Final Report





AUSTRALIAN MEAT PROCESSOR CORPORATION

Biogas Quality Study Research Project

| Project code: | A.ENV.0093 |
|-----------------|--|
| Prepared by: | Michael Assal (Engineer), Terry Schulz (Managing Director) The Odour Unit Pty Ltd |
| Date Submitted: | 20 August 2013 |
| Published by: | Meat & Livestock Australia Limited |







Final report

| Project code: | A.ENV.0093 |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Prepared by: | Michael Assal (Engineer) |
| | Terry Schulz (Managing Director) |
| | The Odour Unit Pty Ltd |
| Date submitted: | 20 August 2013 |
| | |

PUBLISHED BY Meat & Livestock Australia Limited Locked Bag 991 NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059

Biogas Quality Study Research Project

Meat & Livestock Australia acknowledges the matching funds provided by the Australian Government and contributions from the Australian Meat Processor Corporation to support the research and development detailed in this publication.

This publication is published by Meat & Livestock Australia Limited ABN 39 081 678 364 (MLA). Care is taken to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this publication. However MLA cannot accept responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of the information or opinions contained in the publication. You should make your own enquiries before making decisions concerning your interests. Reproduction in whole or in part of this publication is prohibited without prior written consent of MLA.

Executive Summary

This research project study report presents the findings from sampling and testing at three Australian red meat processing plants located in regional New South Wales (NSW) and South Australia (SA). The objective of the study was to evaluate the quantity, quality and purity of biogas production from a typical Covered Anaerobic Lagoon (CAL) system used in the Australian red meat processing industry.

Biogas production and quality

The study determined biogas production and quality on the basis of organic content removed in the CAL system (i.e. m³ biogas/kg Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) removed). The biogas conversion rates as a function of COD removed at each abattoir, including methane composition of the biogas, is shown in **Table A**.

| Table A - Biogas conversion rates as a function of COD removed | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| Parameter | Unit | Abattoir A | Abattoir B | Abattoir C | | | | |
| Methane composition in biogas | % | 65.3 | 68.4 | 63.0 | | | | |
| Biogas conversion rate | m₃/kg COD removed | 0.654 | 0.625 | 0.219 | | | | |
| Methane conversion rate | m₃ CH₄/kg COD removed | 0.375 | 0.428 | 0.138 | | | | |

The range of biogas conversion across all the sampled abattoirs was from 0.219 to 0.654 m³ biogas/ kg COD removed, equivalent to a methane conversion rate from 0.138 to 0.428 m³ CH₄/ kg COD removed, based on a methane composition range from 63 to 68.4% respectively. Other gas species measured in the biogas at significant quantities are summarised in **Table B**.

| Table B – Gas composition of biogas across the study | | | | | |
|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Chemical Parameter | Content | | | | |
| Methane (CH ₄) | 51-83% | | | | |
| Carbon dioxide (CO ₂) | 17-33% | | | | |
| Oxygen (O ₂) | < 0.2 - 3.8% | | | | |
| Hydrogen Sulphide (H ₂ S) | 0.074 - 0.41%^ | | | | |
| Balance Gases (Nitrogen (N ₂) and Argon (Ar)) | 0.8-17.5% | | | | |

^ see comment in Table 5.2

The primary constituents in the biogas across all three abattoirs in this study were methane and carbon dioxide, with a mean values across the study of 64.4% and 25.7% respectively. Oxygen

and balance gases (nitrogen and argon) were also found to be in non-trace quantities, with a mean value across the study of 0.91% and 7.1 % respectively. Balance gases were not directly analysed in this study. It can be seen that Abattoirs A & B CAL systems produced similar results in terms of biogas production and quality, whereas the Abattoir C CAL system produced similar quality biogas at a lower conversion rate. This was possibly due to difficulties in commissioning the CAL system. Based on a limited published literature review, these results (with the exception of Abattoir C) seem to be within reasonable expectations and comparable to other industries that generate biogas from wastewater streams using anaerobic treatment.

Trace quantities of other gas species were measured in the biogas, with a majority below the detectable limit of the measurement/analysis technique used for testing. The trace gas species included ammonia, $N_xO \& NO_x$, carbon monoxide, volatile fatty acids, sulphides (predominately hydrogen sulphide) and siloxanes. Moisture in the biogas was also present as both water vapour and water droplets, indicating that the biogas stream was saturated. Of particular interest is hydrogen sulphide and its prevalence in significant trace concentrations in the biogas ranging from 737 to 4,050 ppm across the three abattoirs. The global mean for hydrogen sulphide in this study was 1,630 ppm.

CAL Commissioning and steady state conditions

Based on advice provided to The Odour Unit from abattoir personnel, biogas generation was observed at each abattoir within three months after commissioning of the CAL system. During and after this period of time, biogas volume and quality (such as methane content) can vary. This study found that after three months from the commissioning date the CAL system at each abattoir was producing biogas that consisted of methane levels greater than 50%. Further advice from abattoir personnel after the completion of the sampling run in this study revealed that a more consistent volume and methane-rich biogas production was possible once the CAL systems achieved steady state conditions.

Biogas suitability for energy recovery

This study has found that the biogas produced from the CAL systems is suitable for energy recovery applications. However the need for the removal of hydrogen sulphide from the biogas needs to be considered and is the subject of separate MLA report (A.ENV.0098) prepared concurrently with this project.

CONTENTS

| Executiv | /e Summary | 2 |
|----------|---|----|
| 1 | Background | 7 |
| 1.1 | Scope of study | 8 |
| 2 | Project objectives | 9 |
| 3 | Study Methodology | 10 |
| 3.1 | CAL sampling conditions | |
| 3.2 | Wastewater sampling | 11 |
| 3.2.1 | Abattoir A | 11 |
| 3.2.2 | Abattoir B | 13 |
| 3.2.3 | Abattoir C | 15 |
| 3.3 | Wastewater Testing | 17 |
| 3.3.1 | Chemical Oxygen Demand | 17 |
| 3.3.2 | Biochemical Oxygen Demand | |
| 3.3.3 | Suspended Solids | |
| 3.3.4 | Volatile Suspended Solids | |
| 3.4 | Biogas Sampling and Testing | |
| 3.4.1 | Biogas | |
| 3.5 | CAL system commissioning and sampling dates | |
| 4 | Results | 21 |
| 4.1 | Result calculations | 21 |
| 4.1.1 | COD Removal | 21 |
| 4.1.2 | Biogas Quantity | 21 |
| 4.1.3 | Biogas Moisture | 21 |
| 4.2 | Abattoir A Results | |
| 4.2.1 | Comments on results | 25 |
| 4.3 | Abattoir B Results | |

| 4.3.1 | Comments on results | |
|-------|--|----|
| 4.4 | Abattoir C Results | 31 |
| 4.4.1 | Comments on results | 34 |
| 5 | Discussion | 35 |
| 5.1 | Biogas conversion rate | 35 |
| 5.2 | Biogas quality | 36 |
| 5.3 | Biogas quantity | 37 |
| 5.4 | CAL system commissioning and steady state conditions | 37 |
| 5.5 | Suitability for energy recovery | 37 |
| 6 | References | 39 |
| | | |

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Biogas GC Analysis Laboratory Result Sheets

Appendix 2 – Wastewater Analysis Laboratory Result Sheets

PHOTOS AND TABLES

PHOTOS

| Photo 3.1 – Flow meter attached to the biogas flare system | 10 |
|---|----|
| Photo 3.10 – Typical biogas flare system | 20 |
| Photo 3.2 – Abattoir A CAL system: Inlet wastewater collection point | 12 |
| Photo 3.3 – Abattoir A CAL system: Outlet wastewater collection point | 13 |
| Photo 3.4 – CAL system at Abattoir B | 14 |
| Photo 3.5 – Abattoir B Inlet wastewater collection point | 14 |
| Photo 3.6 – Abattoir B Outlet wastewater collection point | 15 |
| Photo 3.7- CAL system at Abattoir C | 16 |
| Photo 3.8 – Abattoir C Inlet Wastewater Collection Point | 16 |
| Photo 3.9 – Abattoir C Eastern outlet wastewater collection point indicated | 17 |

TABLES

| Table 3.1 – List of biogas chemical constituents | . 19 |
|---|------|
| Table 3.2 – CAL system commissioning and sampling dates | . 20 |
| Table 4.1 – Abattoir A Wastewater Testing Result: 24 October – 21 November 2011m | . 23 |
| Table 4.2 – Abattoir A Biogas Laboratory Analysis: 24 October – 21 November 2011 | . 23 |
| Table 4.3 – Abattoir A In-situ Biogas Measurements: 24 October – 21 November 2011 | . 24 |
| Table 4.4 – Abattoir A Mean Monthly Biogas Flared 20 September – 22 November 2011 | . 24 |
| Table 4.5 – Abattoir B Wastewater Results 21 March 2012 and 17 April 2012 | . 27 |
| Table 4.6 – Abattoir B Biogas Laboratory Analysis 21 March 2012 and 17 April 2012 | . 28 |
| Table 4.7 – Abattoir B Biogas In-situ Biogas Measurements: 21 March 2012 – 17 April 2012 | . 29 |
| Table 4.8 – Abattoir C Mean Daily Biogas Flared: 16 March 2012 – 17 April 2012 | . 29 |
| Table 4.9 – Abattoir C Wastewater Testing Results 20 March 2013 – 29 May 2013 | . 32 |
| Table 4.10 – Abattoir C Biogas Laboratory Analysis: 20 March 2013 – 29 May 2013 | . 32 |
| Table 4.11 – Abattoir C In-situ Biogas Measurements: 20 March 2013 – 29 May 2013 | . 33 |
| Table 4.12 – Abattoir CMean Daily Biogas Flared 9 May – 21 June 2013 | . 33 |
| Table 5.1 – Biogas conversion rates as a function of COD removed | . 35 |
| Table 5.2 – Composition of biogas across study | . 36 |

1 Background

Australian red meat processing plants generate significant volumes of high strength wastewater as part of their normal operation. This wastewater generally undergoes some form of treatment on-site prior to discharge. There are several conventional strategies available to manage these types of wastewater streams amongst them being anaerobic treatment, widely used as one of the first steps in wastewater treatment. One of the well-known configurations for anaerobic treatment is by the use of covered ponds (or lagoons) commonly referred to as a Covered Anaerobic Lagoon (CAL).

Anaerobic wastewater treatment in CALs involves the breakdown of organic material by acidand methane-forming bacteria in an environment free of oxygen. An effect of this natural process is the generation of a mixture of gaseous species commonly known as biogas. Biogas is primarily composed of methane and carbon dioxide. Other trace gas compounds can include hydrogen sulphide, nitrogen-based compounds (such as ammonia, N_xO & NO_x), carbon monoxide, volatile fatty acids and siloxanes.

In general, biogas cannot be vented to atmosphere as it is highly odorous, a potent greenhouse gas, flammable and potentially toxic to air and the biological environment. As such, biogas is treated and used as a source of energy or is thermally oxidised using a purpose-built flare system.

The quantity and quality of biogas generated are dependent on a number of key factors including but not limited to:

- pH;
- Organic and inorganic content;
- Environmental conditions such as temperature; and
- Available oxygen.

A thorough understanding of biogas composition and quality is an essential element if consideration is given to recovering the biogas for use in downstream processes such as use in boilers and drier systems, cogeneration and trigeneration equipment, and in designing the emergency biogas flare. While there is ample data on biogas quantity and quality from CALs,

there is little public information on the quantity, quality, and purity of biogas liberated from a typical CAL used in the Australian red meat processing industry.

1.1 Scope of study

In order to obtain specific data on the biogas quantity and quality generated from a typical CAL in the Australian red meat processing industry, the scope of this research study involved visiting three separate red meat processing sites, two in New South Wales (NSW) and one in South Australia (SA). For the purposes of this study, the names of the participating abattoirs have been withheld and referred to as follows:

- Abattoir A: Abattoir located in Northern NSW
- Abbatoir B: Abattoir located in Southern NSW
- Abattoir C: Abattoir located in Southern SA

To obtain representative data for the CAL performance, each abattior site was visited on three separate occasions, spaced at least one week apart between each measurement. Each visit involved the collection of gas and wastewater samples from the CALs. These samples were subsequently tested for parameters that are known to be key indicators of biogas and wastewater quality at suitably accrediated laboratories in Sydney, NSW.

2 Project objectives

The objective of the research study was to determine the quantity and quality biogas generated from a typical CAL in red meat industry. To achieve this, the collected measurement and testing results generated in the study were used to derive the biogas production on the basis of Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) removed in the CAL per unit of organic content removed (i.e. m³ biogas/kg COD removed). Based on the derived result, comments were made on the quantity and quality of biogas at the different red meat processing plants, a comparison of this performance to other CALs in different industries, and its suitability for energy recovery strategies.

3 Study Methodology

The sampling and testing methods used in this study, and a brief overview of each sampled abattoir site, has been summarised in the following sections.

3.1 CAL sampling conditions

Currently at each of the participating abattoirs the biogas that is generated by the CALs is directed to a purpose-built flare system. The quantity of biogas generated is measured by an onsite flow meter, attached to the flare system. An example of the flow meter is shown in **Photo 3.1.** The flow meter was used in this study to measure volumetric flow, cumulative flow and temperature of the biogas extracted by the flare system. This was used to determine the quantity of biogas generated for at least a one-month period.



Photo 3.1 – Flow meter attached to the biogas flare system

In general, the CAL systems at each abattoir were found to be performing close to 80% COD removal, indicating that they were at or near a fully-commissioned state. Raw and treated wastewater from the CALs was collected in this study (see **Sections 3.2.1-3.2.3** for details).

3.2 Wastewater sampling

Wastewater samples were collected using suitable bottles supplied by the testing laboratory. The sampling at each site is detailed in the following sections.

3.2.1 Abattoir A

Abattoir A produces a range of meat and rendered products. Overall, this process generates approximately 7 Megalitres (ML) of wastewater per week, over a 5 day production week. The site processes cattle only.

The wastewater treatment flow process can be broken up into three sections as follows:

- 1 Primary treatment by Screening and a Dissolved Air Flotation (DAF) unit;
- 2 Secondary treatment by a single CAL system; and
- 3 Tertiary treatment to remove nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphorous (nitrification and denitrification, and biological phosphorus removal). Clarification is then undertaken to remove suspended solids (Mixed Liquor Suspended Solids) from the treated wastewater.

The final treated effluent is discharged to sewer, used for land application or is recycled

The wastewater received by the CAL system (see **Photo 3.2**) is generated at several upstream areas including holding yards, slaughtering floor, rendering plant, boning room and washing stations. All wastewater from these points converge into a common sump located within the CAL area (refer **Photo 3.3**). This point was considered the 'CAL inlet' sample location. Composite inlet wastewater samples were collected at this point spanning a period of approximately 5 production hours during a slaughtering cycle.

Effluent exiting the CAL system flows into another sump (see **Photo 3.4**) before undergoing further treatment downstream. This exit sump was considered the 'CAL outlet' sample location. Composite outlet wastewater samples were collected at this location spanning a period of approximately 5 production hours, and corresponded with the collection of an inlet wastewater sample.



Photo 3.2 - CAL system at Abattoir A



Photo 3.3 – Abattoir A CAL system: Inlet wastewater collection point



Photo 3.4 - Abattoir A CAL system: Outlet wastewater collection point

3.2.2 Abattoir B

All wastewater generated at Abattoir B is initially treated by a primary wastewater treatment system responsible for removing all solids, before subsequent treatment via the CAL system. This system has two CALs, each with a capacity of 28 ML (see **Photo 3.5**). The site processes cattle.

Wastewater entering the two CALs is received from several upstream areas including the holding yards, slaughtering floor, rendering plant, boning room, and washing stations. All wastewater from these points converge into a common sump located within the CAL area where it bifurcates between the CALs. (see **Photo 3.6**). The common sump is the 'CAL inlet wastewater' sample location. Composite inlet wastewater samples were collected at this point spanning a period of approximately 4 production hours during slaughtering and wash-down cycles.

Effluent exiting the CAL system flows into another sump (refer **Photo 3.7**) before undergoing further treatment in a Biological Nutrient Removal (BNR) pond system. The treated wastewater is then stored in a holding pond before subsequent discharge to sewer, land application or recycling. The sump receiving the wastewater exiting from the CAL was considered the 'CAL outlet wastewater' sample location. Composite outlet wastewater samples were collected at this

location spanning a period of approximately 4 hours during slaughtering and wash-down cycles, and corresponded with the collection of an inlet wastewater sample.



Photo 3.5 - CAL system at Abattoir B



Photo 3.6 - Abattoir B: Inlet wastewater collection point



Photo 3.7 - Abattoir B: Outlet wastewater collection point

3.2.3 Abattoir C

Similar to the other sites, wastewater generated at Abattoir C is received from several upstream areas including the holding yards, slaughtering floor, rendering plant, and washing stations. A contrast however is that Abattoir C process both cattle and sheep whereas the other two abattoirs process cattle only.

All wastewater generated from the process is directed to a tallow recovery plant for removal of solids by screening and secondary tallow recovery. Following this, the effluent is passed through a Dissolved Air Flotation (DAF) unit and then bifurcates into two individual sumps each connected to a CAL with a capacity of 20 ML (see **Photo 3.8**). Both inlet sumps were sampled and this point was termed as the 'inlet wastewater' sample location (see **Photo 3.9**). Composite inlet wastewater samples were collected over a period of approximately 4-5 hours. Both cattle and sheep slaughtering and wash-down cycles for were included in the sampling regime.

The outflows from both CALs are directed to separately connected sumps that exist at the eastern (see **Photo 3.10**) and western quadrants of the CAL area. The streams from both sumps then converge and are pumped off-site for further treatment. Samples were collected at both sumps and considered the 'CAL outlet wastewater' sample location. Composite outlet

wastewater samples were collected at this location and corresponded with the collection of inlet wastewater samples.



Photo 3.8- CAL system at Abattoir C



Photo 3.9 – Abattoir C: Inlet wastewater collection point



Photo 3.10 - Abattoir C: Eastern outlet wastewater collection point indicated

3.3 Wastewater Testing

All collected samples were chilled after collection and transported to MGT Environmental Laboratories, Sydney NSW for testing. The scope for the testing is as follows:

- COD loadings and degree of removal;
- Biochemical Oxygen Demand, over 5 days (BOD₅), loadings and degree of removal;
- Suspended Solids (SS) loadings and degree of removal; and
- Volatile Suspended Solids (VSS) loadings and degree of removal.

Each wastewater testing parameter is briefly described in the following sections.

3.3.1 Chemical Oxygen Demand

The COD of wastewater is the measured amount of oxygen needed to chemically oxidise the organics present. It is considered a critical parameter in determining the performance of the CAL systems at each abattoir in this study.

3.3.2 Biochemical Oxygen Demand

The BOD is the measured amount of oxygen required by acclimated microorganisms to biologically degrade the organic matter in the wastewater.

3.3.3 Suspended Solids

SS is the measure of the quantity of small solid particles that either settle or remain in suspension in the wastewater.

3.3.4 Volatile Suspended Solids

VSS is a measure of the total solids that are oxidised upon ignition.

3.4 Biogas Sampling and Testing

Over the course of this study all biogas generated from the CAL systems at each of the abattoirs are directed to a purpose-built flare system. Where there are two CALs, the biogas is captured and directed to the flare system through a common duct. Each flare system is equipped with a knock-out vessel, designed to minimise entrainment of liquid in the biogas prior to flaring. All gas samples were collected downstream of the knockout vessel in Tedlar ® bags and subsequently transported to SGS Australia Pty Ltd Laboratory in Sydney NSW for gas speciation by Gas Chromatography (GC) analysis. In-situ testing was also carried out using GasTec ® detector tubes over the course of the sampling period. This was mostly important when measuring the hydrogen sulphide content in the biogas as the sample is collected, due to the rapid decay of this compound in storage and transport.

3.4.1 Biogas

As previously mentioned, biogas consists of a mixture of gaseous compounds in a methane and carbon dioxide matrix. Gas speciation was carried out to identify those chemicals species present in the biogas at detectable quantities. A list of the gas compounds tested is shown **Table 3.1.**

Siloxanes concentration analysis was only undertaken for the biogas samples collected at Abattoir C as it was not part of the original scope in this research study, but tested at The Odour Unit's discretion. Siloxanes are found at abattoirs that use anti-foam and other siloxanes-containing agents, but this is understood to be not a common practice. Each abattoir in this study advised that they do not use siloxanes-containing agents.

| Table 3.1 – List of biogas chemical constituents | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Chemical name | Chemical Nomenclature | Comment | | | | | |
| Methane | CH_4 | The fuel used to power the cogeneration equipment. It is a potent greenhouse gas. | | | | | |
| Carbon Dioxide | CO ₂ | Hinders combustion. It is a greenhouse gas. | | | | | |
| Carbon Monoxide | CO | - | | | | | |
| Hydrogen Sulphide | H₂S | Causes corrosion of engine parts | | | | | |
| Sulphur Dioxide | SO_2 | Unlikely to be present alongside H ₂ S | | | | | |
| Oxygen | O ₂ | - | | | | | |
| Ammonia | NH_3 | Indicates poor biogas quality | | | | | |
| Nitric Oxide | NO | - | | | | | |
| Nitrogen Dioxide | NO ₂ | - | | | | | |
| Nitrous Oxide | N ₂ O | - | | | | | |
| Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons (VPH) | - | C_5 - C_{12} aliphatics [^] and C_9 - C_{10} Aromatics [^] | | | | | |
| Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene & Xylene (BTEX) | - | Hinders combustion | | | | | |
| Carbon Monoxide | CO | Assists with combustion | | | | | |
| Volatile Fatty Acids (VFAs) | | A good indicator of biogas condition | | | | | |
| Moisture | H ₂ O | Hinders combustion | | | | | |
| Siloxanes | - | Can cause significant internal damage to engines | | | | | |

Aliphatics - Petroleum hydrocarbons (PHCs) that do not contain benzene rings.
 Aromatics - Petroleum hydrocarbons (PHCs) that contain benzene ring

Each of the flare systems at the abattoirs were designed and constructed by Australian Burner Manufacturers (ABM). An example of a typical flare system setup at the abattoirs is shown in Photo 3.11.



Photo 3.11 - Typical biogas flare system

3.5 CAL system commissioning and sampling dates

The CAL system commissioning and sampling dates are summarised in Table 3.2.

| Table 3.2 – CAL system commissioning and sampling dates | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Site Commissioning date Sampling start date Sampling finis | | | | | | | | |
| Abattoir A | June 2011 | 24 October 2011 | 22 November 2011 | | | | | |
| Abattoir B | 16 January 2012 | 21 March 2012 | 17 April 2012 | | | | | |
| Abattoir C | January 2013 | 20 March 2013 | 29 May 2013 | | | | | |

4 Results

The following sections summarise wastewater and gas testing results across the three abattoirs sampled in this study.

