

## 2 BACKGROUND

Council currently operates a small landfill in Murchison in the floodplain of the Matakītaki River, immediately south of Murchison.

At present the site does not have a resource consent for landfill operations, although it is designated in the TRMP as an operational landfill. An application for resource consent for the site is scheduled in the Refuse Activity Management Plan for the current year.

Method 62 of the Waste Management Plan identifies that Council should investigate closure options and alternative disposal measures for the Murchison community. In accordance with this, and in preparation for a consent application should it proceed, alternative disposal options are being investigated by Council staff.

## 3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED TO DATE

To date, the following options have been considered:

- Apply for a resource consent to operate the landfill long-term and continue operations as at present.
- Apply for a short-term resource consent to operate the landfill, with a view to closing the landfill and developing a transfer station on site in the next two to four years, with waste transported to the Eves Valley landfill.
- Close the landfill in the very near future and develop a transfer station on site. Apply for resource consent for the closed landfill and transfer station operations.

Preliminary capital and operating costs for each of these options have been estimated for the purpose of comparison.

### 3.1 Capital costs

Capital costs of \$392,000 have been budgeted for the upcoming 10-year period at the Murchison site.

Of these costs, \$176,000 has been budgeted for the development of new landfill cells, \$60,000 for resource consenting and the remaining \$156,000 for general site improvements.

New cell development at the landfill usually occurs every 18 months to two years, and costs in the order of \$35,000 for each cell. The current cell has a remaining life of approximately four months and the next cell will also require the existing leachate pump to be moved.

A preliminary estimate indicates a cost in the order \$120,000 for a basic transfer station facility at Murchison, excluding the site improvements already budgeted for above. This indicates a potential capital saving of \$56,000 if a transfer station is developed in the 2006/2007 year, or a saving of approximately \$21,000 if the transfer station development is deferred to the 2008/09 year.

### 3.2 Consenting costs

A budget of \$60,000 has been allowed for the preparation of resource consent application for the existing site. This figure assumes a relatively straight forward application process, and does not allow for the additional costs of a resource consent hearing or of an appeal.

Consent for ongoing operation of the landfill at the current site is by no means assured, and the risk (and cost) of consenting a closed landfill and transfer station are considered to be considerably lower.

### 3.3 Operational costs

Preliminary indications are that a transfer station operation on site would net operational savings in the order of \$9,000 per annum, but that these savings are likely to be largely absorbed by transport and disposal costs for disposing of the waste at Eves Valley.

	<b>Existing landfill operation per annum</b>	<b>Transfer station operation per annum</b>
Site operations and maintenance	\$44,700	\$35,500
Transport and disposal costs	-	\$8,500
Total operations and maintenance	\$44,700	\$44,000

### **3 ON-GOING WORK**

Council staff and consultants over the next six weeks will be further investigating the capital and operational costs of a transfer station development. As part of this evaluation the existing Murchison landfill contractor (Fulton Hogan) and the Council haulage contractor (Sicon) will be approached to provide costings for potential transfer station and haulage operations.

### **4 RECOMMENDATIONS**

**THAT the report be received.**

David Stephenson  
**Utilities Asset Engineer**