Government of **Western Australia**
Department of **Environment Regulation**

Annual Audit Compliance Report Form

Environmental Protection Act 1986, Part V

Section A – Licence Details			
Licence number:	L4201/1991/11	Licence file number:	DEC6295
Licence holder:	Water Corporation		
Trading as:	Woodman Point Wastewater Treatment Plant		
ABN:	28 003 434 917		
Registered address:	629 Newcastle Street, LEEDERVILLE, WA 6007		
Reporting period:	01 / 07 / 2017 **to** 30 / 06 / 2018		

Section B – Statement of Compliance with Licence Conditions

Did you comply with all of your licence conditions during the reporting period?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☐Yes – please complete:

- section C;
- section D if required; and
- sign the declaration in Section F.

☒No – please complete:

- section C;
- section D if required;
- section E; and
- sign the declaration at Section F.

Section C – Statement of Actual Production

Provide the actual production quantity for this reporting period. Supporting documentation is to be attached.

Prescribed Premises Category	**Actual Production Quantity**
54: Sewage facility	142,636 m^3/d (details in Annual Environmental Report)
61: Liquid waste facility	9,722 tonnes (as above)

Section D – Statement of Actual Part 2 Waste Discharge Quantity

Provide the actual Part 2 waste discharge quantity for this reporting period. Supporting documentation is to be attached.

Prescribed Premises Category	**Actual Part 2 Waste Discharge Quantity**

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	1.3.5	Date(s) of non-compliance:	01/09/2017
Details of non-compliance:			
H2S sensor reading >1,500ppb.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance? **NOTE** – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
There was no environmental impact.			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
H2S measuring instrumentation faulted at the Tanker Receival Facility, which triggered the sensor to register a reading of 1,500ppb. The reason for such a setting is because the readings at and above 1500 ppb will generate an audible alarm which will trigger the maintenance team to perform immediate investigation. The H2S sensor defaults to a reading of >1,500ppb when there's a fault with the H2S measuring device. On 01/09/2017, the chemical scrubber in the TRF was fully operational. The chemical pumps and the odour extractions fans were working. As such, there was no exceedance in H2S released to the environment.			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
An electrician inspected the sensor and repaired the fault confirming that it was an instrument issue and not an increase in discharge. It was found that a moisture filter was clogged. The filter unit has been taken out and serviced. New filter shall be ordered for replacement.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
☒ Yes, and			
☐ Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
☒ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 04 / 09 /2017	

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	1.3.5	Date(s) of non-compliance:	05/12/2017
Details of non-compliance:			
H2S sensor reading >1,500ppb.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance? **NOTE** – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
There was no environmental impact.			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
The sodium hypochlorite tanks went on low level and as a result the hypochlorite pumps were disabled. Due to this there was hydrogen sulphide that exited the stack for an extended period with no hypochlorite dosing.			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
Received delivery of chemical and chemical dosing operations returned to normal and the H2S concentrations exiting the discharge stack immediately dropped to near zero.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
☒ Yes, and			
☐ Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
☒ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 07 / 12 /2017	

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	1.3.5	Date(s) of non-compliance:	06/12/2017
Details of non-compliance:			
H2S sensor reading >1,500ppb.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance? **NOTE** – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
There was no environmental impact.			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
Sodium hypochlorite leak identified and hypochlorite dosing stopped for a period to fix leak. Reinstated and commenced dosing at 2:22pm. During repair and fixing of the pipework there was discharge through the stack of hydrogen sulphide.			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
Once the leak was repaired chemical dosing operations returned to normal and the H2S concentrations exiting the discharge stack immediately dropped to near zero. The performance of the chemical scrubbers was monitored until the operators were satisfied that normal operations had been restored.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
☒ Yes, and			
☐ Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
☒ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 07 / 12 /2017	