The wastewater testing results are presented in the conventional testing parameters, that is, in milligrams per litre (mg/L). The biogas testing results are presented as follows:

- Part per million by volume;
- 1 % = 10,000 ppm; and
- v/v = volume per volume.

4.1 **Result calculations**

4.1.1 COD Removal

The COD removal efficiency was determined from the inlet and outlet COD concentrations. The mass of COD removed was derived from the wastewater testing results and the total wastewater inflow of the CAL systems over the sampling period. This was expressed as kilograms of COD removed per day by the CAL systems.

4.1.2 Biogas Quantity

The biogas quantity in this study was evaluated by assuming that the cumulative volume of biogas flared represents the biogas generated over a set period of time. This assumption was considered conservative as the flare system only activates once the pressure under the covers of the CALs reach a pressure set point (found to be around 40 Pa). This method was adopted in this study as it is difficult, in practical terms, to determine the true biogas volume generated by the CAL system.

4.1.3 Biogas Moisture

Across the entire study, the exact moisture content of the biogas was difficult to directly measure both in-situ and at the laboratory. This was due to the volatile nature of the biogas and the lack of available intrinsically safe devices to carry this task out. A change in temperature and pressure of the sample bag upon receipt by the laboratory meant the true reading could not be measured. Notwithstanding this, it is reasonable to assume that the moisture levels of the gas stream would have been at saturation level given the prevailing warm and moist conditions inside the CAL and the extended period of gas/water contact. The saturation levels of water in a predominantly methane/carbon dioxide gas will need to be determined independently, if this information is required.

4.2 Abattoir A Results

Abattoir A was sampled between 24 October 2011 and 22 November 2011. **Table 4.1** summarises wastewater testing results, **Table 4.2** summarises biogas GC analysis testing results, **Table 4.3** summarises in-situ gas measurements collected using the on-site flare meter and Gastec ® detector tubes, and **Table 4.4** summarises the mean daily biogas flared at the site over 20 September 2011 to 22 November 2011.

| Table 4.1 – Abattoir A Wastewater Testing Result: 24 October – 21 November 2011 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Sampling Date | ; | 24 October 2011 | | | 8 November 2011 | | | 22 November 2011 | | 2011 |
| Parameter | Unit | CAL Inlet | CAL Outlet | Removal (%) | CAL Inlet | CAL Outlet | Removal (%) | CAL Inlet | CAL Outlet | Removal (%) |
| BOD₅ | mg/L | 2,700 | 980 | 63 | 750 | 330 | 56 | 3,200 | 450 | 86 |
| COD | mg/L | 2,200 | 750 | 66 | 3,200 | 1,300 | 59 | 3,500 | 1,000 | 71 |
| SS | mg/L | 2,000 | 430 | 79 | 1,800 | 700 | 61 | 1,900 | 280 | 85 |
| VSS | mg/L | 2,400 | 370 | 85 | 1,800 | 640 | 64 | 1,800 | 280 | 84 |
| Mean Temperature | O° | 32 | 31 | - | 34 | 31 | - | 32 | 31 | - |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wastewater Inflow | ML/day | | | | | 1.4 | | | | |
| COD Removed | kg/day | | 2,030 | | | 2,660 | | | 3,500 | |

| Table 4.2 – Abattoir A Biogas Laboratory Analysis: 24 October – 21 November 2011 | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| Sampling Date | 24 Oct | t 2011 8 No | | [,] 2011 | 21 Nov | v 2011 | | | |
| Parameter | Result 1 | Result 2 ^ | Result 1 | Result 2 | Result 1 ^ | Result 2 | | | |
| Methane | 63.15% | > 54% | 54.02% | 51.48% | 59.0% | 62.9% | | | |
| Carbon dioxide | 20.70% | > 18% | 27.60% | 27.90% | 28.2% | 32.7% | | | |
| Oxygen | < 0.3% | 3.8% | < 0.3% | < 0.3% | 1.25% | 0.80% | | | |
| Ammonia | < 0.1 ppm | < 0.1 ppm | < 0.1 ppm | < 0.1 ppm | < 0.1 ppm | < 0.1 ppm | | | |
| Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen Dioxide | < 0.5 ppm | < 0.5 ppm | < 0.5 ppm | < 0.5 ppm | < 0.5 ppm | < 0.5 ppm | | | |
| Nitrous Oxide | < 5 ppm | < 5 ppm | < 5 ppm | < 5 ppm | < 5ppm | < 5ppm | | | |
| Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | > 15 ppm v/v | 15 ppm v/v | > 15 ppm v/v | > 15 ppm v/v | > 15 ppm v/v | > 15ppm v/v | | | |
| Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, and Xylene | > 10 ppm | > 10 ppm | > 10 ppm | > 10 ppm | > 10 ppm | > 10 ppm | | | |
| Carbon Monoxide | 20 ppm | 16 ppm | 3 ppm | 3 ppm | 4 ppm | 4 ppm | | | |
| Hydrogen Sulphide | > 860 ppm | > 580 ppm | 1,200 ppm | 1,270 ppm | 1,106 ppm | 1,335 ppm | | | |
| Sulphur Dioxide | < 2ppm | < 1ppm | < 2 ppm | < 2ppm | < 1 ppm | < 1 ppm | | | |
| Total Volatile Fatty Acids | 3.81 ppm | 3.24 ppm | 0.48 ppm | 0.53 ppm | 0.09 ppm | 0.13 ppm | | | |
| Balance Gases (Nitrogen and Argon) | 12.9% | 21.4% | 15.2% | 17.46% | 11.4% | 3.45% | | | |

^ Sample bag suffered a slight leak that may have affected analyte concentration

| Measurement date | 24 00 | 24 Oct 2011 8 Nov 201 | | | 11 21 Nov 2011 | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|--|
| Test Item | Gas Meter | Gastec® Tube | Gas Meter | Gastec® Tube | Gas Meter | Gastec® Tube | |
| Methane | 57.4% | - | 53.8% | | 54.5% | - | |
| Carbon dioxide | - | > 14,000 ppm | - | > 7,100 ppm | | - | |
| Nitrogen Compounds | | | | | | | |
| Ammonia | - | not detectable | - | not detectable | - | not detectable | |
| Hydrogen Sulphide | - | 1,150 ppm 1,050 ppm | - | 920 ppm 940 ppm | - | 1,200 ppm 1,300 ppm | |
| Moisture ^ | assumed saturated | | assumed | saturated | assumed saturated | | |

^ not directly measured. See comment in Section 4.1.3

| Table 4.4 – Abattoir A Mean Monthly Biogas Flared: 20 September – 22 November 2011 | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Date Mean Biogas Flared (m ³ /day) | | | | | | | |
| 20 September – 30 September 2011 | 1,100 | | | | | | |
| 1 October – 31 October 2011 | 1,530 | | | | | | |
| 1 November – 22 November 2011 | 2,980 | | | | | | |
| Global mean | 1,870 | | | | | | |

Courtesy of Abattoir A

4.2.1 Comments on results

Overall, the general findings from wastewater and biogas testing at Abattoir A were as follows:

- The dominant biogas composition was methane, carbon dioxide and balance gases (nitrogen and argon). Methane levels were found to be greater than 60% on two out of the three visits. Of particular interest was the speed at which the methane conversion commenced inside the CAL, with methane production levels of greater than 50% being achieved in the first month (as advised by Abattoir A);
- The significant reduction in COD and BOD levels indicate that the pond was operating well during the sampling period. These levels are likely to further reduce as the pond matures. The peak recorded removal efficiencies across the three visits for COD and BOD were 76% and 81% respectively;
- Hydrogen sulphide levels existed in significant trace quantities, with a peak level measured at 1,335 ppm;
- All other compounds measured in the biogas were found in trace quantities; and
- The mean biogas conversion rate at Abattoir A across all three visits was calculated to be approximately 0.654 m³ biogas/kg COD removed, equivalent to a methane conversion rate (based on a mean methane composition of 65.3%) of approximately 0.375 m³ CH₄/kg COD removed .

4.3 Abattoir B Results

Abattoir B was sampled between 21 March 2012 and 17 April 2012. **Table 4.5** summarises wastewater testing results, **Table 4.6** summarises biogas GC analysis testing results, **Table 4.7** summarises in-situ gas measurements collected using the on-site flare meter and Gastec ® detector tubes, and **Table 4.8** summarises the mean daily biogas flared at the site over 16 March 2012 and 17 April 2012.

| Table 4.5 – Abattoir B Waster | water Result | ts 21 March | 2012 and 1 | 7 April 2012 | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|---------------|------------|------------------------------|-------|------------|------------------------------|---------------|--------|----------------|
| Sampling Date | | 21 March 2012 | | | | 3 April 20 | 12 | 17 April 2012 | | |
| Parameter | Unit | Inlet | Outlet | Removal Efficiency (%) | Inlet | Outlet | Removal Efficiency (%) | Inlet | Outlet | Removal (%) |
| BOD ₅ | mg/L | 3,800 | 630 | 83 | 3,600 | 510 | 86 | 3,000 | 240 | 92 |
| COD | mg/L | 4,400 | 840 | 81 | 3,800 | 910 | 76 | 4,300 | 670 | 84 |
| SS | mg/L | 1,800 | 410 | 77 | 1,600 | 470 | 71 | 2,200 | 330 | 85 |
| VSS | mg/L | 1,800 | 410 | 77 | 1,500 | 420 | 72 | 2,100 | 320 | 85 |
| Mean Temperature (Slaughtering cycle) | °C | 36.2 | 29.0 | - | 34.9 | 29.6 | - | 32.3 | 28.4 | - |
| Mean Temperature (Wash-down cycle) | °C | - | - | - | 29.5 | 29.9 | - | 28.2 | 29.4 | - |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wastewater Inflow | ML/day | 4.5 | | | 4.6 | | | 3.8 | | |
| COD Removed | kg/day | | 16,000 | | | 13,250 | | | 13,730 | |

| Table 4.6 – Abattoir B Biogas Laboratory Analysis 21 March 2012 and 17 April 2012 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| Date | 21 Mar | ch 2012 | 3 Apr | il 2012 | 17 Apr | il 2012 | | | |
| Test Item | Result 1 | Result 2 | Result 1 | Result 2 | Result 1 | Result 2 | | | |
| Methane | 69.22% | 70.10% | 68.28% | 67.16% | 67.3% | 68.3% | | | |
| Carbon dioxide | 25.90% | 26.50% | 24.10% | 24.10% | 23.5% | 24.2% | | | |
| Oxygen | < 0.3% | < 0.3% | < 0.3% | < 0.3% | 1.60% | < 0.2% | | | |
| Ammonia | < 0.1 ppm | < 0.1ppm | < 0.1 ppm | < 0.1 ppm | < 0.1 ppm | < 0.1 ppm | | | |
| Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen Dioxide | < 0.5ppm | < 0.5 ppm | < 0.5 ppm | < 0.5ppm | < 0.5 ppm | < 0.5 ppm | | | |
| Nitrous Oxide | < 5ppm | < 5 ppm | < 5 ppm | < 5 ppm | < 5 ppm | < 5 ppm | | | |
| Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | <15 ppm v/v | < 15 ppm v/v | <15 ppm v/v | < 15 ppm v/v | < 15 ppm v/v | < 15 ppm v/v | | | |
| Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, and Xylene | < 10 ppm | < 10 ppm | < 10 ppm | < 10 ppm | < 10 ppm | < 10 ppm | | | |
| Carbon Monoxide | 5 ppm | 5 ppm | 3 ppm | 3 ppm | 2 ppm | 2 ppm | | | |
| Hydrogen Sulphide | 1,404 ppm | 1,404 ppm | 1,034 ppm | 950 ppm | 737 ppm | 749 ppm | | | |
| Sulphur Dioxide | < 1 ppm | < 1 ppm | < 1 ppm | < 1 ppm | < 1 ppm | < 1 ppm | | | |
| Total Volatile Fatty Acids | 0.88 ppm | 1.12 ppm | 1.14 ppm | 1.23 ppm | 1.33 ppm | 1.43 ppm | | | |
| Balance Gases (Nitrogen and Argon) | 4.3% | 2.9% | 7.2% | 8.3% | 7.5% | 7.2% | | | |

| Table 4.7 – Abattoir B Bio | Table 4.7 – Abattoir B Biogas In-situ Biogas Measurements: 21 March 2012 – 17 April 2012 | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--|
| Measurement Date | | 21 March 201 | 2 | | 3 April 2012 | | 17 April 2012 | | | |
| On-site Gas Meter | Low Range | Mean | Upper Range | Low Range | Mean | Upper Range | Low Range | Mean | Upper Range | |
| Methane | n/r ^^ | n/r ^^ | n/r ^^ | 76.8% | 80.1% | 82.5% | 82.0% | 82.5% | 83.1% | |
| Oxygen | n/r ^^ | n/r ^^ | n/r ^^ | - | - | - | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| GasTec® Tubes | Low Range | Mean | Upper Range | Low Range | Mean | Upper Range | Low Range | Mean | Upper Range | |
| Ammonia | | | | l | not detectable | | | | | |
| Hydrogen Sulphide | 1,300 ppm | 1,390 ppm | 1,600 ppm | 1,220 ppm | 1,270 ppm | 1,300 ppm | 810 ppm | 895 ppm | 965 ppm | |
| Benzene in aromatics | | | | l | not detectable | | | | | |
| Xylene | | | | - | | | | not detectabl | e | |
| Sulphur Dioxide | | < 0.2 ppm | | | < 0.2 ppm | | | < 0.2 ppm | | |
| Toluene | | not detectable | | | | | | | | |
| Moisture [^] | | | | as | sumed saturate | ed | | | | |

^ not directly measured. See comment in **Section 4.1.3** ^^ n/r: not recorded as meters were offline

| Table 4.8 – Abattoir B Mean Daily Biogas Flared: 16 March 2012 – 17 April 2012 | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Source | Sampling Date | Mean Biogas Flared (m³/day) | | | | | | | |
| The Odour Unit | 16 March 2012 – 21 March 2012 | | 6,430 | | | | | | |
| | 22 March 2012 – 3 April 2012 | 5,560 | | | | | | | |
| readings | 4 April 2012 – 17 April 2012 | 5,950 | | | | | | | |
| | | Lowest flared | Mean flared | Peak flared | | | | | |
| Abattoir B readings | 30 March 2012 – 17 April 2012 | 2,570 | 6,310 | 13,830 | | | | | |
| Global mean | | 6,070 | | | | | | | |

4.3.1 Comments on results

Overall, the general findings from wastewater and biogas testing were as follows:

- The dominant biogas components are methane, carbon dioxide and balance gases (nitrogen and argon). Methane levels were found to be greater than 67% across all visits. Similarly to Abattoir A, of particular interest was the speed at which the methane conversion commenced inside the CAL, with significant methane production levels observed within 4-6 weeks (as advised by Abattoir B);
- The significant reduction in COD and BOD levels indicate that the pond is operating well within the sampling period, with levels likely to further reduce as the pond matures. The peak recorded removal efficiencies across the three (3) visits for COD and BOD were 84% and 92% respectively;
- Hydrogen sulphide levels exist in significant trace quantities, with a peak level measured in-situ at 1,600 ppm. Interestingly, this decreased over the three visits with the lowest recorded measurement at 737 ppm. Notwithstanding this, methane levels remained relatively consistent throughout the three visits;
- All other compounds present in the biogas were in trace quantities;
- The methane levels recorded via the gas meter on-site appears was found to be reading higher than that measured in the laboratory. The reason for was later identified to be due to a malfunction of the meter. This was rectified by Abattoir B who later had advised that measured methane levels were by then consistent with the laboratory findings; and
- The mean biogas conversion rate at Abattoir B across all three was calculated to be approximately 0.625 m³ biogas/kg COD removed, equivalent to a methane conversion rate (based on a mean methane composition of 68.4%) of approximately 0.428 m³ CH₄/kg COD removed.

4.4 Abattoir C Results

Abattoir C was sampled between 20 March 2013 and 29 May 2013. **Table 4.9** summarises wastewater testing results, **Table 4.10** summarises biogas GC analysis testing results, **Table 4.11** summarises in-situ gas measurements collected using the on-site flare meter and Gastec ® detector tubes, and **Table 4.12** summarises the mean daily biogas flared at the site over 9 May 2013 and 21 June 2013.

| Table 4.9 – Abattoir C Wastewater Testing Results: 20 March 2013 – 29 May 2013 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---------|----------|------------------------------|--------|--------------|------------------------------|---------|-------------|------------------------------|--|
| | | 20 Ma | rch 2013 | 5 | | 16 April 201 | 3 | | 29 May 2013 | | |
| Parameter | Unit | Inlet | Outlet | Removal Efficiency (%) | Inlet | Outlet | Removal Efficiency (%) | Inlet | Outlet | Removal Efficiency (%) | |
| BOD₅ | mg/L | 6,900 | 1,300 | 81 | 3,800 | 850 | 78 | 5,500 | 1,200 | 78 | |
| COD | mg/L | 20,000^ | 2,500 | 88 | 7,800^ | 1,600 | 80 | 13,000^ | 1,900 | 85 | |
| SS | mg/L | 3,200 | 490 | 85 | 1,900 | 310 | 84 | 4,500 | 380 | 92 | |
| VSS | mg/L | 3,100 | 490 | 84 | 1,800 | 260 | 86 | 3,300 | 250 | 92 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wastewater Inflow | ML/day | 3.041 | | 3.212 | | 3.365 | | | | | |
| COD removed | kg/day | | 53,200 | | 19,900 | | | 37,400 | | | |

^ accumulation of sludge in CAL inlet sump pit present during sampling

| Table 4.10 – Abattoir C Biogas Laboratory Analysis: 20 March 2013 – 29 May 2013 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| Date | 20 Mar | ch 2013 | 16 Apr | 29 May 2013 | | | | | |
| Test Item | Result 1 | Result 2 | Result 1 | Result 2 | Result 1 | | | | |
| Methane | 66% | 60% | 65% | 60% | 65% | | | | |
| Carbon dioxide | 33% | 30% | 32% | 30% | 33% | | | | |
| Oxygen | 0.23% | 2.2% | 0.66% | 2.2% | 0.44% | | | | |
| Ammonia | < 0.1 ppm | | | | |
| Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen Dioxide | < 0.5 ppm | | | | |
| Nitrous Oxide | < 5ppm | | | | |
| Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | < 15 ppm v/v | | | | |
| Benzene, Ethylbenzene, and Xylene | < 10 ppm | | | | |
| Toluene | > 100 ppm | > 100 ppm | > 50 ppm | > 50 ppm | > 100 ppm | | | | |
| Carbon Monoxide | 3 ppm | 3 ppm | 2 ppm | 2 ppm | 2 ppm | | | | |
| Hydrogen Sulphide | 7,650 ppm | 6,070 ppm | 4,050 ppm | 3,070 ppm | 3,250 ppm | | | | |
| Methyl Mercaptan | 24.6 ppm | 19.9 ppm | 3.6 ppm | 3.3 ppm | 3.2 ppm | | | | |
| Sulphur Dioxide | < 1ppm | < 1ppm | < 1 ppm | < 1 ppm | < 1 ppm | | | | |
| Total Volatile Fatty Acids | 0.01 ppm | 0.02 ppm | 0.10 ppm | 0.036 ppm | 0.06 ppm | | | | |
| Total Siloxanes | < 1ppm | < 1ppm | < 1ppm | < 1ppm | < 1 ppm | | | | |
| Balance Gases(Nitrogen and Argon) | 0.8% | 7.8% | 2.3% | 7.8% | 1.6% | | | | |

| Table 4.11 – Abattoir C In-sit | u Biogas Mea | surements: 2 | 0 March 201 | 3 – 29 May 2 | 2013 | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--|
| Measurement Date | 2 | 20 March 2013 16 April 2013 | | | | | | 29 May 2013 | | |
| Parameter | Low Range | Mean | Upper Range | Low Range | Mean | Upper Range | Low Range | Mean | Upper Range | |
| On-site Gas Meter | | | | | | | | | | |
| Methane | 55% | 62% | 69% | 51% | 58% | 67% | 69% | 70% | 71% | |
| GasTec ® Tubes | | | | | | | | | | |
| Carbon Dioxide | 17% | 20% | 22% | 21% | 22% | 25% | 24% | 24% | 25% | |
| Sulphur Dioxide | | < 0.2 ppm | | | < 0.2 ppm | | | n/d | | |
| Ammonia | | | | | not detectable | e | | | | |
| Hydrogen Sulphide | 1,800 | 2,160 | 2,500 | 1,375 | 1,675 | 2,400 | 2,850 | 3,160 | 3,500 | |
| Benzene in aromatics | | | | | not detectable | e | | | | |
| Xylene | | n/m not detectable | | | | | | | e | |
| Toluene | | | | | not detectable | 9 | | | | |
| Moisture ^ | | | | as | sumed satura | ted | | | | |

^ not directly measured. See comment in Section 4.1.3

| Table 4.12 – Abattoir C Mean Daily Biogas Flared at Abattoir C: 9 May – 21 June 2013 | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Date Mean Biogas Flared (m ³ /day) | | | | | | | | |
| 9 May – 31 May 2013 | 3,150 ^ | | | | | | | |
| 1 June – 21 June 2013 | 3,080 ^^ | | | | | | | |
| | Lowest Flared ^^^ | Mean Flared | Peak Flared | | | | | |
| 9 May – 21 June 2013 | 3,120 | 5,820 | | | | | | |

^ 9 May flaring log only represents a 14 hour period
 ^ 21 June flaring log only represents a 7 hour period
 ^^ excludes days where no flaring occurred i.e. 0 m³ was recorded (this occurred on 18 & 19 May 2013).

4.4.1 Comments on results

Overall, the general findings from wastewater and biogas testing were as follows:

- The dominant biogas components are methane, carbon dioxide, oxygen and balance gases (nitrogen and argon). Based on the laboratory analysis data, the mean biogas methane composition level was 63%;
- The significant reduction in COD and BOD levels indicate that the pond is operating well from a wastewater treatment viewpoint, with levels likely to further reduce as the pond matures. The peak recorded removal efficiencies across the three (3) visits for COD and BOD were 80% and 79% respectively;
- Hydrogen sulphide levels existed in significant trace quantities, with a peak level measured at 7,650 ppm. The global mean across all recorded measurements was 2,400 ppm;
- All other compounds present in the biogas were measured in trace quantities;
- Methane levels measured by the laboratory and on-site gas meter appears to be consistent;
- The mean biogas conversion rate at Abattoir C across all three visits is approximately 0.219 m³/kg COD removed, equivalent to a methane conversion rate (based on 63.0% methane) of approximately 0.138 m³ CH₄/kg COD removed; and
- Based on the above, and in comparison the other conversion rate results in this study, the gas conversion rate result for Abattoir C was lower than expectations. This may due to the greater difficulties experienced by Abattoir C during the commissioning of the CAL system. A follow-up test in several months' time may assist in determining if this result is atypical or representative of other CAL systems in the red meat industry.

5 Discussion

The following section summarise the biogas conversion rates, biogas quality, biogas quantity and suitability of biogas for energy recovery obtained in this research study.

5.1 Biogas conversion rate

Table 5.1 summarises the mean biogas conversion rates derived for each abattoir in this study and compares these to other reported conversion rates found in industries other than red meat processing.

| Table 5.1 – Biogas conv | Table 5.1 – Biogas conversion rates as a function of COD removed | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|---------------|-------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Parameter | Abattoir A | Abattoir B | Abattoir C | Dairy (AU) | Flushed Dairy Cattle Manure (USA) | Brewery (Pilot scale) | | | | |
| kg of COD removed / day | 2,711 | 12,080 | 20,500 | - | 6,710 | - | | | | |
| Volume of biogas flared (m ³ /day) | 1,770 | 6,070 | 3,120 | - | 3,360 | - | | | | |
| Methane composition in biogas (%) | 65.3 | 68.4 | 63.0 | - | 70.1 | 67-79 | | | | |
| Biogas conversion rate (m ³ /kg COD removed) | 0.654 | 0.625 | 0.219 | - | 0.500 | 0.418-0.44 | | | | |
| Methane conversion rate (m ³ CH₄/kg COD removed) | 0.375 | 0.428 | 0.138 | 0.35 ¹ | 0.351 ² | 0.28-0.35 ³ | | | | |

^ For the purpose of calculating the performance of the biogas conversion rate (m³/kg of COD removed) of the CAL system, the mean daily logged volume of biogas flared and quantity of COD removed has been used._Complementing the results from sampling and testing in this study, weekly wastewater data supplied by Abattoir C from the period of 20 March to 5 June 2013 has been used in calculating the mean COD available and removed for the CALs. This has generated a result that is considered to be more representative of the CALs performance within the sampling period, due to the extensive nature of abattoir's testing programme.

As shown in **Table 5.1**, the range of biogas conversion across all the sampled abattoirs was from 0.219 to 0.654 m³ biogas/ kg COD removed, equivalent to a methane conversion rate from 0.138 to 0.428 m³ CH₄/ kg COD removed, based on a methane composition range from 63 to 68.4% respectively. Based on published values, these results seem to be within reasonable expectations and comparable to other industries that generate biogas from wastewater streams using anaerobic treatment. The exception is Abattoir C which was found to have a lower biogas conversion than the other two abattoirs. This may have been attributed to the on-going optimisation by Abattoir C of the CAL system during sampling period of this study.

5.2 Biogas quality

Table 5.2 summarises the typical biogas composition range values found in this study.

| Table 5.2 – Composition of biogas across s | study | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|
| Chemical Parameter | Concentration range | Mean Concentration |
| Methane | 51-83% | 64.4% |
| Carbon dioxide | 17-33% | 25.7% |
| Oxygen | < 0.2 - 3.8% | 0.91% |
| Ammonia | Trace | Trace |
| Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen Dioxide | Trace | Trace |
| Nitrous Oxide | Trace | Trace |
| Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | Trace | Trace |
| Benzene, Ethylbenzene, and Xylene | Trace | Trace |
| Toluene | Trace | Trace |
| Carbon Monoxide | Trace | Trace |
| Hydrogen Sulphide | 0.074 - 0.41%^ | 0.16% |
| Methyl Mercaptan | Trace | Trace |
| Sulphur Dioxide | Trace | Trace |
| Total Volatile Fatty Acids | Trace | Trace |
| Total Siloxanes | Trace | Trace |
| Balance Gases (Nitrogen and Argon) | 0.8-17.5% | 7.1% |

^ excludes laboratory analysis measurements for biogas samples collected on 20 March 2013 at Abattoir C, which indicated hydrogen sulphide levels of 6,070 ppm and 7,650 ppm (see **Table 4.10**). These measurements appear to be atypical and localised to that particular sampling event based on the overall results in this study. The reason for the higher than expected hydrogen sulphide levels may be related to the greater difficulties experienced at Abattoir C during commissioning of the CAL system. As such, these measurements were not taken into account in the range.

The primary constituents in the biogas across all three abattoirs in this study were methane and carbon dioxide, with a mean values across the study of 64.4% and 25.7% respectively. Oxygen and balance gases (nitrogen and argon) were also found to be in non-trace quantities, with a mean value across the study of 0.91% and 7.1% respectively. Balance gases were not directly analysed in this study.

Trace quantities of other gas species were measured in the biogas, with a majority below the detectable limit of the measurement/analysis technique used for testing. The trace gas species included ammonia, $N_xO \& NO_x$, carbon monoxide, volatile fatty acids, sulphides (predominately

hydrogen sulphide) and siloxanes. Moisture in the biogas was also present as both water vapour and water droplets, indicating that the biogas stream was saturated.

Of particular interest is the hydrogen sulphide levels and its prevalence in significant trace concentrations in the biogas ranging from 737 to 4,050 ppm across the three abattoirs, corresponding to a global mean of 1,630 ppm. On face value, and for comparison, this range appears to be analogous to biogas produced from swine and dairy manures reported to contain from 300 to 4,500 ppm of hydrogen sulphude¹. The relevance of hydrogen sulphide in biogas and its associated issues for use in industrial units (such as cogeneration and trigeneration equipment, dryers and boilers) has been extensively reviewed in MLA project code A.ENV.0098 (June 2012), and therefore has been only briefly discussed in this study (see **Section 5.4**).

5.3 Biogas quantity

Valuable quantities of biogas were found to be flared at the site over the sampling periods, with a mean range of 1,870 to 6,070 m³ across the three abattoirs. The overall mean volume of biogas flared at the site was 3,690 m³. Further research work will be required to determine if this quantity is sufficient for use in gas engine operating in an industrial environment.

5.4 CAL system commissioning and steady state conditions

Based on advice provided to The Odour Unit from abattoir personnel, biogas generation was observed at each abattoir within three months after commissioning of the CAL system. During and after this period of time, biogas volume and quality (such as methane content) can vary. This study found that after three months from the commissioning date the CAL system at each abattoir was producing biogas that consisted of methane levels greater than 50%. Further advice from abattoir personnel after the completion of the sampling run in this study revealed that a more consistent volume and methane-rich biogas production was possible once the CAL systems achieved steady state conditions.

5.5 Suitability for energy recovery

The following are preliminary comments on the biogas suitability for energy recovery based on the findings in this study:

 The biogas is rich in methane and at levels that would be considered suitable for energy generation;

- Biogas conditioning is also required to remove water vapour and carbon dioxide;
- It is generally accepted that biogas cleaning to remove hydrogen sulphide will be required if it is to be used in process equipment such as boilers, drier systems and cogeneration or trigeneration plants to prevent damage by acid wear. However The Odour Unit is aware of one large gas engine generator installation in NSW which combusts landfill gas with similarly high hydrogen sulphide levels, without the need for scrubbing to remove this compound;
- Other gas compounds found in the biogas were found trace quantities that would not be considered significant nor potentially problematically if used in a gas-fired engine systems; and
- The efficacy of beneficially using the limited volume of biogas generated will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis. At worst the biogas could be used as a supplementary fuel.

Further data would assist in determining if the results found at Abattoir C are representative of biogas conversion rates and CAL performances in the red meat industry during commissioning stages.

6 References

- 1 Diary Australia, Eco-efficiency for Australian dairy processors Fact sheet 5: Biogas, August 2004
- 2 US Environmental Protection Agency, *An evaluation of a covered anaerobic lagoon for flushed dairy cattle manure stabilization and biogas production*, Final report, 17 June 2008
- 3 Ince, B.K., Ince, O., Anderson, G.K., and Arayici, S. (2001), *Assessment of biogas use* as an energy source from anaerobic digestion of brewery wastewater, Water, Air, and Soil Pollution, 126, 239.
- 4 Meat & Livestock Australia Limited, A.ENV.0098 *Review of Biogas Cleaning,* Final report, June 2012

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Biogas GC Analysis Laboratory Result Sheets

- Abattoir A Biogas Laboratory Analysis Result Sheets October 2011 November 2011
- Abattoir B Biogas Laboratory Analysis Result Sheets March 2012 April 2012
- Abattoir C Biogas Laboratory Analysis Result Sheets March 2013 May 2013

Abattoir A

Biogas Laboratory Analysis Result Sheets October 2011 – November 2011



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

| Client's Name: Contact: Site: Type of sample: Container: | Odour Unit Michael Assal MLA, NSW Off Gas Tedlar Bag | | Report No: Client Ref No: Date Received: Date Reported: Sampled by: Page: | ENV 14024 N/A 24-October-2011 21-November-2011 N/A 1 of 1 |
|--|--|----------|--|--|
| Item: | Analysis of Biogas | | | |
| | SGS Lab ID 89911 | | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
| | Test Item | Method | Result | Result |
| | Sample ID | | 89911-1 | 89911-2 |
| | Methane | SGSMC112 | 63.15% | >54%* |
| | Carbondioxide | SGSMC112 | 20.70% | >18%* |
| | Oxygen | SGSMC112 | <0.3% | 3.8%* |
| | Nitrogen Compounds | | | |
| | Ammonia | SGSMC112 | <0.1ppm | <0.1ppm |
| | Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen dioxide | SGSMC112 | <0.5ppm | <0.5ppm |
| | Nitrous Oxide | SGSMC112 | <5ppm | <5ppm |
| | Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | SGSMC112 | >15 ppm v/v | >15 ppm v/v |
| | BTEX | SGSMC112 | >10ppm | >10ppm |
| | Carbon Monoxide | SGSMC112 | 20ppm | 16ppm* |
| | Hydrogen Sulphide | SGSMC112 | >860ppm | >580ppm* |
| | Sulphur Dioxide | SGSMC112 | <2ppm | <1ppm* |
| | acetic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.88ppm | 0.81ppm* |
| | propanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.40ppm | 0.33ppm* |
| | i-butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.26ppm | 0.21ppm* |
| | butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.43ppm | 0.34ppm* |
| | i-valeric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.75ppm | 0.64ppm* |
| | valeric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.96ppm | 0.81ppm* |
| | i-capric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.083ppm | 0.068ppm* |
| | capric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.046ppm | 0.036ppm* |
| | Total VFA | SGSMC112 | 3.81ppm | 3.24ppm* |
| | Balance (Nitrogen and Argon) | SGSMC112 | 15.8% | 24.1%* |

* NOTE: sample 2 suffered a leak, possibly the result of depressurisation in transit, resulting in a significant air leak, and reduction in analyte concentration

For: SGS Australia Pty. Ltd.

SJMAtore

Dr David Stone PhD (cantab) MRACI CChem Senior Chemist

This document is issued by the Company under its General Conditions of Service accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms_and_conditions.htm. Attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein. Any holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the Company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of Client's instructions, if any. The Company's sole responsibility is to its Client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents. Any unauthorized alteration, forgery or falsification of the content or appearance of this document is unlawful and offenders may be prosecuted to the fullest



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

| Client's Name: Contact: Site: Type of sample: Container: | Odour Unit Michael Assal MLA, NSW Off Gas Tedlar Bag | | Report No: Client Ref No: Date Received: Date Reported: Sampled by: Page: | ENV 14142 N/A 08-November-2011 21-November-2011 N/A 1 of 1 |
|--|--|----------|--|---|
| Item: | Analysis of Biogas | | | |
| | SGS Lab ID 89980 | | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
| | Test Item | Method | Result | Result |
| | Sample ID | | 89980-1 | 89980-2 |
| | Methane | SGSMC112 | 54.02% | 51.48% |
| | Carbondioxide | SGSMC112 | 27.60% | 27.90% |
| | Oxygen | SGSMC112 | <0.3% | <0.3% |
| | Nitrogen Compounds | | | |
| | Ammonia | SGSMC112 | <0.1ppm | <0.1ppm |
| | Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen dioxide | SGSMC112 | <0.5ppm | <0.5ppm |
| | Nitrous Oxide | SGSMC112 | <5ppm | <5ppm |
| | Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | SGSMC112 | >15 ppm v/v | >15 ppm v/v |
| | BTEX | SGSMC112 | >10ppm | >10ppm |
| | Carbon Monoxide | SGSMC112 | Зррт | Зррт |
| | Hydrogen Sulphide | SGSMC112 | 1200ppm | 1270ppm |
| | Sulphur Dioxide | SGSMC112 | <2ppm | <2ppm |
| | acetic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.29ppm | 0.26ppm |
| | propanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.025ppm | 0.030ppm |
| | i-butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.006ppm | <0.005ppm |
| | butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.082ppm | 0.069ppm |
| | i-valeric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.028ppm | 0.011ppm |
| | valeric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.048ppm | 0.155ppm |
| | i-capric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| | capric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| | Total VFA | SGSMC112 | 0.48ppm | 0.53ppm |
| | Balance (Nitrogen and Argon) | SGSMC112 | 17.96% | 20.19% |

For: SGS Australia Pty. Ltd.

DJMAtore

Dr David Stone PhD (cantab) MRACI CChem Senior Chemist

This document is issued by the Company under its General Conditions of Service accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms_and_conditions.htm. Attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein. Any holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the Company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of Client's instructions, if any. The Company's sole responsibility is to its Client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents. Any unauthorized alteration, forgery or falsification of the content or appearance of this document is unlawful and offenders may be prosecuted to the fullest



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

| Client's Name: Contact: Site: Type of sample: Container: | Odour Unit Michael Assal MLA, NSW Off Gas Tedlar Bag | | Report No: Client Ref No: Date Received: Date Reported: Sampled by: Page: | ENV 14239 N/A 22-November-2011 28-November-2011 N/A 1 of 1 |
|--|--|----------|--|---|
| Item: | Analysis of Biogas | | | |
| | SGS Lab ID 90048 | | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
| | Test Item | Method | Result | Result |
| | Sample ID | | 90048-1 | 90048-2 |
| | Methane | SGSMC112 | 59.0% | 62.9% |
| | Carbondioxide | SGSMC112 | 28.2% | 32.7% |
| | Oxygen | SGSMC112 | 1.25% | 0.80% |
| | Nitrogen Compounds | | | |
| | Ammonia | SGSMC112 | <0.1ppm | <0.1ppm |
| | Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen dioxide | SGSMC112 | <0.5ppm | <0.5ppm |
| | Nitrous Oxide | SGSMC112 | <5ppm | <5ppm |
| | Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | SGSMC112 | >15 ppm v/v | >15 ppm v/v |
| | BTEX | SGSMC112 | >10ppm | >10ppm |
| | Carbon Monoxide | SGSMC112 | 4ppm | 4ppm |
| | Hydrogen Sulphide | SGSMC112 | 1106ppm | 1335ppm |
| | Sulphur Dioxide | SGSMC112 | <1ppm | <1ppm |
| | acetic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.08ppm | 0.11ppm |
| | propanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.01ppm | 0.02ppm |
| | i-butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| | butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| | i-valeric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| | valeric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| | i-capric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| | capric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| | Total VFA | SGSMC112 | 0.09ppm | 0.13ppm |
| | Balance (Nitrogen and Argon) | SGSMC112 | 11.4% | 3.45% |

* NOTE: sample 1 has suffered a minor air leak in transit, possibly the result of a small pin-hole leak in the sample bag, causing a reduction in analyte concentration

For: SGS Australia Pty. Ltd.

SJMAtore

Dr David Stone PhD (cantab) MRACI CChem Senior Chemist

This document is issued by the Company under its General Conditions of Service accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms_and_conditions.htm. Attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein. Any holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the Company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of Client's instructions, if any. The Company's sole responsibility is to its Client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents. Any unauthorized alteration, forgery or falsification of the content or appearance of this document is unlawful and offenders may be prosecuted to the fullest

Abattoir B

Biogas Laboratory Analysis Result Sheets March 2012 – April 2012



| Client's Name: Contact: Site: Type of sample: Container: | Odour Unit Michael Assal MLA, NSW Bio-Gas Tedlar Bag | | Report No: Client Ref No: Date Received: Date Reported: Sampled by: Page: | ENV 15141 N/A 22-March-2012 02-April-2012 N/A 1 of 1 |
|--|--|----------|--|---|
| Item: | Analysis of Biogas | | | |
| | SGS Lab ID 90364 | | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
| | Test Item | Method | Result | Result |
| | Sample ID | | 90364-1 | 90364-2 |
| | Methane | SGSMC112 | 69.22% | 70.10% |
| | Carbondioxide | SGSMC112 | 25.90% | 26.50% |
| | Oxygen | SGSMC112 | <0.3% | <0.3% |
| | Nitrogen Compounds | | | |
| | Ammonia | SGSMC112 | <0.1ppm | <0.1ppm |
| | Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen dioxide | SGSMC112 | <0.5ppm | <0.5ppm |
| | Nitrous Oxide | SGSMC112 | <5ppm | <5ppm |
| | Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | SGSMC112 | >15 ppm v/v | >15 ppm v/v |
| | BTEX | SGSMC112 | >10ppm | >10ppm |
| | Carbon Monoxide | SGSMC112 | 5ppm | 5ppm |
| | Hydrogen Sulphide | SGSMC112 | 1404ppm | 1404ppm |
| | Sulphur Dioxide | SGSMC112 | <1ppm | <1ppm |
| | acetic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.38ppm | 0.44ppm |
| | propanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.20ppm | 0.23ppm |
| | i-butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.15ppm | 0.16ppm |
| | butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.10ppm | 0.11ppm |
| | i-valeric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.075ppm | 0.08ppm |
| | valeric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.06ppm | 0.07ppm |
| | i-capric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.023ppm | 0.018ppm |
| | capric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.016ppm | 0.015ppm |
| | Total VFA | SGSMC112 | 0.88ppm | 1.12ppm |
| | Balance (Nitrogen and Argon) | SGSMC112 | 4.3% | 2.90% |

NOTEs

For: SGS Australia Pty. Ltd.

SJMAtore

Dr David Stone PhD (cantab) MRACI CChem Senior Chemist

This document is issued by the Company under its General Conditions of Service accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms_and_conditions.htm. Attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein. Any holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the Company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of Client's instructions, if any. The Company's sole responsibility is to its Client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents. Any unauthorized alteration, forgery or falsification of the content or appearance of this document is unlawful and offenders may be prosecuted to the fullest



| Client's Name: Contact: Site: Type of sample: Container: | Odour Unit Michael Assal MLA, NSW Bio-Gas Tedlar Bag | | Report No: Client Ref No: Date Received: Date Reported: Sampled by: Page: | ENV 15169 N/A 04-April-2012 11-April-2012 N/A 1 of 1 |
|--|--|----------|--|---|
| Item: | Analysis of Biogas | | | |
| | SGS Lab ID 90384 | | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
| | Test Item | Method | Result | Result |
| | Sample ID | | 90384-1 | 90384-2 |
| | Methane | SGSMC112 | 68.28% | 67.16% |
| | Carbondioxide | SGSMC112 | 24.10% | 24.10% |
| | Oxygen | SGSMC112 | <0.3% | <0.3% |
| | Nitrogen Compounds | | | |
| | Ammonia | SGSMC112 | <0.1ppm | <0.1ppm |
| | Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen dioxide | SGSMC112 | <0.5ppm | <0.5ppm |
| | Nitrous Oxide | SGSMC112 | <5ppm | <5ppm |
| | Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | SGSMC112 | <15 ppm v/v | <15 ppm v/v |
| | BTEX | SGSMC112 | <10ppm | <10ppm |
| | Carbon Monoxide | SGSMC112 | 3ppm | 3ppm |
| | Hydrogen Sulphide | SGSMC112 | 1034ppm | 950ppm |
| | Sulphur Dioxide | SGSMC112 | <1ppm | <1ppm |
| | acetic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.48ppm | 0.54ppm |
| | propanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.23ppm | 0.24ppm |
| | i-butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.16ppm | 0.17ppm |
| | butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.10ppm | 0.10ppm |
| | i-valeric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.075ppm | 0.08ppm |
| | valeric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.06ppm | 0.06ppm |
| | i-capric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.021ppm | 0.020ppm |
| | capric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.016ppm | 0.015ppm |
| | Total VFA | SGSMC112 | 1.14ppm | 1.23ppm |
| | Balance (Nitrogen and Argon) | SGSMC112 | 7.2% | 8.3% |

NOTEs

For: SGS Australia Pty. Ltd.

SJMAtore

Dr David Stone PhD (cantab) MRACI CChem Senior Chemist

This document is issued by the Company under its General Conditions of Service accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms_and_conditions.htm. Attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein. Any holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the Company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of Client's instructions, if any. The Company's sole responsibility is to its Client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents. Any unauthorized alteration, forgery or falsification of the content or appearance of this document is unlawful and offenders may be prosecuted to the fullest



| Client's Name: Contact: Site: Type of sample: Container: | Odour Unit Michael Assal MLA, NSW Bio-Gas Tedlar Bag | | Report No: Client Ref No: Date Received: Date Reported: Sampled by: Page: | ENV 15245 N/A 18-April-2012 23-April-2012 N/A 1 of 1 |
|--|--|----------|--|---|
| Item: | Analysis of Biogas | | | |
| | SGS Lab ID 107454 | | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
| | Test Item | Method | Result | Result |
| | Sample ID | | 107454-1 | 107454-2 |
| | Methane | SGSMC112 | 67.3% | 68.3% |
| | Carbondioxide | SGSMC112 | 23.5% | 24.2% |
| | Oxygen | SGSMC112 | 1.60% | <0.2% |
| | Nitrogen Compounds | | | |
| | Ammonia | SGSMC112 | <0.1ppm | <0.1ppm |
| | Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen dioxide | SGSMC112 | <0.5ppm | <0.5ppm |
| | Nitrous Oxide | SGSMC112 | <5ppm | <5ppm |
| | Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | SGSMC112 | <15 ppm v/v | <15 ppm v/v |
| | BTEX | SGSMC112 | <10ppm | <10ppm |
| | Carbon Monoxide | SGSMC112 | 2ppm | 2ppm |
| | Hydrogen Sulphide | SGSMC112 | 737ppm | 749ppm |
| | Sulphur Dioxide | SGSMC112 | <1ppm | <1ppm |
| | acetic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.58ppm | 0.64ppm |
| | propanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.27ppm | 0.29ppm |
| | i-butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.18ppm | 0.19ppm |
| | butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.11ppm | 0.12ppm |
| | i-valeric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.08ppm | 0.08ppm |
| | valeric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.07ppm | 0.07ppm |
| | i-capric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.02ppm | 0.02ppm |
| | capric acid | SGSMC112 | 0.02ppm | 0.022ppm |
| | Total VFA | SGSMC112 | 1.33ppm | 1.43ppm |
| | Balance (Nitrogen and Argon) | SGSMC112 | 7.5% | 7.2% |

NOTEs

For: SGS Australia Pty. Ltd.