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	1.3.5	Date(s) of non-compliance:	07/12/2017
Details of non-compliance:			
H2S sensor reading >1,500ppb.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance? **NOTE** – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
There was no environmental impact.			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
There was an electrical fault at the WWTP which resulted in the aerators at the SBR not operating. When the aeration at the SBR was reinstatement there was a large amount of foul air extracted from the SBR bioselectors which resulted in a surge of H2S in the chemical scrubbers.			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
Operations continued to run as normal and additional sodium hypochlorite was dosed to reduce the H2S concentrations. Levels returned to normal after 18 minutes. The performance of the chemical scrubbers was monitored until the operators were satisfied that normal operations had been restored.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
☒ Yes, and			
☐ Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
☒ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 08 / 12 /2017	

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	1.3.5	Date(s) of non-compliance:	02/02/2018
Details of non-compliance:			
H2S sensor reading >1,500ppb.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance? **NOTE** – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
There was no environmental impact.			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
The cause was a pipework leak on the Train 2 secondary chemical scrubber.			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
The pipework was repaired and once dosing recommenced the H2S levels returned to normal. The performance of the chemical scrubber was monitored until the operators were satisfied that normal operations had been restored.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
☒ Yes, and			
☐ Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
☒ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 03 / 02 /2018	

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	1.3.5	Date(s) of non-compliance:	04/02/2018
Details of non-compliance:			
H2S sensor reading >1,500ppb.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance? **NOTE** – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
There was no environmental impact.			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
The cause was a fault at the sodium hypochlorite pump which prevented them from starting.			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
The duty pump was turned on and the H2S level returned to normal. The performance of the chemical scrubber was monitored until the operators were satisfied that normal operations had been restored.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
☒ Yes, and			
☐ Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
☒ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 07 / 02 /2018	

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	1.3.5	Date(s) of non-compliance:	05/02/2018
Details of non-compliance:			
H2S sensor reading >1,500ppb.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance? **NOTE** – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
There was no environmental impact.			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
The cause was a fault at the sodium hypochlorite pump which prevent them from starting.			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
The duty pump was turned on and the H2S level returned to normal. The performance of the chemical scrubber was monitored until the operators were satisfied that normal operations had been restored.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
☒ Yes, and			
☐ Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
☒ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 07 / 02 /2018	

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	1.3.5	Date(s) of non-compliance:	07/03/2018
Details of non-compliance:			
H2S sensor reading >1,500ppb.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance? **NOTE** – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
There was no environmental impact.			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
The cause was a potable water shutdown at the plant, which meant the chemical scrubbers lost water for a period of time.			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
The water supply was returned to the chemical scrubbers and the H2S levels returned to normal. The performance of the chemical scrubber was monitored until the operators were satisfied that normal operations had been restored.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
☒ Yes, and			
☐ Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
☒ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 08 / 02 /2018	

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	1.3.5	Date(s) of non-compliance:	14/03/2018
Details of non-compliance:			
H2S sensor reading >1,500ppb.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance? **NOTE** – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
There was no environmental impact.			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
This was caused by citric acid cleaning of the two (2) secondary chemical scrubbers. The cleaning was required due to a build-up of material on the tellerites and to complete the works the chemical dosing pumps (caustic and hypochlorite) were isolated and not running.			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
Cleaning of the secondary scrubber is part of standard operational maintenance and once completed, all pumps and valves were de-isolated so dosing could recommence and normal operation resume. The H2S levels then returned to normal. The performance of the chemical scrubber was monitored until the operators were satisfied that normal operations had been restored.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
☒ Yes, and			
☐ Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
☒ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 07 / 02 /2018	

Section F – Declaration

I/We declare that the information in this Annual Audit Compliance Report is true and correct and is not false or misleading in a material particular[1]. I/We consent to the Annual Audit Compliance Report being published on the Department of Environment Regulation's (DER) website.			
Signature[2]:	[redacted]	Signature:	
Name: (printed)	Mark Leathersich	Name: (printed)	
Position:	General Manager Operations	Position:	
Date:	9/8/17	Date:	
Seal (if signing under seal):			

[1] It is an offence under section 112 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* for a person to give information on this form that to their knowledge is false or misleading in a material particular.

[2] AACRs can only be signed by the licence holder or an authorised person with the legal authority to sign on behalf of the licence holder.