SJMAtore

Dr David Stone PhD (cantab) MRACI CChem Senior Chemist

This document is issued by the Company under its General Conditions of Service accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms_and_conditions.htm. Attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein. Any holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the Company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of Client's instructions, if any. The Company's sole responsibility is to its Client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents. Any unauthorized alteration, forgery or falsification of the content or appearance of this document is unlawful and offenders may be prosecuted to the fullest

Abattoir C

Biogas Laboratory Analysis Result Sheets March 2013 – May 2013



ANALYTICAL REPORT

| Customer: | The Odour Unit Pty Ltd |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Attention: | Michael Assal |
| Your Reference: | Investigation of digester gases |
| SGS Report Number: | ENV 17578 |

Date of Receipt of Samples: 21 March 2013

The work has been carried out in accordance with your instructions. The results and associated information are contained in the following pages of the report. Should you have any queries regarding this report please contact the undersigned.

Reported by: Dr David Stone

Report authorised by: Dr Paul Pui

MAtore

Date: ____4/4/2013__

Date: 5/4/2013

This document is issued, on the Client's behalf, by the company under its General Conditions of Service available on request and accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms and conditions.htm. The client's attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein.

Any other holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of client's instructions, if any. The company's sole responsibility is to its client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents.

This test report shall not be reproduced except in full, without written approval of the laboratory.



1. Background

Two samples of process gas (in 10-litre Tedlar gas sample bags) were delivered to SGS by TOU. The list of samples appears below. The scope of this investigation is to determine the nature of any sulphur-containing gases, and major VOCs in the process gas.

2.1 Sample description

Sample Description

Material Type process gas process gas

 1
 MLA Biogas #1
 21 March, 2013

 2
 MLA Biogas #2
 21 March, 2013

2.2 Sample preparation prior to analysis:

No preparation was required, the gases are sampled directly. Blank analyses were run between samples to avoid any possibility of contamination from one sample to affect the result for another.

For Sulphur gases hydrocarbons 250 or 10 microlitre of gas was directly injected onto a Gas Chromatograph with Sulphur Chemi-luminescence detector (GC-SCD) using a syringe. For volatile organic compounds, the process gases were trapped onto a clean thermal desorbtion tube using a syringe, and thermally desorbed, using method US EPA TO-17.

Major gases were determined using 10 microlitre of gas directly injected onto a Gas Chromatograph with thermal conductivity detector (GC-TCD)

3. Preliminary laboratory examinations

Because of the reactive nature of the samples, the samples were analysed for all analytes including Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) within 24 hours of arrival.

4. Analytical Spectroscopic Results

4.1 Table 1. GC-TCD examination of process gases

| | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
|----------------|----------|--------------|
| analyte | Concer | ntration (%) |
| methane | 66% | 60% |
| carbon dioxide | 33% | 30% |
| air | 1% | 10% |

4.2 Table 2. GC-SCD examination of process gases

| | Sample 1 | Sample 2 | |
|--------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| analyte | Concentration (ppm) | | |
| hydrogen sulphide | 7,650 | 6,070 | |
| carbonyl sulphide | 0.8 | 0.07 | |
| methyl mercaptan | 24.6 | 19.9 | |
| ethyl mercaptan | 0.047 | 0.043 | |
| i-propyl mercaptan | 0.019 | 0.017 | |

 Iia Pty Ltd
 Environmental Services
 Unit 16/33 Maddox St
 Alexandria 2015
 NSW
 Australia

 0 964 278
 t +61 (0) 2 8594 0400
 f + 61 (0) 2 8594 0499
 www.au.sgs.com



| propyl mercaptan | 0.015 | 0.013 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|
| dimethyl sulphide | 1.43 | 1.29 |
| dimethyl disulphide | 0.94 | 0.87 |
| ethylmethyl disulphide | <0.03 | <0.03 |
| carbon disulphide | 0.22 | 0.19 |

4.3 Table 3. GC-MS examination of process gases

| | Sample 1 | Sample 2 | |
|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| analyte | Concentration (ppb) | | |
| i-butane | <0.6 | <0.6 | |
| butane | <0.6 | <0.6 | |
| i-pentane | <0.6 | <0.6 | |
| pentane | 27.4 | 24.7 | |
| hexanes | 23.6 | 17.2 | |
| heptane | 29.4 | 25.4 | |
| octane | 162 | 142 | |
| nonane | 442 | 438 | |
| decane | 969 | 988 | |
| undecane | 300 | 326 | |
| dodecane | 18.2 | 21.8 | |
| tridecane | 10.1 | 11.3 | |
| tetradecane | 2.5 | 4.0 | |
| pentadecane | <0.6 | 1.6 | |
| benzene | 10.3 | 11.2 | |
| toluene | >100ppm | >100ppm | |
| ethylbenzene | 25.3 | 20.8 | |
| m,p-xylenes | 69.8 | 64.8 | |
| o-xylene | 66.1 | 58.7 | |
| C3-alkylbenzenes | 1080 | 1050 | |
| naphthalene | 19.8 | 19.1 | |

4.4 Table 4. Siloxanes in process gases by TD-GC-MS

| | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
|------------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| analyte | Concentrat | ion (ppb) |
| hexamethyl cyclotrisiloxane | 9.4 | 7.5 |
| octamethyl cyclotetrasiloxane | 6.7 | 6.4 |
| decamethyl cyclopentasiloxane | 13.6 | 6.6 |
| dodecamethyl cyclohexasiloxane | 210 | 169 |
| tetradecamethyl cycloheptasiloxane | 121 | 137 |
| hexadecamethyl cyclooctasiloxane | 15.2 | 17.3 |

5. Conclusions

This is a biogas with high amounts of H2S and methyl mercaptan, but relatively low amounts of the other common VOCs and siloxanes.

Environmental Services Unit 16/33 Maddox St Alexandria 2015 NSW Australia t +61 (0) 2 8594 0400 f + 61 (0) 2 8594 0499 www.au.sgs.com



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

| Client's Name: Contact: Site: Type of sample: Container: | Michael Assal MLA, NSW | | Report No: Client Ref No: Date Received: Date Reported: Sampled by: Page: | ENV 17578 N/A 21-March-2013 04-April-2013 N/A 1 of 1 | |
|--|---------------------------------|----------|--|---|--|
| Item: | Analysis of Biogas | | | | |
| | SGS Lab ID 116245 | | Sample 1 | Sample 2 | |
| | Test Item | Method | Result | Result | |
| | Sample ID | | 116245-1 | 116245-2 | |
| | Methane | SGSMC112 | 66.0% | 60.0% | |
| | Carbondioxide | SGSMC112 | 33.0% | 30.0% | |
| | Oxygen | SGSMC112 | 0.23% | 2.2% | |
| | Nitrogen Compounds | | | | |
| | Ammonia | SGSMC112 | <0.1ppm | <0.1ppm | |
| | Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen dioxide | SGSMC112 | <0.5ppm | <0.5ppm | |
| | Nitrous Oxide | SGSMC112 | <5ppm | <5ppm | |
| | Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | SGSMC112 | <15 ppm v/v | <15 ppm v/v | |
| | BTEX | SGSMC112 | <10ppm | <10ppm | |
| | Carbon Monoxide | SGSMC112 | 3ppm | 3ppm | |
| | Hydrogen Sulphide | SGSMC112 | 7650ppm | 6070ppm | |
| | Sulphur Dioxide | SGSMC112 | <1ppm | <1ppm | |
| | acetic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.01ppm | 0.02ppm | |
| | propanoic acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm | |
| | i-butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm | |
| | butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm | |
| | i-valeric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm | |
| | valeric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm | |
| | i-capric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm | |
| | capric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm | |
| | Total VFA | SGSMC112 | 0.01ppm | 0.02ppm | |
| | | | | | |

NOTES:

For: SGS Australia Pty. Ltd.

Balance (Nitrogen and Argon)

DJMAtore

Dr David Stone PhD (cantab) MRACI CChem Senior Chemist

This document is issued by the Company under its General Conditions of Service accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms_and_conditions.htm. Attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein. Any holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the Company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of Client's instructions, if any. The Company's sole responsibility is to its Client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents. Any unauthorized alteration, forgery or falsification of the content or appearance of this document is unlawful and offenders may be prosecuted to the fullest

SGSMC112

0.8%

Unless otherwise stated the results shown in this test report refer only to the sample(s) tested and such sample(s) are retained for 21 days only. This document cannot be reproduced except in full, without prior approval of the Company.

7.8%



ANALYTICAL REPORT

| Customer: | The Odour Unit Pty Ltd |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Attention: | Michael Assal |
| Your Reference: | Investigation of digester gases |
| SGS Report Number: | ENV 17734 |

Date of Receipt of Samples: 17 April 2013

The work has been carried out in accordance with your instructions. The results and associated information are contained in the following pages of the report. Should you have any queries regarding this report please contact the undersigned.

Reported by: Dr David Stone

Report authorised by: Dr Paul Pui

Atore

Date: 24/4/2013

Date: ____29/4/2013____

This document is issued, on the Client's behalf, by the company under its General Conditions of Service available on request and accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms and conditions.htm. The client's attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein.

Any other holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of client's instructions, if any. The company's sole responsibility is to its client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents.

This test report shall not be reproduced except in full, without written approval of the laboratory.



1. Background

Two samples of process gas (in 10-litre Tedlar gas sample bags) were delivered to SGS by TOU. The list of samples appears below. The scope of this investigation is to determine the nature of any sulphur-containing gases, and major VOCs in the process gas.

2.1 Sample description

Sample Description

Material Type process gas process gas

 1
 MLA Biogas #1
 17 April, 2013

 2
 MLA Biogas #2
 17 April, 2013

2.2 Sample preparation prior to analysis:

No preparation was required, the gases are sampled directly. Blank analyses were run between samples to avoid any possibility of contamination from one sample to affect the result for another.

For Sulphur gases hydrocarbons 250 or 10 microlitre of gas was directly injected onto a Gas Chromatograph with Sulphur Chemi-luminescence detector (GC-SCD) using a syringe. For volatile organic compounds, the process gases were trapped onto a clean thermal desorbtion tube using a syringe, and thermally desorbed, using method US EPA TO-17.

Major gases were determined using 10 microlitre of gas directly injected onto a Gas Chromatograph with thermal conductivity detector (GC-TCD)

3. Preliminary laboratory examinations

Because of the reactive nature of the samples, the samples were analysed for all analytes including Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) within 24 hours of arrival.

4. Analytical Spectroscopic Results

4.1 Table 1. GC-TCD examination of process gases

| | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
|----------------|----------|--------------|
| analyte | Concer | ntration (%) |
| methane | 65% | 60% |
| carbon dioxide | 32% | 30% |
| air | 3% | 10% |

4.2 Table 2. GC-SCD examination of process gases

| | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
|--------------------|----------|---------------|
| analyte | Concent | tration (ppm) |
| hydrogen sulphide | 4,050 | 3,070 |
| carbonyl sulphide | 0.43 | 0.37 |
| methyl mercaptan | 3.6 | 3.3 |
| ethyl mercaptan | 0.040 | 0.035 |
| i-propyl mercaptan | 0.012 | 0.011 |

 Pty Ltd
 Environmental Services
 Unit 16/33 Maddox St
 Alexandria 2015
 NSW
 Australia

 964 278
 t +61 (0) 2 8594 0400
 f + 61 (0) 2 8594 0499
 www.au.sgs.com



| propyl mercaptan | 0.010 | 0.008 |
|------------------------|--------|-------|
| dimethyl sulphide | 0.43 | 0.29 |
| dimethyl disulphide | 0.54 | 0.37 |
| ethylmethyl disulphide | < 0.03 | <0.03 |
| carbon disulphide | 0.077 | 0.254 |

4.3 Table 3. GC-MS examination of process gases

| | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
|------------------|---------------------|----------|
| analyte | Concentration (ppb) | |
| i-butane | 1.1 | 0.9 |
| butane | <0.5 | <0.5 |
| i-pentane | 7.4 | 1.7 |
| pentane | 30.4 | 30.8 |
| hexanes | 44.2 | 39.9 |
| heptane | 81.9 | 50.6 |
| octane | 403 | 301 |
| nonane | 723 | 562 |
| decane | 2,563 | 2,074 |
| undecane | 1,216 | 955 |
| dodecane | 116 | 43.0 |
| tridecane | 21.2 | 8.4 |
| tetradecane | 9.6 | 4.3 |
| pentadecane | 11.3 | 6.5 |
| benzene | 30.2 | 14.3 |
| toluene | >50ppm | >50ppm |
| ethylbenzene | 44.9 | 22.3 |
| m,p-xylenes | 168 | 69.2 |
| o-xylene | 141 | 70.2 |
| C3-alkylbenzenes | 2,024 | 1,777 |
| naphthalene | 36.0 | 5.1 |

4.4 Table 4. Siloxanes in process gases by TD-GC-MS

| | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
|------------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| analyte | Concentrat | ion (ppb) |
| hexamethyl cyclotrisiloxane | 60.6 | 13.6 |
| octamethyl cyclotetrasiloxane | 20.7 | 10.4 |
| decamethyl cyclopentasiloxane | 57.8 | 7.3 |
| dodecamethyl cyclohexasiloxane | 547 | 35.9 |
| tetradecamethyl cycloheptasiloxane | 120 | 63.7 |
| hexadecamethyl cyclooctasiloxane | 12.1 | 11.1 |

5. Conclusions

This is a biogas with high amounts of H2S and methyl mercaptan, but relatively low amounts of the other common VOCs and siloxanes.

SGS Australia Pty Ltd ABN 44 000 964 278 Environmental Services Unit 16/33 Maddox St Alexandria 2015 NSW Australia t+61 (0) 2 8594 0400 f+61 (0) 2 8594 0499 www.au.sgs.com



| Client's Name: Contact: Site: Type of sample: Container: | Odour Unit Michael Assal MLA, NSW Bio-Gas Tedlar Bag | | Report No: Client Ref No: Date Received: Date Reported: Sampled by: Page: | ENV 17734 N/A 17-April-2013 24-April-2013 N/A 1 of 1 |
|--|--|----------|--|---|
| Item: | Analysis of Biogas | | | |
| | SGS Lab ID 116885 | | Sample 1 | Sample 2 |
| | Test Item | Method | Result | Result |
| | Sample ID | | 116885-1 | 116885-2 |
| | Methana | CCCMC110 | CE 09/ | 60.00/ |

| Sample ID | | 116885-1 | 116885-2 |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Methane | SGSMC112 | 65.0% | 60.0% |
| Carbondioxide | SGSMC112 | 32.0% | 30.0% |
| Oxygen | SGSMC112 | 0.66% | 2.2% |
| Nitrogen Compounds | GGGMIGTTE | 0.0070 | 2.270 |
| Ammonia | SGSMC112 | <0.1ppm | <0.1ppm |
| Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen dioxide | SGSMC112 | <0.5ppm | <0.5ppm |
| Nitrous Oxide | SGSMC112 | <5ppm | <5ppm |
| Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | SGSMC112 | <15 ppm v/v | <15 ppm v/v |
| BTEX | SGSMC112 | <10ppm | <10ppm |
| Carbon Monoxide | SGSMC112 | 2ppm | 2ppm |
| Hydrogen Sulphide | SGSMC112 | 4050ppm | 3070ppm |
| Sulphur Dioxide | SGSMC112 | <1ppm | <1ppm |
| acetic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.10ppm | 0.036ppm |
| propanoic acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| i-butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| i-valeric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| valeric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| i-capric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| capric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm | <0.005ppm |
| Total VFA | SGSMC112 | 0.10ppm | 0.036ppm |
| Balance (Nitrogen and Argon) | SGSMC112 | 2.3% | 7.8% |

NOTES:

For: SGS Australia Pty. Ltd.

SJMAtore

Dr David Stone PhD (cantab) MRACI CChem Senior Chemist

This document is issued by the Company under its General Conditions of Service accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms_and_conditions.htm. Attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein. Any holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the Company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of Client's instructions, if any. The Company's sole responsibility is to its Client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents. Any unauthorized alteration, forgery or falsification of the content or appearance of this document is unlawful and offenders may be prosecuted to the fullest



ANALYTICAL REPORT

| Customer: | The Odour Unit Pty Ltd |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Attention: | Michael Assal |
| Your Reference: | Investigation of digester gases |
| SGS Report Number: | ENV 18031 |

Date of Receipt of Samples: 30th May 2013

The work has been carried out in accordance with your instructions. The results and associated information are contained in the following pages of the report. Should you have any queries regarding this report please contact the undersigned.

Reported by: Dr David Stone

Report authorised by: Dr Paul Pui

MAtore

Date: ____4/6/2013___

Date: ____5/6/2013____

This document is issued, on the Client's behalf, by the company under its General Conditions of Service available on request and accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms and conditions.htm. The client's attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein.

Any other holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of client's instructions, if any. The company's sole responsibility is to its client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents.

This test report shall not be reproduced except in full, without written approval of the laboratory.



1. Background

One sample of process gas (in 10-litre Tedlar gas sample bags) was delivered to SGS by TOU. The list of samples appears below. The scope of this investigation is to determine the nature of any sulphur-containing gases, and major VOCs in the process gas.

2.1 Sample description

| Sample | Description | |
|--------|---------------|--------------|
| 1 | MLA Biogas #1 | 29 May, 2013 |

Material Type process gas

2.2 Sample preparation prior to analysis:

No preparation was required, the gases are sampled directly. Blank analyses were run between samples to avoid any possibility of contamination from one sample to affect the result for another.

For Sulphur gases hydrocarbons 250 or 10 microlitre of gas was directly injected onto a Gas Chromatograph with Sulphur Chemi-luminescence detector (GC-SCD) using a syringe. For volatile organic compounds, the process gases were trapped onto a clean thermal desorbtion tube using a syringe, and thermally desorbed, using method US EPA TO-17.

Major gases were determined using 10 microlitre of gas directly injected onto a Gas Chromatograph with thermal conductivity detector (GC-TCD)

3. Preliminary laboratory examinations

Because of the reactive nature of the samples, the samples were analysed for all analytes including Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) within 24 hours of arrival.

4. Analytical Spectroscopic Results

4.1 Table 1. GC-TCD examination of process gases

| | Sample 1 |
|----------------|-------------------|
| analyte | Concentration (%) |
| methane | 65% |
| carbon dioxide | 33% |
| air | 2% |

4.2 Table 2. GC-SCD examination of process gases

| | Sample 1 |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| analyte | Concentration (ppm) |
| hydrogen sulphide | 3,250 |
| carbonyl sulphide | 0.33 |
| methyl mercaptan | 3.2 |
| ethyl mercaptan | 0.03 |
| i-propyl mercaptan | 0.01 |
| propyl mercaptan | 0.01 |

SGS Australia Pty Ltd Envi ABN 44 000 964 278 t+6

Environmental Services Unit 16/33 Maddox St Alexandria 2015 NSW Australia t+61 (0) 2 8594 0400 f+61 (0) 2 8594 0499 www.au.sgs.com



| dimethyl sulphide | 0.23 |
|------------------------|-------|
| dimethyl disulphide | 0.34 |
| ethylmethyl disulphide | <0.03 |
| carbon disulphide | 0.061 |

4.3 Table 3. GC-MS examination of process gases

| | Sample 1 |
|------------------|---------------------|
| analyte | Concentration (ppb) |
| i-butane | <0.5 |
| butane | <0.5 |
| i-pentane | 1.9 |
| pentane | 14.6 |
| hexanes | 37.2 |
| heptane | 22.1 |
| octane | 97.3 |
| nonane | 617 |
| decane | 425 |
| undecane | 82.9 |
| dodecane | 4.6 |
| tridecane | 0.7 |
| tetradecane | 0.3 |
| pentadecane | <0.3 |
| benzene | 8.6 |
| toluene | >100ppm |
| ethylbenzene | 12.4 |
| m,p-xylenes | 25.7 |
| o-xylene | 22.5 |
| C3-alkylbenzenes | 187 |
| naphthalene | 0.7 |

4.4 Table 4. Siloxanes in process gases by TD-GC-MS

| | Sample 1 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| analyte | Concentration (ppb) |
| hexamethyl cyclotrisiloxane | 57.0 |
| octamethyl cyclotetrasiloxane | 37.8 |
| decamethyl cyclopentasiloxane | 29.4 |
| dodecamethyl cyclohexasiloxane | 19.6 |
| tetradecamethyl cycloheptasiloxane | 37.3 |
| hexadecamethyl cyclooctasiloxane | 7.4 |

5. Conclusions

This is a biogas with high amounts of H2S and methyl mercaptan, but relatively low amounts of the other common VOCs and siloxanes.



Sample 1

| Client's Name: | Odour Unit | Report No: | ENV 18031 |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Contact: | Michael Assal | Client Ref No: | N/A |
| Site: | MLA, NSW | Date Received: | 30-May-2013 |
| | | Date Reported: | 04-June-2013 |
| Type of sample: | Bio-Gas | Sampled by: | N/A |
| Container: | Tedlar Bag | Page: | 1 of 1 |

Item:

Analysis of Biogas

SGS Lab ID 117977

| | | oumpio i |
|---------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Test Item | Method | Result |
| Sample ID | | 117997-1 |
| Methane | SGSMC112 | 65.0% |
| Carbondioxide | SGSMC112 | 33.0% |
| Oxygen | SGSMC112 | 0.44% |
| Nitrogen Compounds | | |
| Ammonia | SGSMC112 | <0.1ppm |
| Nitric Oxide & Nitrogen dioxide | SGSMC112 | <0.5ppm |
| Nitrous Oxide | SGSMC112 | <5ppm |
| Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons | SGSMC112 | <15 ppm v/v |
| втех | SGSMC112 | <10ppm |
| Carbon Monoxide | SGSMC112 | 2ppm |
| Hydrogen Sulphide | SGSMC112 | 3250ppm |
| Sulphur Dioxide | SGSMC112 | <1ppm |
| acetic acid | SGSMC112 | 0.06ppm |
| propanoic acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm |
| i-butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm |
| butanoic acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm |
| i-valeric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm |
| valeric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm |
| i-capric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm |
| capric acid | SGSMC112 | <0.005ppm |
| Total VFA | SGSMC112 | 0.06ppm |
| | | |
| Balance (Nitrogen and Argon) | SGSMC112 | 1.6% |

NOTES:

For: SGS Australia Pty. Ltd.

MAtore

Dr David Stone PhD (cantab) MRACI CChem Senior Chemist

This document is issued by the Company under its General Conditions of Service accessible at http://www.sgs.com/terms_and_conditions.htm. Attention is drawn to the limitation of liability, indemnification and jurisdiction issues defined therein. Any holder of this document is advised that information contained hereon reflects the Company's findings at the time of its intervention only and within the limits of Client's instructions, if any. The Company's sole responsibility is to its Client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under the transaction documents. Any unauthorized alteration, forgery or falsification of the content or appearance of this document is unlawful and offenders may be prosecuted to the fullest

Appendix 2 – Wastewater Analysis Laboratory Result Sheets

- Abattoir A Wastewater Laboratory Result Sheets October 2011 November 2011
- Abattoir B Wastewater Laboratory Result Sheets March 2012 April 2012
- Abattoir C Wastewater Laboratory Result Sheets March 2013 May 2013

Abattoir A

Wastewater Laboratory Result Sheets October 2011 – November 2011



The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015

WORLD RECOGNISED

Certificate of Analysis

NATA Accredited Accreditation Number 1261 Site Number 18217

Accredited for compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The results of the tests, calibrations and/or measurements included in this document are traceable to Australian/national standards.

Attention: Michael Assal

Report Client Reference Received Date 316338-W-V1 WASTEWATER ANALYSIS Oct 24, 2011

| Client Sample ID Sample Matrix mgt-LabMark Sample No. Date Sampled | | | INLET: 0820-1225 Water S11-Oc12865 Oct 24, 2011 | OUTLET: 0823-1235 Water S11-Oc12866 Oct 24, 2011 |
|---|-----|------|---|--|
| Test/Reference | LOR | Unit | | |
| | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | 2 | mg/L | 2700 | 980 |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | 5 | mg/L | 2200 | 750 |
| Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 2000 | 430 |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 2400 | 370 |



Sample History

Where samples are submitted/analysed over several days, the last date of extraction and analysis is reported.

| Description Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Testing Site Sydney | Extracted Oct 25, 2011 | Holding Time 2 Day |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| - Method: 4050-4051 BOD Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) - Method: 4520 COD | Sydney | Oct 31, 2011 | 28 Day |
| - Method: 4100 Total Suspended Solids | Sydney | Oct 27, 2011 | 7 Day |
| Volatile Suspended Solids - Method: 4100 Total Volatile Suspended Solids | Sydney | Oct 31, 2011 | 7 Day |



T

ABN – 50 005 085 521 e.mail : mgt@mgtenv.com.au web : www.mgtlabmark.com.au

Melbourne 3-5 Kingston Town Close Oakleigh VIC 3166 Phone : +61 3 9564 7055 NATA # 1261 & 1645 Site # 1254 & 14271 **Sydney** Unit F6, Building F 16 Mars Road Lane Cove West NSW 2066 Phone : +61 2 8215 6222 NATA # 1261 Site # 18217

Brisbane 1/21 Smallwood Place Murarrie QLD 4172 Phone : +61 7 3902 4600

| Company Name: The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Address: Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015 | | | | Orde Rep Pho Fax: | er No.: ort #: ne: | 316 02 | 3338 9209 4 9209 4 | Recei Due: Priorit Conta | | Oct 24, 2011 4:10 PM Nov 1, 2011 4:00 PM 5 Day Michael Assal | |
|--|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Client Job N | | EWATER ANA | LYSIS | | | | | | | mgt-LabMark | Client Manager: Onur Mehmet |
| Sample Detail | | | Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Suspended Solids | Volatile Suspended Solids | | | | | |
| | here analysis is | | | | | | | | | | |
| Melbourne Laboratory - NATA Site #1261 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sydney Laboratory - NATA Site #1645 | | | | X | Х | X | X | | | | |
| Sample ID | Sample Date | Sampling Time | Matrix | LAB ID | | | | | | | |
| INLET | Oct 24, 2011 | | Water | S11-Oc12865 | Х | Х | х | x | | | |
| OUTLET | Oct 24, 2011 | | Water | S11-Oc12866 | Х | Х | х | X | | | |



mgt-LabMark Internal Quality Control Review

General

- 1. Laboratory QC results for Method Blanks, Duplicates, Matrix Spikes, and Laboratory Control Samples are included in this QC report where applicable. Additional QC data may be available on request.
- 2. All soil results are reported on a dry basis, unless otherwise stated.
- 3. Actual PQLs are matrix dependant. Quoted PQLs may be raised where sample extracts are diluted due to interferences.
- 4. Results are uncorrected for matrix spikes or surrogate recoveries.
- 5. SVOC analysis on waters are performed on homogenised, unfiltered samples, unless noted otherwise.
- 6. Samples were analysed on an 'as received' basis.
- 7. This report replaces any interim results previously issued.

Holding Times

Please refer to 'Sample Preservation and Container Guide' for holding times (QS3001) For samples received on the last day of holding time, notification of testing requirements should have been received at least 6 hours prior to sample receipt deadlines as stated on the Sample Receipt Acknowledgment If the Laboratory did not receive the information in the required timeframe, and regardless of any other integrity issues, suitably qualified results may still be reported.

Holding times apply from the date of sampling, therefore compliance to these may be outside the laboratory's control. **NOTE: pH duplicates are reported as a range NOT as an RPD

UNITS

| mg/kg:milligrams per Kilogram | mg/L:milligrams per litre |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| μg/L:micrograms per litre | ppm:Parts per million |
| ppb:Parts per billion | %:Percentage |
| org/100mL:Organisms per 100 millilitres | NTU:Nephelometric Turbidity Units |

TERMS

| 1 Ertino | |
|-------------------|---|
| Dry: | Where a moisture has been determined on a solid sample the result is expressed on a dry basis. |
| LOR: | Limit Of Reporting. |
| SPIKE: | Addition of the analyte to the sample and reported as percentage recovery. |
| RPD: | Relative Percent Difference between two Duplicate pieces of analysis. |
| LCS: | Laboratory Control Sample - reported as percent recovery. |
| CRM: | Certified Reference Material - reported as percent recovery. |
| Method Blank: | In the case of solid samples these are performed on laboratory certified clean sands. |
| | In the case of water samples these are performed on de-ionised water. |
| Surr - Surrogate: | The addition of a like compound to the analyte target and reported as percentage recovery. |
| Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from the same sample and reported in the same units as the result to show comparison. |
| Batch Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from a sample outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| Batch SPIKE: | Spike recovery reported on a sample from outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| USEPA: | U.S Environmental Protection Agency |
| APHA: | American Public Health Association |
| ASLP: | Australian Standard Leaching Procedure (AS4439.3) |
| TCLP: | Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure |
| COC: | Chain Of Custody |
| SRA: | Sample Receipt Advice |
| CP: | Client Parent - QC was performed on samples pertaining to this report |
| NCP: | Non-Client Parent - QC was performed on samples not pertaining to this report, however QC is representative of the sequence or batch that client samples were analysed within |
| | |

QC - ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

RPD Duplicates: Global RPD Duplicates Acceptance Criteria is 30% however the following acceptance guidelines are equally applicable:

Results <10 times the LOR : No Limit

Results between 10-20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-50%

Results >20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-30%

Surrogate Recoveries : Recoveries must lie between 50-150% - Phenols 20-130%.

QC DATA GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. Where a result is reported as a less than (<), higher than the nominated LOR, this is due to either matrix interference, extract dilution required due to interferences or contaminant levels within the sample, high moisture content or insufficient sample provided.
- 2. Duplicate data shown within this report that states the word "BATCH" is a Batch Duplicate from outside of your sample batch, but within the laboratory sample batch at a 1:10 ratio. The Parent and Duplicate data shown is not data from your samples.
- 3. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting LCS data, Toxophene & Chlordane are not added to the LCS.
- 4. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting Spike data, Toxophene is not added to the Spike.
- Total Recoverable Hydrocarbons where reporting Spike & LCS data, a single spike of commercial Hydrocarbon products in the range of C12-C30 is added and it's Total Recovery is reported in the C10-C14 cell of the Report.
- 6. pH and Free Chlorine analysed in the laboratory Analysis on this test must begin within 30 minutes of sampling. Therefore laboratory analysis is unlikely to be completed within holding time. Analysis will begin as soon as possible after sample receipt
- 7. Recovery Data (Spikes & Surrogates) where chromatographic interference does not allow the determination of Recovery the term "INT" appears against that analyte.
- 8. Polychlorinated Biphenyls are spiked only using Arochlor 1260 in Matrix Spikes and LCS's.
- 9. For Matrix Spikes and LCS results a dash " -" in the report means that the specific analyte was not added to the QC sample>
- 10. Duplicate RPD's are calculated from raw analytical data thus it is possible to have two sets of data below the LOR with a positive RPD eg: LOR 0.1, Result A = <0.1 (raw data is 0.02) & Result B = <0.1 (raw data is 0.03) resulting in a RPD of 40% calculated from the raw data.



Quality Control Results

| Test | | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Method Blank | | | | | | | L | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | | | mg/L | < 2 | | 2 | | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | | |
| Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| LCS - % Recovery | | ł | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Suspended Solids | | | % | 99 | | | 70-130 | Pass | |
| Test | Lab Sample ID | QA Source | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
| Duplicate | | | | | | | • • • | | |
| | | | | Result 1 | Result 2 | RPD | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | N11-Oc11945 | NCP | mg/L | 6.4 | 5.9 | 8 | 30% | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | S11-Oc13522 | NCP | mg/L | 760 | 750 | 1 | 30% | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | S11-Oc12865 | CP | mg/L | 2000 | 1800 | 7 | 30% | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | S11-Oc12865 | CP | mg/L | 2400 | 2400 | 1 | 30% | Pass | |



Comments

| Sample Integrity | |
|---|-----|
| Custody Seals Intact (if used) | N/A |
| Attempt to Chill was evident | Yes |
| Sample correctly preserved | Yes |
| Organic samples had Teflon liners | Yes |
| Sample containers for volatile analysis received with minimal headspace | N/A |
| Samples received within HoldingTime | Yes |
| Some samples have been subcontracted | No |

Authorised By

Onur Mehmet

Client Services

NATA Signatories: Bob Symons

Senior Analyst-Inorganic (NSW)

Fint -

Dr. Bob Symons Laboratory Manager

Final report - this Report replaces any previously issued Report

- Indicates Not Requested

* Indicates NATA accreditation does not cover the performance of this service

Uncertainty data is available on request

mgt-LabMark shall not be liable for loss, cost, damages or expenses incurred by the client, or any other person or company, resulting from the use of any information or interpretation given in this report. In no case shall mgt-LabMark be liable for consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost profits, damages for failure to meet deadlines and lost production arising from this report. This document shall not be reproduced except in full and relates only to the items tested. Unless indicated otherwise, the tests were performed on the samples as received.



The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015



Certificate of Analysis

NATA Accredited Accreditation Number 1261 Site Number 18217

Accredited for compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The results of the tests, calibrations and/or measurements included in this document are traceable to Australian/national standards.

Attention: Michael Assal

Report Client Reference Received Date 317836-W WASTE WATER ANALYSIS Nov 08, 2011

| Client Sample ID Sample Matrix mgt-LabMark Sample No. | | | INLET Water S11-No04831 | OUTLET Water S11-No04832 |
|---|-----|------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Date Sampled Test/Reference | LOR | Unit | Nov 08, 2011 | Nov 08, 2011 |
| | | 0 | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | 2 | mg/L | 750 | 330 |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | 5 | mg/L | 3200 | 1300 |
| Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 1800 | 700 |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 1800 | 640 |



Sample History

Where samples are submitted/analysed over several days, the last date of extraction and analysis is reported.

| Description Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Testing Site Sydney | Extracted Nov 09, 2011 | Holding Time 2 Day |
|--|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| - Method: 4050-4051 BOD Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Svdnev | Nov 11. 2011 | 28 Dav |
| - Method: 4520 COD | Sydney | 100 11, 2011 | 20 Day |
| Suspended Solids | Sydney | Nov 09, 2011 | 7 Day |
| - Method: 4100 Total Suspended Solids Volatile Suspended Solids | Sydney | Nov 10. 2011 | 7 Day |
| - Method: 4100 Total Volatile Suspended Solids | 0,0.0, | | . 20) |



ABN - 50 005 085 521 e.mail : mgt@mgtenv.com.au web : www.mgtlabmark.com.au

Melbourne 3-5 Kingston Town Close Oakleigh VIC 3166 Phone : +61 3 9564 7055 NATA # 1261 & 1645 Site # 1254 & 14271

Sydney Unit F6, Building F 16 Mars Road Lane Cove West NSW 2066 Phone : +61 2 8215 6222 NATA # 1261 Site # 18217

Brisbane 1/21 Smallwood Place Murarrie QLD 4172 Phone : +61 7 3902 4600

| Company Name: The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Address: Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015 Client Job No.: WASTE WATER ANALYSIS | | | | | Order No.: Report #: 317836 Phone: 02 9209 4220 Fax: 02 9209 4421 | | | | Received: Due: Priority: Contact nam | ne: | Nov 8, 2011 4:45 PM Nov 16, 2011 4:00 PM 5 Day Michael Assal |
|---|---|------------|--------|-------------|---|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | r | ngt-LabMarl | k Client Manager: Onur Mehmet |
| | | mple Detai | I | | Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Suspended Solids | Volatile Suspended Solids | | | |
| | Laboratory where analysis is conducted Melbourne Laboratory - NATA Site #1261 Sydney Laboratory - NATA Site #1645 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | x | x | х | x | | | |
| | | Sampling | | | ^ | ^ | ^ | ^ | | | |
| Sample ID | Sample Date | Time | Matrix | LAB ID | | | | | | | |
| INLET | Nov 08, 2011 | | Water | S11-No04831 | Х | Х | X | Х | | | |
| OUTLET | Nov 08, 2011 | | Water | S11-No04832 | Х | Х | Х | Х | | | |



mgt-LabMark Internal Quality Control Review

General

- 1. Laboratory QC results for Method Blanks, Duplicates, Matrix Spikes, and Laboratory Control Samples are included in this QC report where applicable. Additional QC data may be available on request.
- 2. All soil results are reported on a dry basis, unless otherwise stated.
- 3. Actual PQLs are matrix dependant. Quoted PQLs may be raised where sample extracts are diluted due to interferences.
- 4. Results are uncorrected for matrix spikes or surrogate recoveries.
- 5. SVOC analysis on waters are performed on homogenised, unfiltered samples, unless noted otherwise.
- 6. Samples were analysed on an 'as received' basis.
- 7. This report replaces any interim results previously issued.

Holding Times

Please refer to 'Sample Preservation and Container Guide' for holding times (QS3001) For samples received on the last day of holding time, notification of testing requirements should have been received at least 6 hours prior to sample receipt deadlines as stated on the Sample Receipt Acknowledgment If the Laboratory did not receive the information in the required timeframe, and regardless of any other integrity issues, suitably qualified results may still be reported.

Holding times apply from the date of sampling, therefore compliance to these may be outside the laboratory's control. **NOTE: pH duplicates are reported as a range NOT as an RPD

UNITS

| mg/L:milligrams per litre |
|-----------------------------------|
| ppm:Parts per million |
| %:Percentage |
| NTU:Nephelometric Turbidity Units |
| |

TERMS

| 1 Ertino | |
|-------------------|---|
| Dry: | Where a moisture has been determined on a solid sample the result is expressed on a dry basis. |
| LOR: | Limit Of Reporting. |
| SPIKE: | Addition of the analyte to the sample and reported as percentage recovery. |
| RPD: | Relative Percent Difference between two Duplicate pieces of analysis. |
| LCS: | Laboratory Control Sample - reported as percent recovery. |
| CRM: | Certified Reference Material - reported as percent recovery. |
| Method Blank: | In the case of solid samples these are performed on laboratory certified clean sands. |
| | In the case of water samples these are performed on de-ionised water. |
| Surr - Surrogate: | The addition of a like compound to the analyte target and reported as percentage recovery. |
| Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from the same sample and reported in the same units as the result to show comparison. |
| Batch Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from a sample outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| Batch SPIKE: | Spike recovery reported on a sample from outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| USEPA: | U.S Environmental Protection Agency |
| APHA: | American Public Health Association |
| ASLP: | Australian Standard Leaching Procedure (AS4439.3) |
| TCLP: | Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure |
| COC: | Chain Of Custody |
| SRA: | Sample Receipt Advice |
| CP: | Client Parent - QC was performed on samples pertaining to this report |
| NCP: | Non-Client Parent - QC was performed on samples not pertaining to this report, however QC is representative of the sequence or batch that client samples were analysed within |
| | |

QC - ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

RPD Duplicates: Global RPD Duplicates Acceptance Criteria is 30% however the following acceptance guidelines are equally applicable:

Results <10 times the LOR : No Limit

Results between 10-20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-50%

Results >20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-30%

Surrogate Recoveries : Recoveries must lie between 50-150% - Phenols 20-130%.

QC DATA GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. Where a result is reported as a less than (<), higher than the nominated LOR, this is due to either matrix interference, extract dilution required due to interferences or contaminant levels within the sample, high moisture content or insufficient sample provided.
- 2. Duplicate data shown within this report that states the word "BATCH" is a Batch Duplicate from outside of your sample batch, but within the laboratory sample batch at a 1:10 ratio. The Parent and Duplicate data shown is not data from your samples.
- 3. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting LCS data, Toxophene & Chlordane are not added to the LCS.
- 4. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting Spike data, Toxophene is not added to the Spike.
- Total Recoverable Hydrocarbons where reporting Spike & LCS data, a single spike of commercial Hydrocarbon products in the range of C12-C30 is added and it's Total Recovery is reported in the C10-C14 cell of the Report.
- 6. pH and Free Chlorine analysed in the laboratory Analysis on this test must begin within 30 minutes of sampling. Therefore laboratory analysis is unlikely to be completed within holding time. Analysis will begin as soon as possible after sample receipt
- 7. Recovery Data (Spikes & Surrogates) where chromatographic interference does not allow the determination of Recovery the term "INT" appears against that analyte.
- 8. Polychlorinated Biphenyls are spiked only using Arochlor 1260 in Matrix Spikes and LCS's.
- 9. For Matrix Spikes and LCS results a dash " -" in the report means that the specific analyte was not added to the QC sample>
- 10. Duplicate RPD's are calculated from raw analytical data thus it is possible to have two sets of data below the LOR with a positive RPD eg: LOR 0.1, Result A = <0.1 (raw data is 0.02) & Result B = <0.1 (raw data is 0.03) resulting in a RPD of 40% calculated from the raw data.



Quality Control Results

| Test | | | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------|----------|----------|-----|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Method Blank | | | | | | | | • | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 | Day) | | mg/L | < 2 | | | 2 | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | | | | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| LCS - % Recovery | | | | | | | • | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | % | 98 | | | 70-130 | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | | | % | 92 | | | 70-130 | Pass | |
| Test | Lab Sample ID | QA Source | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
| Duplicate | | | | | | | • • • | | |
| | | | | Result 1 | Result 2 | RPD | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | S11-No05007 | NCP | mg/L | 11 | 12 | 7.0 | 30% | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | S11-No05396 | NCP | mg/L | 420 | 420 | <1 | 30% | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | N11-No04446 | NCP | mg/L | < 5 | 5.5 | 20 | 30% | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | S11-No04831 | CP | mg/L | 1800 | 1700 | 4.0 | 30% | Pass | |



Comments

| Sample Integrity | |
|---|-----|
| Custody Seals Intact (if used) | N/A |
| Attempt to Chill was evident | Yes |
| Sample correctly preserved | Yes |
| Organic samples had Teflon liners | Yes |
| Sample containers for volatile analysis received with minimal headspace | N/A |
| Samples received within HoldingTime | Yes |
| Some samples have been subcontracted | No |

Authorised By

Onur Mehmet

Client Services

NATA Signatories: Bob Symons

Senior Analyst-Inorganic (NSW)

Any -

Dr. Bob Symons Laboratory Manager

Final report - this Report replaces any previously issued Report

- Indicates Not Requested

* Indicates NATA accreditation does not cover the performance of this service

Uncertainty data is available on request

mg-LabMark shall not be liable for loss, cost, damages or expenses incurred by the client, or any other person or company, resulting from the use of any information or interpretation given in this report. In no case shall mgt-LabMark be liable for consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost profits, damages for failure to meet deadlines and lost production arising from this report. This document shall not be reproduced except in full and relates only to the items tested. Unless indicated otherwise, the tests were performed on the samples as received.



The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015



Certificate of Analysis

NATA Accredited Accreditation Number 1261 Site Number 18217

Accredited for compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The results of the tests, calibrations and/or measurements included in this document are traceable to Australian/national standards.

Attention: Michael Assal

Report Client Reference Received Date 319357-W WATE WATER ANALYSIS Nov 22, 2011

| Client Sample ID Sample Matrix mgt-LabMark Sample No. Date Sampled | | | INLET Water S11-No13613 Nov 22, 2011 | OUTLET Water S11-No13614 Nov 22, 2011 |
|---|-----|------|---|--|
| Test/Reference | LOR | Unit | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | 2 | mg/L | 3200 | 450 |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | 5 | mg/L | 3500 | 1000 |
| Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 1900 | 280 |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 1800 | 280 |



Sample History

Where samples are submitted/analysed over several days, the last date of extraction and analysis is reported.

| Description Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Testing Site Sydney | Extracted Nov 23, 2011 | Holding Time 2 Day |
|--|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| - Method: 4050-4051 BOD Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Sydney | Nov 25, 2011 | 28 Day |
| - Method: 4520 COD Suspended Solids | Sydney | Nov 23, 2011 | 7 Day |
| - Method: 4100 Total Suspended Solids Volatile Suspended Solids | Sydney | Nov 23, 2011 | 7 Day |
| - Method: 4100 Total Volatile Suspended Solids | | | . 20) |



ABN - 50 005 085 521 e.mail : mgt@mgtenv.com.au web : www.mgtlabmark.com.au

Melbourne 3-5 Kingston Town Close Oakleigh VIC 3166 Phone : +61 3 9564 7055 NATA # 1261 & 1645 Site # 1254 & 14271

Sydney Unit F6, Building F 16 Mars Road Lane Cove West NSW 2066 Phone : +61 2 8215 6222 NATA # 1261 Site # 18217

Brisbane 1/21 Smallwood Place Murarrie QLD 4172 Phone : +61 7 3902 4600

| Company Na Address: | Suite 1 Locom EVELE NSW 2 | | td an Technold | ogy Park, 2 | | er No.: ort #: ne: : | 319 02 9 | 9357 9209 4 9209 4 | Received: Due: Priority: Contact na | me: | Nov 22, 2011 6:00 PM Nov 30, 2011 4:00 PM 5 Day Michael Assal |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| Client Job N | o.: WATE | WATER ANAL | YSIS | | | | | | | mgt-LabMarl | Client Manager: Onur Mehmet |
| | | mple Deta | il | | Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Suspended Solids | Volatile Suspended Solids | | | |
| Laboratory wi | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | boratory - NAT | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sydney Labor | atory - NATA S | | | | X | X | X | X | | | |
| Sample ID | Sample Date | Sampling Time | Matrix | LAB ID | | | | | | | |
| INLET | Nov 22, 2011 | | Water | S11-No13613 | х | х | X | х | | | |
| OUTLET | Nov 22, 2011 | | Water | S11-No13614 | Х | Х | X | х | | | |



mgt-LabMark Internal Quality Control Review

General

- 1. Laboratory QC results for Method Blanks, Duplicates, Matrix Spikes, and Laboratory Control Samples are included in this QC report where applicable. Additional QC data may be available on request.
- 2. All soil results are reported on a dry basis, unless otherwise stated.
- 3. Actual PQLs are matrix dependant. Quoted PQLs may be raised where sample extracts are diluted due to interferences.
- 4. Results are uncorrected for matrix spikes or surrogate recoveries.
- 5. SVOC analysis on waters are performed on homogenised, unfiltered samples, unless noted otherwise.
- 6. Samples were analysed on an 'as received' basis.
- 7. This report replaces any interim results previously issued.

Holding Times

Please refer to 'Sample Preservation and Container Guide' for holding times (QS3001) For samples received on the last day of holding time, notification of testing requirements should have been received at least 6 hours prior to sample receipt deadlines as stated on the Sample Receipt Acknowledgment If the Laboratory did not receive the information in the required timeframe, and regardless of any other integrity issues, suitably qualified results may still be reported.

Holding times apply from the date of sampling, therefore compliance to these may be outside the laboratory's control. **NOTE: pH duplicates are reported as a range NOT as an RPD

UNITS

| mg/L:milligrams per litre |
|-----------------------------------|
| ppm:Parts per million |
| %:Percentage |
| NTU:Nephelometric Turbidity Units |
| |

TERMS

| 1 Ertino | |
|-------------------|---|
| Dry: | Where a moisture has been determined on a solid sample the result is expressed on a dry basis. |
| LOR: | Limit Of Reporting. |
| SPIKE: | Addition of the analyte to the sample and reported as percentage recovery. |
| RPD: | Relative Percent Difference between two Duplicate pieces of analysis. |
| LCS: | Laboratory Control Sample - reported as percent recovery. |
| CRM: | Certified Reference Material - reported as percent recovery. |
| Method Blank: | In the case of solid samples these are performed on laboratory certified clean sands. |
| | In the case of water samples these are performed on de-ionised water. |
| Surr - Surrogate: | The addition of a like compound to the analyte target and reported as percentage recovery. |
| Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from the same sample and reported in the same units as the result to show comparison. |
| Batch Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from a sample outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| Batch SPIKE: | Spike recovery reported on a sample from outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| USEPA: | U.S Environmental Protection Agency |
| APHA: | American Public Health Association |
| ASLP: | Australian Standard Leaching Procedure (AS4439.3) |
| TCLP: | Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure |
| COC: | Chain Of Custody |
| SRA: | Sample Receipt Advice |
| CP: | Client Parent - QC was performed on samples pertaining to this report |
| NCP: | Non-Client Parent - QC was performed on samples not pertaining to this report, however QC is representative of the sequence or batch that client samples were analysed within |
| | |

QC - ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

RPD Duplicates: Global RPD Duplicates Acceptance Criteria is 30% however the following acceptance guidelines are equally applicable:

Results <10 times the LOR : No Limit

Results between 10-20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-50%

Results >20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-30%

Surrogate Recoveries : Recoveries must lie between 50-150% - Phenols 20-130%.

QC DATA GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. Where a result is reported as a less than (<), higher than the nominated LOR, this is due to either matrix interference, extract dilution required due to interferences or contaminant levels within the sample, high moisture content or insufficient sample provided.
- 2. Duplicate data shown within this report that states the word "BATCH" is a Batch Duplicate from outside of your sample batch, but within the laboratory sample batch at a 1:10 ratio. The Parent and Duplicate data shown is not data from your samples.
- 3. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting LCS data, Toxophene & Chlordane are not added to the LCS.
- 4. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting Spike data, Toxophene is not added to the Spike.
- Total Recoverable Hydrocarbons where reporting Spike & LCS data, a single spike of commercial Hydrocarbon products in the range of C12-C30 is added and it's Total Recovery is reported in the C10-C14 cell of the Report.
- 6. pH and Free Chlorine analysed in the laboratory Analysis on this test must begin within 30 minutes of sampling. Therefore laboratory analysis is unlikely to be completed within holding time. Analysis will begin as soon as possible after sample receipt
- 7. Recovery Data (Spikes & Surrogates) where chromatographic interference does not allow the determination of Recovery the term "INT" appears against that analyte.
- 8. Polychlorinated Biphenyls are spiked only using Arochlor 1260 in Matrix Spikes and LCS's.
- 9. For Matrix Spikes and LCS results a dash " -" in the report means that the specific analyte was not added to the QC sample>
- 10. Duplicate RPD's are calculated from raw analytical data thus it is possible to have two sets of data below the LOR with a positive RPD eg: LOR 0.1, Result A = <0.1 (raw data is 0.02) & Result B = <0.1 (raw data is 0.03) resulting in a RPD of 40% calculated from the raw data.



Quality Control Results

| Test | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Method Blank | | | | | | | - | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 | Day) | | mg/L | < 2 | | | 2 | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| LCS - % Recovery | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | % | 100 | | | 70-130 | Pass | |
| Test | Lab Sample ID | QA Source | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
| Duplicate | | • | | • | | | • | | |
| | | | Result 1 | Result 2 | RPD | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | S11-No13613 | CP | mg/L | 3200 | 3000 | 4 | 30% | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | S11-No13613 | CP | mg/L | 3500 | 3400 | 2 | 30% | Pass | |



Comments

| Sample Integrity | |
|---|-----|
| Custody Seals Intact (if used) | N/A |
| Attempt to Chill was evident | Yes |
| Sample correctly preserved | Yes |
| Organic samples had Teflon liners | Yes |
| Sample containers for volatile analysis received with minimal headspace | N/A |
| Samples received within HoldingTime | Yes |
| Some samples have been subcontracted | No |

Authorised By

Onur Mehmet

Client Services

NATA Signatories: Bob Symons

Senior Analyst-Inorganic (NSW)

Fint -

Dr. Bob Symons Laboratory Manager

Final report - this Report replaces any previously issued Report

- Indicates Not Requested

* Indicates NATA accreditation does not cover the performance of this service

Uncertainty data is available on request

mgt-LabMark shall not be liable for loss, cost, damages or expenses incurred by the client, or any other person or company, resulting from the use of any information or interpretation given in this report. In no case shall mgt-LabMark be liable for consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost profits, damages for failure to meet deadlines and lost production arising from this report. This document shall not be reproduced except in full and relates only to the items tested. Unless indicated otherwise, the tests were performed on the samples as received.

Abattoir B

Wastewater Laboratory Result Sheets March 2012 – April 2012



The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015



Certificate of Analysis

NATA Accredited Accreditation Number 1261 Site Number 18217

Accredited for compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The results of the tests, calibrations and/or measurements included in this document are traceable to Australian/national standards.

Attention: Michael Assal

Report Client Reference Received Date 331155-W WASTE WATER ANALYSIS Mar 22, 2012

| Client Sample ID | | | WW OUTLET | WW INLET |
|---------------------------------------|-----|------|--------------|--------------|
| Sample Matrix | | | Water | Water |
| mgt-LabMark Sample No. | | | S12-Ma13988 | S12-Ma13989 |
| Date Sampled | | | Mar 21, 2012 | Mar 21, 2012 |
| Test/Reference | LOR | Unit | | |
| | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | 2 | mg/L | 630 | 3800 |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | 5 | mg/L | 840 | 2500 |
| Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 410 | 1800 |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 410 | 1800 |



Sample History

Where samples are submitted/analysed over several days, the last date of extraction and analysis is reported.

| Description Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) - Method: 4050-4051 BOD | Testing Site Sydney | Extracted Mar 22, 2012 | Holding Time 2 Day |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Sydney | Mar 22, 2012 | 28 Day |
| - Method: 4520 COD Suspended Solids | Sydney | Mar 22, 2012 | 7 Day |
| - Method: 4100 Total Suspended Solids Volatile Suspended Solids - Method: 4100 Total Volatile Suspended Solids | Sydney | Mar 22, 2012 | 7 Day |
| - Method. 4100 Total Volatile Suspended Solids | | | |



Oakle Phone ABN – 50 005 085 521 e.mail : enviro@mgtlabmark.com.au web : www.mgtlabmark.com.au Site #

Melbourne 3-5 Kingston Town Close Oakleigh VIC 3166 Phone : +61 3 9564 7055 NATA # 1261 Site # 1254
 Sydney
 Br

 Unit F6, Building F
 1//

 16 Mars Road
 M

 Lane Cove West NSW 2066
 Pł

 Phone : +61 2 8215 6222
 N/

 NATA # 1261 Site # 18217

Brisbane 1/21 Smallwood Place Murarrie QLD 4172 Phone : +61 7 3902 4600 NATA # 1261 Site # 20794

| Address: | Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015 Client Job No.: | | | | Phone: | | 02 9 | 331155 02 9209 4220 02 9209 4421 | | Received: Due: Priority: Contact nam | - | Mar 22, 2012 10:45 AM Mar 29, 2012 4:00 PM 5 Day Michael Assal k Client Manager: Onur Mehmet |
|--|--|------------------|---------|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| | WAST | E WATER ANA | ALYSIS | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sa | mple Deta | il | | Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Suspended Solids | Volatile Suspended Solids | | | | |
| Laboratory w | here analysis i | s conducted | | | | | | | | | | |
| Melbourne La | boratory - NA | TA Site # 1254 | & 14271 | | | | | | | | | |
| Sydney Labo | Sydney Laboratory - NATA Site # 18217 | | | X | Х | Х | Х | | | | | |
| Brisbane Laboratory - NATA Site # 20794 External Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sample ID | Sample Date | Sampling Time | Matrix | LAB ID | | | | | | | | |
| WW OUTLET | Mar 21, 2012 | | Water | S12-Ma13988 | Х | Х | Х | Х | | | | |
| WW INLET | Mar 21, 2012 | | Water | S12-Ma13989 | Х | Х | Х | Х | | | | |



mgt-LabMark Internal Quality Control Review

General

- 1. Laboratory QC results for Method Blanks, Duplicates, Matrix Spikes, and Laboratory Control Samples are included in this QC report where applicable. Additional QC data may be available on request.
- 2. All soil results are reported on a dry basis, unless otherwise stated.
- 3. Actual PQLs are matrix dependant. Quoted PQLs may be raised where sample extracts are diluted due to interferences.
- 4. Results are uncorrected for matrix spikes or surrogate recoveries.
- 5. SVOC analysis on waters are performed on homogenised, unfiltered samples, unless noted otherwise.
- 6. Samples were analysed on an 'as received' basis.
- 7. This report replaces any interim results previously issued.

Holding Times

Please refer to 'Sample Preservation and Container Guide' for holding times (QS3001)

For samples received on the last day of holding time, notification of testing requirements should have been received at least

6 hours prior to sample receipt deadlines as stated on the Sample Receipt Acknowledgment

If the Laboratory did not receive the information in the required timeframe, and regardless of any other integrity issues, suitably qualified results may still be reported.

Holding times apply from the date of sampling, therefore compliance to these may be outside the laboratory's control. **NOTE: pH duplicates are reported as a range NOT as an RPD

UNITS mg/kg:milligrams per Kilogram

 mg/kg:milligrams per Kilogram
 mg/L:milligrams per litre

 µg/L:micrograms per litre
 ppm:Parts per million

 ppb:Parts per billion
 %:Percentage

 org/100mL:Organisms per 100 millilitres
 NTU:Nephelometric Turbidity Units

TERMS

| Dry: | Where a moisture has been determined on a solid sample the result is expressed on a dry basis. |
|-------------------|---|
| LOR: | Limit Of Reporting. |
| SPIKE: | Addition of the analyte to the sample and reported as percentage recovery. |
| RPD: | Relative Percent Difference between two Duplicate pieces of analysis. |
| LCS: | Laboratory Control Sample - reported as percent recovery. |
| CRM: | Certified Reference Material - reported as percent recovery. |
| Method Blank: | In the case of solid samples these are performed on laboratory certified clean sands. |
| | In the case of water samples these are performed on de-ionised water. |
| Surr - Surrogate: | The addition of a like compound to the analyte target and reported as percentage recovery. |
| Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from the same sample and reported in the same units as the result to show comparison. |
| Batch Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from a sample outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| Batch SPIKE: | Spike recovery reported on a sample from outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| USEPA: | U.S Environmental Protection Agency |
| APHA: | American Public Health Association |
| ASLP: | Australian Standard Leaching Procedure (AS4439.3) |
| TCLP: | Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure |
| COC: | Chain Of Custody |
| SRA: | Sample Receipt Advice |
| CP: | Client Parent - QC was performed on samples pertaining to this report |
| NCP: | Non-Client Parent - QC was performed on samples not pertaining to this report, however QC is representative of the sequence or batch that client samples were analysed within |

QC - ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

RPD Duplicates: Global RPD Duplicates Acceptance Criteria is 30% however the following acceptance guidelines are equally applicable:

Results <10 times the LOR : No Limit

Results between 10-20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-50%

Results >20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-30%

Surrogate Recoveries : Recoveries must lie between 50-150% - Phenols 20-130%.

QC DATA GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. Where a result is reported as a less than (<), higher than the nominated LOR, this is due to either matrix interference, extract dilution required due to interferences or contaminant levels within the sample, high moisture content or insufficient sample provided.
- 2. Duplicate data shown within this report that states the word "BATCH" is a Batch Duplicate from outside of your sample batch, but within the laboratory sample batch at a 1:10 ratio. The Parent and Duplicate data shown is not data from your samples.
- 3. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting LCS data, Toxophene & Chlordane are not added to the LCS.
- 4. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting Spike data, Toxophene is not added to the Spike.
- 5. Total Recoverable Hydrocarbons where reporting Spike & LCS data, a single spike of commercial Hydrocarbon products in the range of C12-C30 is added and it's Total Recovery is reported in the C10-C14 cell of the Report.
- pH and Free Chlorine analysed in the laboratory Analysis on this test must begin within 30 minutes of sampling. Therefore laboratory analysis is unlikely to be completed within holding time. Analysis will begin as soon as possible after sample receipt
- 7. Recovery Data (Spikes & Surrogates) where chromatographic interference does not allow the determination of Recovery the term "INT" appears against that analyte.
- 8. Polychlorinated Biphenyls are spiked only using Arochlor 1260 in Matrix Spikes and LCS's.
- 9. For Matrix Spikes and LCS results a dash " -" in the report means that the specific analyte was not added to the QC sample>
- 10. Duplicate RPD's are calculated from raw analytical data thus it is possible to have two sets of data below the LOR with a positive RPD eg: LOR 0.1, Result A = <0.1 (raw data is 0.02) & Result B = <0.1 (raw data is 0.03) resulting in a RPD of 40% calculated from the raw data.



Quality Control Results

| Test | | | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------|----------|----------|------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Method Blank | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD | mg/L | < 2 | | | 2 | Pass | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | | | |
| Suspended Solids | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | | | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | | | |
| LCS - % Recovery | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | % | 96 | | | 70-130 | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | | | % | 97 | | | 70-130 | Pass | |
| Test | Lab Sample ID | QA Source | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
| Duplicate | | | | | • | | | | |
| | | | | Result 1 | Result 2 | RPD | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | S12-Ma13988 | CP | mg/L | 630 | 630 | <1 | 30% | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | S12-Ma12666 | NCP | mg/L | 160 | 160 | 2.0 | 30% | Pass | |
| Duplicate | • | | | | • | | | | |
| | | | | Result 1 | Result 2 | RPD | | | |
| Suspended Solids | S12-Ma13989 | CP | mg/L | 1800 | 1800 | 3.0 | 30% | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | S12-Ma13989 | CP | mg/L | 1800 | 1700 | 4.0 | 30% | Pass | |



Comments

| Sample Integrity | |
|---|-----|
| Custody Seals Intact (if used) | N/A |
| Attempt to Chill was evident | Yes |
| Sample correctly preserved | Yes |
| Organic samples had Teflon liners | Yes |
| Sample containers for volatile analysis received with minimal headspace | Yes |
| Samples received within HoldingTime | Yes |
| Some samples have been subcontracted | No |

Authorised By

Onur Mehmet Bob Symons Client Services Senior Analyst-Inorganic (NSW)

.

Dr. Bob Symons Laboratory Manager

Final report - this Report replaces any previously issued Report

- Indicates Not Requested

* Indicates NATA accreditation does not cover the performance of this service

Uncertainty data is available on request

mgt-LabMark shall not be liable for loss, cost, damages or expenses incurred by the client, or any other person or company, resulting from the use of any information or interpretation given in this report. In no case shall mgt-LabMark be liable for consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost profits, damages for failure to meet deadlines and lost production arising from this report. This document shall not be reproduced except in full and relates only to the items tested. Unless indicated otherwise, the tests were performed on the samples as received.



The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015

Attention: Michael Assal

Report Client Reference Received Date 331840-W RE TEST: WASTE WATER ANALYSIS Mar 27, 2012

| Client Sample ID | | | WW INLET |
|------------------------------|-----|------|--------------|
| Sample Matrix | | | Water |
| mgt-LabMark Sample No. | | | S12-Ma18800 |
| Date Sampled | | | Mar 21, 2012 |
| Test/Reference | LOR | Unit | |
| | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | 5 | mg/L | 4400 |

Certificate of Analysis

NATA Accredited Accreditation Number 1261 Site Number 18217

NATA

WORLD RECOGNISED

Accredited for compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The results of the tests, calibrations and/or measurements included in this document are traceable to Australian/national standards.



Sample History

Where samples are submitted/analysed over several days, the last date of extraction and analysis is reported.

Description Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) - Method: 4520 COD Testing Site Sydney Extracted Mar 28, 2012 Holding Time 28 Day



ATORIES ABN – 50 005 085 521 e.mail : enviro@mgtlabmark.com.au web : www.mgtlabmark.com.au Site Site

Melbourne 3-5 Kingston Town Close Oakleigh VIC 3166 Phone : +61 3 9564 7055 NATA # 1261 Site # 1254 **Sydney** Unit F6, Building F 16 Mars Road Lane Cove West NSW 2066 Phone : +61 2 8215 6222 NATA # 1261 Site # 18217 Brisbane 1/21 Smallwood Place Murarrie QLD 4172 Phone : +61 7 3902 4600 NATA # 1261 Site # 20794

| Company Na Address: | Suite 1 | | td an Technold | ogy Park, 2 | Order No.: Report #: Phone: Fax: | 331840 02 9209 4220 02 9209 4421 | Received: Due: Priority: Contact name: | Mar 27, 2012 3:46 PM Apr 3, 2012 4:00 PM 5 Day Michael Assal |
|------------------------|--|-------------|-------------------|-------------|---|--|---|---|
| Client Job No | | ST: WASTE W | ATER ANA | LYSIS | | | mgt-LabM | ark Client Manager: Onur Mehr |
| | Sa | mple Deta | il | | Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | |
| Laboratory wh | | | | | | | | |
| Melbourne La | - | | & 14271 | | x | | | |
| | ydney Laboratory - NATA Site # 18217 risbane Laboratory - NATA Site # 20794 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| External Labo | ratory | | | | | | | |
| | | Sampling | Matrix | LAB ID | | | | |
| Sample ID | Sample Date | Time | Matrix | | | | | |



mgt-LabMark Internal Quality Control Review

General

- 1. Laboratory QC results for Method Blanks, Duplicates, Matrix Spikes, and Laboratory Control Samples are included in this QC report where applicable. Additional QC data may be available on request.
- 2. All soil results are reported on a dry basis, unless otherwise stated.
- 3. Actual PQLs are matrix dependant. Quoted PQLs may be raised where sample extracts are diluted due to interferences.
- 4. Results are uncorrected for matrix spikes or surrogate recoveries.
- 5. SVOC analysis on waters are performed on homogenised, unfiltered samples, unless noted otherwise.
- 6. Samples were analysed on an 'as received' basis.
- 7. This report replaces any interim results previously issued.

Holding Times

Please refer to 'Sample Preservation and Container Guide' for holding times (QS3001)

For samples received on the last day of holding time, notification of testing requirements should have been received at least

6 hours prior to sample receipt deadlines as stated on the Sample Receipt Acknowledgment

If the Laboratory did not receive the information in the required timeframe, and regardless of any other integrity issues, suitably qualified results may still be reported.

Holding times apply from the date of sampling, therefore compliance to these may be outside the laboratory's control. **NOTE: pH duplicates are reported as a range NOT as an RPD

UNITS mg/kg:milligrams per Kilogram

 mg/kg:milligrams per Kilogram
 mg/L:milligrams per litre

 µg/L:micrograms per litre
 ppm:Parts per million

 ppb:Parts per billion
 %:Percentage

 org/100mL:Organisms per 100 millilitres
 NTU:Nephelometric Turbidity Units

TERMS

| Dry: | Where a moisture has been determined on a solid sample the result is expressed on a dry basis. |
|-------------------|--|
| LOR: | Limit Of Reporting. |
| SPIKE: | Addition of the analyte to the sample and reported as percentage recovery. |
| RPD: | Relative Percent Difference between two Duplicate pieces of analysis. |
| LCS: | Laboratory Control Sample - reported as percent recovery. |
| CRM: | Certified Reference Material - reported as percent recovery. |
| Method Blank: | In the case of solid samples these are performed on laboratory certified clean sands. |
| | In the case of water samples these are performed on de-ionised water. |
| Surr - Surrogate: | The addition of a like compound to the analyte target and reported as percentage recovery. |
| Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from the same sample and reported in the same units as the result to show comparison. |
| Batch Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from a sample outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| Batch SPIKE: | Spike recovery reported on a sample from outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| USEPA: | U.S Environmental Protection Agency |
| APHA: | American Public Health Association |
| ASLP: | Australian Standard Leaching Procedure (AS4439.3) |
| TCLP: | Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure |
| COC: | Chain Of Custody |
| SRA: | Sample Receipt Advice |
| CP: | Client Parent - QC was performed on samples pertaining to this report |
| NCP: | Non-Client Parent - QC was performed on samples not pertaining to this report, however QC is representative of the sequence or batch that client samples were a within |
| | |

QC - ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

RPD Duplicates: Global RPD Duplicates Acceptance Criteria is 30% however the following acceptance guidelines are equally applicable:

Results <10 times the LOR : No Limit

Results between 10-20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-50%

Results >20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-30%

Surrogate Recoveries : Recoveries must lie between 50-150% - Phenols 20-130%.

QC DATA GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. Where a result is reported as a less than (<), higher than the nominated LOR, this is due to either matrix interference, extract dilution required due to interferences or contaminant levels within the sample, high moisture content or insufficient sample provided.
- 2. Duplicate data shown within this report that states the word "BATCH" is a Batch Duplicate from outside of your sample batch, but within the laboratory sample batch at a 1:10 ratio. The Parent and Duplicate data shown is not data from your samples.
- 3. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting LCS data, Toxophene & Chlordane are not added to the LCS.
- 4. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting Spike data, Toxophene is not added to the Spike.
- 5. Total Recoverable Hydrocarbons where reporting Spike & LCS data, a single spike of commercial Hydrocarbon products in the range of C12-C30 is added and it's Total Recovery is reported in the C10-C14 cell of the Report.
- pH and Free Chlorine analysed in the laboratory Analysis on this test must begin within 30 minutes of sampling. Therefore laboratory analysis is unlikely to be completed within holding time. Analysis will begin as soon as possible after sample receipt
- 7. Recovery Data (Spikes & Surrogates) where chromatographic interference does not allow the determination of Recovery the term "INT" appears against that analyte.
- 8. Polychlorinated Biphenyls are spiked only using Arochlor 1260 in Matrix Spikes and LCS's.
- 9. For Matrix Spikes and LCS results a dash " -" in the report means that the specific analyte was not added to the QC sample>
- 10. Duplicate RPD's are calculated from raw analytical data thus it is possible to have two sets of data below the LOR with a positive RPD eg: LOR 0.1, Result A = <0.1 (raw data is 0.02) & Result B = <0.1 (raw data is 0.03) resulting in a RPD of 40% calculated from the raw data.

analysed



Quality Control Results



Comments

| Sample Integrity | |
|---|-----|
| Custody Seals Intact (if used) | N/A |
| Attempt to Chill was evident | Yes |
| Sample correctly preserved | Yes |
| Organic samples had Teflon liners | Yes |
| Sample containers for volatile analysis received with minimal headspace | Yes |
| Samples received within HoldingTime | Yes |
| Some samples have been subcontracted | No |

Authorised By

Bob Symons Bob Symons Client Services Senior Analyst-Inorganic (NSW)

.

Dr. Bob Symons Laboratory Manager

Final report - this Report replaces any previously issued Report

- Indicates Not Requested

* Indicates NATA accreditation does not cover the performance of this service

Uncertainty data is available on request

mgt-LabMark shall not be liable for loss, cost, damages or expenses incurred by the client, or any other person or company, resulting from the use of any information or interpretation given in this report. In no case shall mgt-LabMark be liable for consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost profits, damages for failure to meet deadlines and lost production arising from this report. This document shall not be reproduced except in full and relates only to the items tested. Unless indicated otherwise, the tests were performed on the samples as received.



The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015

WORLD RECOGNISED ACCREDITATION

Certificate of Analysis

NATA Accredited Accreditation Number 1261 Site Number 18217

Accredited for compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The results of the tests, calibrations and/or measurements included in this document are traceable to Australian/national standards.

Attention: Michael Assal

Report Client Reference Received Date 332928-W WASTE WATER ANALYSIS Apr 04, 2012

| Client Sample ID | | | WASTE WATER | WASTE WATER OUTLET |
|---------------------------------------|-----|------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Sample Matrix | | | Water | Water |
| mgt-LabMark Sample No. | | | S12-Ap03088 | S12-Ap03089 |
| Date Sampled | | | Apr 03, 2012 | Apr 03, 2012 |
| Test/Reference | LOR | Unit | | |
| | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | 2 | mg/L | 3600 | 510 |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | 5 | mg/L | 3800 | 910 |
| Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 1600 | 470 |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 1500 | 420 |



Sample History

Where samples are submitted/analysed over several days, the last date of extraction and analysis is reported.

| Description Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) - Method: 4050-4051 BOD | Testing Site Sydney | Extracted Apr 05, 2012 | Holding Time 2 Day |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Sydney | Apr 05, 2012 | 28 Day |
| - Method: 4520 COD Suspended Solids | Sydney | Apr 05, 2012 | 7 Day |
| - Method: 4100 Total Suspended Solids Volatile Suspended Solids - Method: 4100 Total Volatile Suspended Solids | Sydney | Apr 10, 2012 | 7 Day |
| | Sydney | Apr 10, 2012 | 7 Day |



Oakle Phone ABN – 50 005 085 521 e.mail : enviro@mgtlabmark.com.au web : www.mgtlabmark.com.au Site #

Melbourne 3-5 Kingston Town Close Oakleigh VIC 3166 Phone : +61 3 9564 7055 NATA # 1261 Site # 1254
 Sydney
 Bri

 Unit F6, Building F
 1/2

 16 Mars Road
 Mu

 Lane Cove West NSW 2066
 Ph

 Phone : +61 2 8215 6222
 NA

 NATA # 1261 Site # 18217
 Hall

Brisbane 1/21 Smallwood Place Murarrie QLD 4172 Phone : +61 7 3902 4600 NATA # 1261 Site # 20794

| Company Na Address: Client Job N | Suite 1 Locom EVELE NSW 2 o. : | 2015 | an Technolo | ogy Park, 2 | | | 332 02 9 | 928 9209 4 9209 4 | Received: Due: Priority: Contact na | | Apr 4, 2012 2:15 PM Apr 13, 2012 4:00 PM 5 Day Michael Assal k Client Manager: Onur Mehmet |
|--|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--|------------|---|
| | WAST | E WATER ANA | ALYSIS | | | | | | | mgt-Labina | |
| | | mple Deta | il | | Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Suspended Solids | Volatile Suspended Solids | | | |
| - | here analysis is | | 9 14071 | | | | | | | | |
| | atory - NATA S | | 0 14271 | | x | x | x | х | | | |
| | oratory - NATA | | | | ~ | | <u>^</u> | ~ | | | |
| External Labo | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sample ID | Sample Date | Sampling Time | Matrix | LAB ID | | | | | | | |
| WASTE WATER INLET | Apr 03, 2012 | | Water | S12-Ap03088 | x | x | x | х | | | |
| WASTE WATER OUTLET | Apr 03, 2012 | | Water | S12-Ap03089 | x | x | x | x | | | |



mgt-LabMark Internal Quality Control Review

General

- 1. Laboratory QC results for Method Blanks, Duplicates, Matrix Spikes, and Laboratory Control Samples are included in this QC report where applicable. Additional QC data may be available on request.
- 2. All soil results are reported on a dry basis, unless otherwise stated.
- 3. Actual PQLs are matrix dependant. Quoted PQLs may be raised where sample extracts are diluted due to interferences.
- 4. Results are uncorrected for matrix spikes or surrogate recoveries.
- 5. SVOC analysis on waters are performed on homogenised, unfiltered samples, unless noted otherwise.
- 6. Samples were analysed on an 'as received' basis.
- 7. This report replaces any interim results previously issued.

Holding Times

Please refer to 'Sample Preservation and Container Guide' for holding times (QS3001)

For samples received on the last day of holding time, notification of testing requirements should have been received at least

6 hours prior to sample receipt deadlines as stated on the Sample Receipt Acknowledgment

If the Laboratory did not receive the information in the required timeframe, and regardless of any other integrity issues, suitably qualified results may still be reported.

Holding times apply from the date of sampling, therefore compliance to these may be outside the laboratory's control. **NOTE: pH duplicates are reported as a range NOT as an RPD

UNITS mg/kg:milligrams per Kilogram µg/L:micrograms per litre

org/100mL:Organisms per 100 millilitres

mg/L:milligrams per litre ppm:Parts per million %:Percentage NTU:Nephelometric Turbidity Units

MPN/100mL:Most Probable Number of organisms per 100 milliltres

TERMS

ppb:Parts per billion

| Dry: | Where a moisture has been determined on a solid sample the result is expressed on a dry basis. |
|-------------------|---|
| LOR: | Limit Of Reporting. |
| SPIKE: | Addition of the analyte to the sample and reported as percentage recovery. |
| RPD: | Relative Percent Difference between two Duplicate pieces of analysis. |
| LCS: | Laboratory Control Sample - reported as percent recovery. |
| CRM: | Certified Reference Material - reported as percent recovery. |
| Method Blank: | In the case of solid samples these are performed on laboratory certified clean sands. |
| | In the case of water samples these are performed on de-ionised water. |
| Surr - Surrogate: | The addition of a like compound to the analyte target and reported as percentage recovery. |
| Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from the same sample and reported in the same units as the result to show comparison. |
| Batch Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from a sample outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| Batch SPIKE: | Spike recovery reported on a sample from outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| USEPA: | U.S Environmental Protection Agency |
| APHA: | American Public Health Association |
| ASLP: | Australian Standard Leaching Procedure (AS4439.3) |
| TCLP: | Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure |
| COC: | Chain Of Custody |
| SRA: | Sample Receipt Advice |
| CP: | Client Parent - QC was performed on samples pertaining to this report |
| NCP: | Non-Client Parent - QC was performed on samples not pertaining to this report, however QC is representative of the sequence or batch that client samples were analysed within |

QC - ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

RPD Duplicates: Global RPD Duplicates Acceptance Criteria is 30% however the following acceptance guidelines are equally applicable:

Results <10 times the LOR : No Limit

Results between 10-20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-50%

Results >20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-30%

Surrogate Recoveries : Recoveries must lie between 50-150% - Phenols 20-130%.

QC DATA GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. Where a result is reported as a less than (<), higher than the nominated LOR, this is due to either matrix interference, extract dilution required due to interferences or contaminant levels within the sample, high moisture content or insufficient sample provided.
- 2. Duplicate data shown within this report that states the word "BATCH" is a Batch Duplicate from outside of your sample batch, but within the laboratory sample batch at a 1:10 ratio. The Parent and Duplicate data shown is not data from your samples.
- 3. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting LCS data, Toxophene & Chlordane are not added to the LCS.
- 4. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting Spike data, Toxophene is not added to the Spike.
- 5. Total Recoverable Hydrocarbons where reporting Spike & LCS data, a single spike of commercial Hydrocarbon products in the range of C12-C30 is added and it's Total Recovery is reported in the C10-C14 cell of the Report.
- pH and Free Chlorine analysed in the laboratory Analysis on this test must begin within 30 minutes of sampling. Therefore laboratory analysis is unlikely to be completed within holding time. Analysis will begin as soon as possible after sample receipt
- 7. Recovery Data (Spikes & Surrogates) where chromatographic interference does not allow the determination of Recovery the term "INT" appears against that analyte.
- 8. Polychlorinated Biphenyls are spiked only using Arochlor 1260 in Matrix Spikes and LCS's.
- 9. For Matrix Spikes and LCS results a dash " -" in the report means that the specific analyte was not added to the QC sample>
- 10. Duplicate RPD's are calculated from raw analytical data thus it is possible to have two sets of data below the LOR with a positive RPD eg: LOR 0.1, Result A = <0.1 (raw data is 0.02) & Result B = <0.1 (raw data is 0.03) resulting in a RPD of 40% calculated from the raw data.



Quality Control Results

| Test | | | | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------|----------|----------|-----|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Method Blank | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD | -5 Day) | | mg/L | < 2 | | | 2 | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| LCS - % Recovery | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | % | 101 | | | 70-130 | Pass | |
| Test | Lab Sample ID | QA Source | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
| Duplicate | | | | | • | | • | | |
| | | | | Result 1 | Result 2 | RPD | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | N12-Ap02903 | NCP | mg/L | 2300 | 2300 | 1.0 | 30% | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | S12-Ap00422 | NCP | mg/L | 8.0 | 10 | 24 | 30% | Pass | |
| Duplicate | | | | | • | | - | | |
| | | | | Result 1 | Result 2 | RPD | | | |
| Suspended Solids | S12-Ap03089 | CP | mg/L | 470 | 480 | 1.0 | 30% | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | S12-Ap03089 | CP | mg/L | 420 | 440 | 3.0 | 30% | Pass | |



Comments

| Sample Integrity | |
|---|-----|
| Custody Seals Intact (if used) | N/A |
| Attempt to Chill was evident | Yes |
| Sample correctly preserved | Yes |
| Organic samples had Teflon liners | Yes |
| Sample containers for volatile analysis received with minimal headspace | Yes |
| Samples received within HoldingTime | Yes |
| Some samples have been subcontracted | No |

Authorised By

Onur Mehmet Bob Symons Client Services Senior Analyst-Inorganic (NSW)

.

Dr. Bob Symons Laboratory Manager

Final report - this Report replaces any previously issued Report

- Indicates Not Requested

* Indicates NATA accreditation does not cover the performance of this service

Uncertainty data is available on request

mgt-LabMark shall not be liable for loss, cost, damages or expenses incurred by the client, or any other person or company, resulting from the use of any information or interpretation given in this report. In no case shall mgt-LabMark be liable for consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost profits, damages for failure to meet deadlines and lost production arising from this report. This document shall not be reproduced except in full and relates only to the items tested. Unless indicated otherwise, the tests were performed on the samples as received.



The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015



Certificate of Analysis

NATA Accredited Accreditation Number 1261 Site Number 18217

Accredited for compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The results of the tests, calibrations and/or measurements included in this document are traceable to Australian/national standards.

Attention: Michael Assal-ALL INVOICES

Report Client Reference Received Date 334088-W WASTE WATER OUTLET Apr 17, 2012

| Client Sample ID | | | WWINLET | WWOUTLET |
|---------------------------------------|-----|------|--------------|--------------|
| Sample Matrix | | | Water | Water |
| mgt-LabMark Sample No. | | | S12-Ap09838 | S12-Ap09839 |
| Date Sampled | | | Apr 17, 2012 | Apr 17, 2012 |
| Test/Reference | LOR | Unit | | |
| | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | 2 | mg/L | 3000 | 240 |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | 5 | mg/L | 4300 | 670 |
| Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 2200 | 330 |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 2100 | 320 |



Sample History

Where samples are submitted/analysed over several days, the last date of extraction and analysis is reported.

| Description Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) - Method: 4050-4051 BOD | Testing Site Sydney | Extracted Apr 18, 2012 | Holding Time 2 Day |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Sydney | Apr 19, 2012 | 28 Day |
| - Method: 4520 COD Suspended Solids | Sydney | Apr 19, 2012 | 7 Day |
| - Method: 4100 Total Suspended Solids Volatile Suspended Solids | Sydney | Apr 19, 2012 | 7 Day |
| - Method: 4100 Total Volatile Suspended Solids | | | |



Oak Pho ABN – 50 005 085 521 e.mail : enviro@mgtlabmark.com.au web : www.mgtlabmark.com.au Site

Melbourne 3-5 Kingston Town Close Oakleigh VIC 3166 Phone : +61 3 9564 7055 NATA # 1261 Site # 1254 **Sydney** Unit F6, Building F 16 Mars Road Lane Cove West NSW 2066 Phone : +61 2 8215 6222 NATA # 1261 Site # 18217 Brisbane 1/21 Smallwood Place Murarrie QLD 4172 Phone : +61 7 3902 4600 NATA # 1261 Site # 20794

| Company N Address: Client Job N | Suite 1 Locom EVELE NSW 2 | | an Technolo | ogy Park, 2 | | | 02 9 | 088 9209 4 9209 4 | Due: Priori | rity: tact name: | Apr 17, 2012 7:50 PM Apr 26, 2012 4:00 PM 5 Day Michael Assal-ALL INVOICES |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sa | mple Deta | il | | Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Suspended Solids | Volatile Suspended Solids | | | |
| Laboratory w | here analysis i | s conducted | | | | | | | | | |
| Melbourne La | aboratory - NAT | A Site # 1254 | & 14271 | | | | | | | | |
| Sydney Labo | ratory - NATA S | Site # 18217 | | | х | Х | Х | X | | | |
| Brisbane Lab | oratory - NATA | Site # 20794 | | | | | | | | | |
| External Labo | oratory | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sample ID | Sample Date | Sampling Time | Matrix | LAB ID | | | | | | | |
| WWINLET | Apr 17, 2012 | | Water | S12-Ap09838 | Х | Х | х | х | | | |
| WWOUTLET | Apr 17, 2012 | | Water | S12-Ap09839 | Х | Х | Х | Х | | | |



mgt-LabMark Internal Quality Control Review

General

- 1. Laboratory QC results for Method Blanks, Duplicates, Matrix Spikes, and Laboratory Control Samples are included in this QC report where applicable. Additional QC data may be available on request.
- 2. All soil results are reported on a dry basis, unless otherwise stated.
- 3. Actual PQLs are matrix dependant. Quoted PQLs may be raised where sample extracts are diluted due to interferences
- 4. Results are uncorrected for matrix spikes or surrogate recoveries.
- SVOC analysis on waters are performed on homogenised, unfiltered samples, unless noted otherwise, 5.
- 6. Samples were analysed on an 'as received' basis
- This report replaces any interim results previously issued. 7.

Holding Times

Please refer to 'Sample Preservation and Container Guide' for holding times (QS3001)

For samples received on the last day of holding time, notification of testing requirements should have been received at least

6 hours prior to sample receipt deadlines as stated on the Sample Receipt Acknowledgment

If the Laboratory did not receive the information in the required timeframe, and regardless of any other integrity issues, suitably qualified results may still be reported.

Holding times apply from the date of sampling, therefore compliance to these may be outside the laboratory's control. **NOTE: pH duplicates are reported as a range NOT as an RPD

UNITS mg/kg:milligrams per Kilogram µg/L:micrograms per litre

ppb:Parts per billion

mg/L:milligrams per litre ppm:Parts per million %:Percentage org/100mL:Organisms per 100 millilitres NTU:Nephelometric Turbidity Units

MPN/100mL: Most Probable Number of organisms per 100 milliltres

TERMS

| Dry: | Where a moisture has been determined on a solid sample the result is expressed on a dry basis. |
|-------------------|---|
| LOR: | Limit Of Reporting. |
| SPIKE: | Addition of the analyte to the sample and reported as percentage recovery. |
| RPD: | Relative Percent Difference between two Duplicate pieces of analysis. |
| LCS: | Laboratory Control Sample - reported as percent recovery. |
| CRM: | Certified Reference Material - reported as percent recovery. |
| Method Blank: | In the case of solid samples these are performed on laboratory certified clean sands. |
| | In the case of water samples these are performed on de-ionised water. |
| Surr - Surrogate: | The addition of a like compound to the analyte target and reported as percentage recovery. |
| Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from the same sample and reported in the same units as the result to show comparison. |
| Batch Duplicate: | A second piece of analysis from a sample outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| Batch SPIKE: | Spike recovery reported on a sample from outside of the client's batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| USEPA: | U.S Environmental Protection Agency |
| APHA: | American Public Health Association |
| ASLP: | Australian Standard Leaching Procedure (AS4439.3) |
| TCLP: | Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure |
| COC: | Chain Of Custody |
| SRA: | Sample Receipt Advice |
| CP: | Client Parent - QC was performed on samples pertaining to this report |
| NCP: | Non-Client Parent - QC was performed on samples not pertaining to this report, however QC is representative of the sequence or batch that client samples were analysed within |

QC - ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

RPD Duplicates: Global RPD Duplicates Acceptance Criteria is 30% however the following acceptance guidelines are equally applicable:

Results <10 times the LOR : No Limit

Results between 10-20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-50%

Results >20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-30%

Surrogate Recoveries : Recoveries must lie between 50-150% - Phenols 20-130%.

QC DATA GENERAL COMMENTS

- Where a result is reported as a less than (<), higher than the nominated LOR, this is due to either matrix interference, extract dilution required due to interferences or contaminant levels within the sample, high moisture content or insufficient sample provided. 1.
- Duplicate data shown within this report that states the word "BATCH" is a Batch Duplicate from outside of your sample batch, but within the laboratory sample batch at a 1:10 ratio. The Parent and Duplicate data shown is not data from your samples. 2.
- 3 Organochlorine Pesticide analysis - where reporting LCS data, Toxophene & Chlordane are not added to the LCS.
- 4. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis - where reporting Spike data, Toxophene is not added to the Spike.
- Total Recoverable Hydrocarbons where reporting Spike & LCS data, a single spike of commercial Hydrocarbon products in the range of C12-C30 is added and it's Total Recovery is reported in the C10-C14 cell of the Report. 5.
- 6. pH and Free Chlorine analysed in the laboratory - Analysis on this test must begin within 30 minutes of sampling. Therefore laboratory analysis is unlikely to be completed within holding time. Analysis will begin as soon as possible after sample receipt
- 7 Recovery Data (Spikes & Surrogates) - where chromatographic interference does not allow the determination of Recovery the term "INT" appears against that analyte.
- 8. Polychlorinated Biphenyls are spiked only using Arochlor 1260 in Matrix Spikes and LCS's.
- For Matrix Spikes and LCS results a dash " -" in the report means that the specific analyte was not added to the QC sample> 9.
- Duplicate RPD's are calculated from raw analytical data thus it is possible to have two sets of data below the LOR with a positive RPD eg: LOR 0.1, Result A = <0.1 (raw data is 0.02) & Result B = <0.1 (raw data is 0.03) resulting in a RPD of 40% calculated from the raw data. 10.



Quality Control Results

| Test | | | | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
|--|---------------|--------------|-------|----------|----------|-----|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Method Blank | | | | | • | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD | -5 Day) | | mg/L | < 2 | | | 2 | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| LCS - % Recovery | | | | | • | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | % | 98 | | | 70-130 | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | | | % | 94 | | | 70-130 | Pass | |
| Test | Lab Sample ID | QA Source | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
| Duplicate | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Result 1 | Result 2 | RPD | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | S12-Ap09096 | NCP | mg/L | 510 | 510 | 1.0 | 30% | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | S12-Ap09838 | CP | mg/L | 4300 | 3900 | 8.0 | 30% | Pass | |



Comments

| Sample Integrity | |
|---|-----|
| Custody Seals Intact (if used) | N/A |
| Attempt to Chill was evident | Yes |
| Sample correctly preserved | Yes |
| Organic samples had Teflon liners | Yes |
| Sample containers for volatile analysis received with minimal headspace | N/A |
| Samples received within HoldingTime | Yes |
| Some samples have been subcontracted | No |

Authorised By

Onur Mehmet Bob Symons Client Services Senior Analyst-Inorganic (NSW)

.

Dr. Bob Symons Laboratory Manager

Final report - this Report replaces any previously issued Report

- Indicates Not Requested

* Indicates NATA accreditation does not cover the performance of this service

Uncertainty data is available on request

mgt-LabMark shall not be liable for loss, cost, damages or expenses incurred by the client, or any other person or company, resulting from the use of any information or interpretation given in this report. In no case shall mgt-LabMark be liable for consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost profits, damages for failure to meet deadlines and lost production arising from this report. This document shall not be reproduced except in full and relates only to the items tested. Unless indicated otherwise, the tests were performed on the samples as received.

Abattoir C

Wastewater Laboratory Result Sheets March 2013 – May 2013





The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015



Certificate of Analysis

NATA Accredited Accreditation Number 1261 Site Number 18217

Accredited for compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The results of the tests, calibrations and/or measurements included in this document are traceable to Australian/national standards.

Attention:

Report

373180-W

Michael Assal-ALL INVOICES

Client Reference Received Date 373180-W N1700L Mar 22, 2013

| Client Sample ID Sample Matrix Eurofins mgt Sample No. Date Sampled | | | CAL INLET Water S13-Ma18621 Mar 20, 2013 | CAL OUTLET Water S13-Ma18622 Mar 20, 2013 |
|--|-----|------|---|--|
| Test/Reference | LOR | Unit | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | 2 | mg/L | 6900 | 1300 |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | 5 | mg/L | 20000 | 2500 |
| Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 3200 | 490 |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 3100 | 490 |



Sample History

Where samples are submitted/analysed over several days, the last date of extraction and analysis is reported. A recent review of our LIMS has resulted in the correction or clarification of some method identifications. Due to this, some of the method reference information on reports has changed. However, no substantive change has been made to our laboratory methods, and as such there is no change in the validity of current or previous results (regarding both quality and NATA accreditation).

| Description | Testing Site | Extracted | Holding Time |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Sydney | Mar 22, 2013 | 2 Day |
| - Method: 4050-4051 BOD | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Sydney | Mar 22, 2013 | 28 Day |
| - Method: 4520 COD | | | |
| Suspended Solids | Sydney | Mar 26, 2013 | 7 Day |
| - Method: 4100 Total Suspended Solids dried at 103-105°C | | | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | Sydney | Mar 26, 2013 | 7 Day |
| | | | |

- Method: 4100 Total Volatile Suspended Solids

| | pany Name: 'ess: nt Job No.: | The Odor Suite 160 EVELEIG NSW 201 N1700L | θH | echnology Park, | 2 Locomotive | | R P | rder epor hone ax: | | 373180 02 9209 4220 02 9209 4421 | Received: Due: Priority: Contact N | | Mar 22, 2013 11:26 AM Apr 2, 2013 5 Day Michael Assal-ALL INVOICI |
|---|------------------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|----------|--|
| · | IT JOD NO | NT700L | | | | | | | | | I | mgt-LabN | lark Client Manager: Jean He |
| 085 521 e.mail : enviro@mgtlabmark.com.au web | | | Sample Detail | | | Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Suspended Solids | Volatile Suspended Solids | | Date Reported:Apr 02, 2013 | | |
| <mark>'⊘b@r</mark> | | analysis is co | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | urne Laborat | ory - NATA S - NATA Site | Site # 1254 & 14 | 271 | | X | X | Х | x | | | | |
| | ne Laboratory | ry - NATA Site | # 10217 | | | ^ | | ^ | | | | | |
| oterr | al Laborator | v | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B San | | ample Date | Sampling Time | Matrix | LAB ID | | | | | | | | |
| ₩ L | ILET Ma | r 20, 2013 | | Water | S13-Ma18621 | Х | | Х | Х | | | | |
| <u>Z</u> \L d | | r 20, 2013 | | Water | S13-Ma18622 | Х | Х | Х | Х | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Date Reported:Apr 02, 2013 | | |



Eurofins | mgt Internal Quality Control Review and Glossary

General

- 1. Laboratory QC results for Method Blanks, Duplicates, Matrix Spikes, and Laboratory Control Samples are included in this QC report where applicable. Additional QC data may be available on request.
- 2. All soil results are reported on a dry basis, unless otherwise stated.
- 3. Actual PQLs are matrix dependant. Quoted PQLs may be raised where sample extracts are diluted due to interferences.
- 4. Results are uncorrected for matrix spikes or surrogate recoveries.
- 5. SVOC analysis on waters are performed on homogenised, unfiltered samples, unless noted otherwise.
- 6. Samples were analysed on an 'as received' basis. 7. This report replaces any interim results previously issued.

Holding Times

Please refer to 'Sample Preservation and Container Guide' for holding times (QS3001).

For samples received on the last day of holding time, notification of testing requirements should have been received at least 6 hours prior to sample receipt deadlines as stated on the Sample Receipt Acknowledgment.

If the Laboratory did not receive the information in the required timeframe, and regardless of any other integrity issues, suitably qualified results may still be reported.

Holding times apply from the date of sampling, therefore compliance to these may be outside the laboratory's control.

**NOTE: pH duplicates are reported as a range NOT as RPD

UNITS

| mg/kg: milligrams per Kilogram | mg/l: milligrams per litre |
|---|----------------------------|
| ug/l: micrograms per litre | ppm: Parts per million |
| ppb: Parts per billion | %: Percentage |
| org/100ml: Organisms per 100 millilitres | NTU: Units |
| MPN/100ml · Most Probable Number of organisms per 100 millilitres | |

TERMS

| CRM | Certified Reference Material - reported as percent recovery |
|------------------|---|
| Method Blank | In the case of solid samples these are performed on laboratory certified clean sands. |
| | In the case of water samples these are performed on de-ionised water. |
| Surr - Surrogate | The addition of a like compound to the analyte target and reported as percentage recovery. |
| Duplicate | A second piece of analysis from the same sample and reported in the same units as the result to show comparison. |
| Batch Duplicate | A second piece of analysis from a sample outside of the clients batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| Batch SPIKE | Spike recovery reported on a sample from outside of the clients batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| USEPA | United States Environment Protection Authority |
| APHA | American Public Health Association |
| ASLP | Australian Standard Leaching Procedure (AS4439.3) |
| TCLP | Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure |
| COC | Chain of Custody |
| SRA | Sample Receipt Advice |
| CP | Client Parent - QC was performed on samples pertaining to this report |
| NCP | Non-Client Parent - QC performed on samples not pertaining to this report, QC is representative of the sequence or batch that client samples were analysed within |
| | |

QC - ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

RPD Duplicates: Global RPD Duplicates Acceptance Criteria is 30% however the following acceptance guidelines are equally applicable:

Results <10 times the LOR : No Limit

Results between 10-20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-50%

Results >20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-30%

Surrogate Recoveries : Recoveries must lie between 50-150% - Phenols 20-130%.

QC DATA GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. Where a result is reported as a less than (<), higher than the nominated LOR, this is due to either matrix interference, extract dilution required due to interferences or contaminant levels within the sample, high moisture content or insufficient sample provided.
- 2. Duplicate data shown within this report that states the word "BATCH" is a Batch Duplicate from outside of your sample batch, but within the laboratory sample batch at a 1:10 ratio. The Parent and Duplicate data shown is not data from your samples.
- 3. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting LCS data, Toxophene & Chlordane are not added to the LCS.
- 4. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting Spike data, Toxophene is not added to the Spike.
- 5. Total Recoverable Hydrocarbons where reporting Spike & LCS data, a single spike of commercial Hydrocarbon products in the range of C12-C30 is added and it's Total Recovery is reported in the C10-C14 cell of the Report.
- 6. pH and Free Chlorine analysed in the laboratory Analysis on this test must begin within 30 minutes of sampling. Therefore laboratory analysis is unlikely to be completed within holding time. Analysis will begin as soon as possible after sample receipt.
- 7. Recovery Data (Spikes & Surrogates) where chromatographic interference does not allow the determination of Recovery the term "INT" appears against that analyte.
- 8. Polychlorinated Biphenyls are spiked only using Arochlor 1260 in Matrix Spikes and LCS's.
- 9. For Matrix Spikes and LCS results a dash " -" in the report means that the specific analyte was not added to the QC sample.
- 10. Duplicate RPD's are calculated from raw analytical data thus it is possible to have two sets of data.



| Test | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|-------|----------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Method Blank | | | | - | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD | mg/L | < 2 | | | 2 | Pass | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| LCS - % Recovery | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | % | 94 | | | 70-130 | Pass | | | |
| Suspended Solids | | | | 101 | | | 70-130 | Pass | |
| Test | Lab Sample ID | QA Source | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
| Duplicate | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Result 1 | Result 2 | RPD | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | S13-Ma17906 | NCP | mg/L | 3.3 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 30% | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | S13-Ma18621 | CP | mg/L | 20000 | 20000 | 2.0 | 30% | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | S13-Ma18621 | CP | mg/L | 3200 | 3600 | 13 | 30% | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | S13-Ma18621 | CP | mg/L | 3100 | 3600 | 13 | 30% | Pass | |



Comments

| Custody Seals Intact (if used) | N/A |
|---|-----|
| Attempt to Chill was evident | Yes |
| Sample correctly preserved | Yes |
| Organic samples had Teflon liners | Yes |
| Sample containers for volatile analysis received with minimal headspace | Yes |
| Samples received within HoldingTime | Yes |
| Some samples have been subcontracted | No |
| | |

Authorised By

Jean Heng Bob Symons Client Services Senior Analyst-Inorganic (NSW)

Dr. Bob Symons Laboratory Manager

Final report - this Report replaces any previously issued Report

- Indicates Not Requested

* Indicates NATA accreditation does not cover the performance of this service

Uncertainty data is available on request

Eurofins | mgt shall not be liable for loss, cost, damages or expenses incurred by the client, or any other person or company, resulting from the use of any information or interpretation given in this report. In no case shall Eurofins | mgt be liable for consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost profits, damages for failure to meet deadlines and lost production arising from this report. This document shall not be reproduced except in full and relates only to the items tested. Unless indicated otherwise, the tests were performed on the samples as received.





The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015



Certificate of Analysis

NATA Accredited Accreditation Number 1261 Site Number 18217

Accredited for compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The results of the tests, calibrations and/or measurements included in this document are traceable to Australian/national standards.

Attention:

Report

376074-W

Michael Assal-ALL INVOICES

Client Reference Received Date 376074-W N1700L Apr 18, 2013

| Client Sample ID Sample Matrix Eurofins mgt Sample No. Date Sampled | | | CAL INLET Water S13-Ap13670 Apr 18, 2013 | CAL OUTLET Water S13-Ap13671 Apr 18, 2013 |
|--|-----|------|---|--|
| Test/Reference | LOR | Unit | | |
| | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | 2 | mg/L | 3800 | 850 |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | 5 | mg/L | 7800 | 1600 |
| Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 1900 | 310 |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 1800 | 260 |



Sample History

Where samples are submitted/analysed over several days, the last date of extraction and analysis is reported. A recent review of our LIMS has resulted in the correction or clarification of some method identifications. Due to this, some of the method reference information on reports has changed. However, no substantive change has been made to our laboratory methods, and as such there is no change in the validity of current or previous results (regarding both quality and NATA accreditation).

| Description | Testing Site | Extracted | Holding Time |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Sydney | Apr 18, 2013 | 2 Day |
| - Method: 4050-4051 BOD | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Sydney | Apr 18, 2013 | 28 Day |
| - Method: 4520 COD | | | |
| Suspended Solids | Sydney | Apr 22, 2013 | 7 Day |
| - Method: 4100 Total Suspended Solids dried at 103-105°C | | | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | Sydney | Apr 22, 2013 | 7 Day |
| Mothod: 4100 Total Valatila Suspanded Salida | | | |

- Method: 4100 Total Volatile Suspended Solids

| Company Address: Climping | : Suite [·] EVELI | 2015 | Technology Park, | 2 Locomotive | | R P | epor epor hone ax: | | N1700-3 MA2 376074 02 9209 4220 02 9209 4421 | Received: Due: Priority: Contact Name: | Apr 18, 2013 12:00 AM Apr 26, 2013 5 Day Michael Assal-ALL INVOICE: |
|--|--|--------------------|------------------|--------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| 521 e.mail : enviro@mgtlabmark.com.au web : ww | v where analysis is | Sample Detail | I | | Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Suspended Solids | Volatile Suspended Solids | | Date Reported: Apr 24, 2013 | mgt Client Manager: Jean He |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Laboratory - NAT | | 4271 | | X | v | | X | | | |
| | boratory - NATA S aboratory - NATA. | | | | X | X | Х | X | | | |
| ternal La | | Sile # 20134 | | | - | | | | | | |
| Saniple II | | e Sampling Time | Matrix | LAB ID | | | | | | | |
| | | | Water | S13-Ap13670 | Х | | Х | Х | | | |
| | ET Apr 18, 2013 | | Water | S13-Ap13671 | Х | Х | Х | Х | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Date Reported:Apr 24, 2013 | |



Eurofins | mgt Internal Quality Control Review and Glossary

General

- 1. Laboratory QC results for Method Blanks, Duplicates, Matrix Spikes, and Laboratory Control Samples are included in this QC report where applicable. Additional QC data may be available on request.
- 2. All soil results are reported on a dry basis, unless otherwise stated.
- 3. Actual PQLs are matrix dependant. Quoted PQLs may be raised where sample extracts are diluted due to interferences.
- 4. Results are uncorrected for matrix spikes or surrogate recoveries.
- 5. SVOC analysis on waters are performed on homogenised, unfiltered samples, unless noted otherwise.
- 6. Samples were analysed on an 'as received' basis. 7. This report replaces any interim results previously issued.

Holding Times

Please refer to 'Sample Preservation and Container Guide' for holding times (QS3001).

For samples received on the last day of holding time, notification of testing requirements should have been received at least 6 hours prior to sample receipt deadlines as stated on the Sample Receipt Acknowledgment.

If the Laboratory did not receive the information in the required timeframe, and regardless of any other integrity issues, suitably qualified results may still be reported.

Holding times apply from the date of sampling, therefore compliance to these may be outside the laboratory's control.

**NOTE: pH duplicates are reported as a range NOT as RPD

UNITS

| mg/kg: milligrams per Kilogram | mg/I: milligrams per litre |
|---|----------------------------|
| ug/l: micrograms per litre | ppm: Parts per million |
| ppb: Parts per billion | %: Percentage |
| org/100ml: Organisms per 100 millilitres | NTU: Units |
| MPN/100ml · Most Probable Number of organisms per 100 millilitres | |

TERMS

| LCS | Laboratory Control Sample - reported as percent recovery |
|------------------|---|
| CRM | Certified Reference Material - reported as percent recovery |
| Method Blank | In the case of solid samples these are performed on laboratory certified clean sands. |
| | In the case of water samples these are performed on de-ionised water. |
| Surr - Surrogate | The addition of a like compound to the analyte target and reported as percentage recovery. |
| Duplicate | A second piece of analysis from the same sample and reported in the same units as the result to show comparison. |
| Batch Duplicate | A second piece of analysis from a sample outside of the clients batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| Batch SPIKE | Spike recovery reported on a sample from outside of the clients batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| USEPA | United States Environment Protection Authority |
| APHA | American Public Health Association |
| ASLP | Australian Standard Leaching Procedure (AS4439.3) |
| TCLP | Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure |
| COC | Chain of Custody |
| SRA | Sample Receipt Advice |
| СР | Client Parent - QC was performed on samples pertaining to this report |
| NCP | Non-Client Parent - QC performed on samples not pertaining to this report, QC is representative of the sequence or batch that client samples were analysed within |
| | |

QC - ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

RPD Duplicates: Global RPD Duplicates Acceptance Criteria is 30% however the following acceptance guidelines are equally applicable:

Results <10 times the LOR : No Limit

Results between 10-20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-50%

Results >20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-30%

Surrogate Recoveries : Recoveries must lie between 50-150% - Phenols 20-130%.

QC DATA GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. Where a result is reported as a less than (<), higher than the nominated LOR, this is due to either matrix interference, extract dilution required due to interferences or contaminant levels within the sample, high moisture content or insufficient sample provided.
- 2. Duplicate data shown within this report that states the word "BATCH" is a Batch Duplicate from outside of your sample batch, but within the laboratory sample batch at a 1:10 ratio. The Parent and Duplicate data shown is not data from your samples.
- 3. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting LCS data, Toxophene & Chlordane are not added to the LCS.
- 4. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting Spike data, Toxophene is not added to the Spike.
- 5. Total Recoverable Hydrocarbons where reporting Spike & LCS data, a single spike of commercial Hydrocarbon products in the range of C12-C30 is added and it's Total Recovery is reported in the C10-C14 cell of the Report.
- 6. pH and Free Chlorine analysed in the laboratory Analysis on this test must begin within 30 minutes of sampling. Therefore laboratory analysis is unlikely to be completed within holding time. Analysis will begin as soon as possible after sample receipt.
- 7. Recovery Data (Spikes & Surrogates) where chromatographic interference does not allow the determination of Recovery the term "INT" appears against that analyte.
- 8. Polychlorinated Biphenyls are spiked only using Arochlor 1260 in Matrix Spikes and LCS's.
- 9. For Matrix Spikes and LCS results a dash " -" in the report means that the specific analyte was not added to the QC sample.
- 10. Duplicate RPD's are calculated from raw analytical data thus it is possible to have two sets of data.



| Test | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|-------|----------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Method Blank | | | | - | | | - | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD | -5 Day) | | mg/L | < 2 | | | 2 | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | | | mg/L | < 5 | | | 5 | Pass | |
| LCS - % Recovery | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Suspended Solids | | | % | 101 | | | 70-130 | Pass | |
| Test | Lab Sample ID | QA Source | Units | Result 1 | | | Acceptance Limits | Pass Limits | Qualifying Code |
| Duplicate | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Result 1 | Result 2 | RPD | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | S13-Ap13670 | СР | mg/L | 3800 | 3400 | 9.0 | 30% | Pass | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | S13-Ap13540 | NCP | mg/L | 130 | 120 | 2.0 | 30% | Pass | |
| Suspended Solids S13-Ap13670 CP | | | mg/L | 1900 | 1800 | 4.0 | 30% | Pass | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids S13-Ap13670 CP | | | | 1800 | 1700 | 5.0 | 30% | Pass | |



Comments

| Custody Seals Intact (if used) | N/A |
|---|-----|
| Attempt to Chill was evident | Yes |
| Sample correctly preserved | Yes |
| Organic samples had Teflon liners | Yes |
| Sample containers for volatile analysis received with minimal headspace | Yes |
| Samples received within HoldingTime | Yes |
| Some samples have been subcontracted | No |
| | |

Authorised By

Jean Heng Bob Symons Client Services Senior Analyst-Inorganic (NSW)

Dr. Bob Symons Laboratory Manager

Final report - this Report replaces any previously issued Report

- Indicates Not Requested

* Indicates NATA accreditation does not cover the performance of this service

Uncertainty data is available on request

Eurofins | mgt shall not be liable for loss, cost, damages or expenses incurred by the client, or any other person or company, resulting from the use of any information or interpretation given in this report. In no case shall Eurofins | mgt be liable for consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost profits, damages for failure to meet deadlines and lost production arising from this report. This document shall not be reproduced except in full and relates only to the items tested. Unless indicated otherwise, the tests were performed on the samples as received.





The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive Street EVELEIGH NSW 2015



Certificate of Analysis

NATA Accredited Accreditation Number 1261 Site Number 18217

Accredited for compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The results of the tests, calibrations and/or measurements included in this document are traceable to Australian/national standards.

Attention:

Report

380886-W

Michael Assal-ALL INVOICES

Client Reference Received Date 380886-W N1700L May 30, 2013

| Client Sample ID Sample Matrix Eurofins mgt Sample No. Date Sampled | | | CAL INLET Water S13-My25036 May 29, 2013 | CAL OUTLET Water S13-My25037 May 29, 2013 |
|--|-----|------|---|--|
| Test/Reference | LOR | Unit | | |
| | | | | |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | 2 | mg/L | 5500 | 1200 |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | 5 | mg/L | 13000 | 1900 |
| Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 4500 | 380 |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | 5 | mg/L | 3300 | 250 |



Sample History

Where samples are submitted/analysed over several days, the last date of extraction and analysis is reported. A recent review of our LIMS has resulted in the correction or clarification of some method identifications. Due to this, some of the method reference information on reports has changed. However, no substantive change has been made to our laboratory methods, and as such there is no change in the validity of current or previous results (regarding both quality and NATA accreditation).

| Description | Testing Site | Extracted | Holding Time | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Sydney | May 30, 2013 | 2 Day | |
| - Method: 4050-4051 BOD | | | | |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Sydney | Jun 03, 2013 | 28 Day | |
| - Method: 4520 COD | | | | |
| Suspended Solids | Sydney | May 30, 2013 | 7 Day | |
| - Method: 4100 Total Suspended Solids dried at 103-105°C | | | | |
| Volatile Suspended Solids | Sydney | May 31, 2013 | 7 Day | |
| - Method: (1100 Total Volatile Suspended Solids | | | | |

Method: 4100 Total Volatile Suspended Solids

| Melbourne Stingston Town Close Oakleigh VIC 3166 Phone: +61 38564 5000 | NATA # 1261 Site # 1254 & 14271 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|------------------|------------------|--|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|--|
| | Congr Aded e | The Odour Unit Pty Ltd Suite 16012, Australian Technology Park, 2 Locomotive EVELEIGH NSW 2015 Tent Job No.: N1700L | | | | | | R P | Order Repor Phone Fax: | | N1700-3 MA3 380886 02 9209 4220 02 9209 4421 | | Received: Due: Priority: Contact Name: | May 30, 2013 1:00 PM Jun 6, 2013 5 Day Michael Assal-ALL INVOICES |
| | web: wwv | | | | | | | | 0 | < | | | Eurofins | mgt Client Manager: Jean Heng |
| | 521 e.mail : enviro@mgtlabmark.com.au | Sample Detail | | | Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD-5 Day) | Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | Suspended Solids | Volatile Suspended Solids | | Date Reported:Jun 06, 2013 | | | | |
| | | | re analysis is c | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | | | Site # 1254 & 14 | 271 | | | | | | | | | |
| | E | | tory - NATA Site | | | | Х | Х | X | Х | | | | |
| | | | atory - NATA S | ite # 20794 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | al Labora ple ID LET | Sample Date | Sampling Time | Matrix | LAB ID | | | | | | | | |
| <u>,</u> | AL INI | LET | May 29, 2013 | | Water | S13-My25036 | Х | Х | Х | Х | | | | |
| 7 | AL CL | JTLET | May 29, 2013 | | Water | S13-My25037 | Х | Х | Х | | | | | |
| 🔅 eurofins | | | | | | | | | | | | Date Reported:Jun 06, 2013 | | |



Eurofins | mgt Internal Quality Control Review and Glossary

General

- 1. Laboratory QC results for Method Blanks, Duplicates, Matrix Spikes, and Laboratory Control Samples are included in this QC report where applicable. Additional QC data may be available on request.
- 2. All soil results are reported on a dry basis, unless otherwise stated.
- 3. Actual PQLs are matrix dependant. Quoted PQLs may be raised where sample extracts are diluted due to interferences.
- 4. Results are uncorrected for matrix spikes or surrogate recoveries.
- 5. SVOC analysis on waters are performed on homogenised, unfiltered samples, unless noted otherwise.
- 6. Samples were analysed on an 'as received' basis. 7. This report replaces any interim results previously issued.

Holding Times

Please refer to 'Sample Preservation and Container Guide' for holding times (QS3001).

For samples received on the last day of holding time, notification of testing requirements should have been received at least 6 hours prior to sample receipt deadlines as stated on the Sample Receipt Acknowledgment.

If the Laboratory did not receive the information in the required timeframe, and regardless of any other integrity issues, suitably qualified results may still be reported.

Holding times apply from the date of sampling, therefore compliance to these may be outside the laboratory's control.

**NOTE: pH duplicates are reported as a range NOT as RPD

UNITS

| mg/kg: milligrams per Kilogram | mg/l: milligrams per litre |
|---|----------------------------|
| ug/l: micrograms per litre | ppm: Parts per million |
| ppb: Parts per billion | %: Percentage |
| org/100ml: Organisms per 100 millilitres | NTU: Units |
| MPN/100ml · Most Probable Number of organisms per 100 millilitres | |

TERMS

| LCS | Laboratory Control Sample - reported as percent recovery |
|------------------|---|
| CRM | Certified Reference Material - reported as percent recovery |
| Method Blank | In the case of solid samples these are performed on laboratory certified clean sands. |
| | In the case of water samples these are performed on de-ionised water. |
| Surr - Surrogate | The addition of a like compound to the analyte target and reported as percentage recovery. |
| Duplicate | A second piece of analysis from the same sample and reported in the same units as the result to show comparison. |
| Batch Duplicate | A second piece of analysis from a sample outside of the clients batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| Batch SPIKE | Spike recovery reported on a sample from outside of the clients batch of samples but run within the laboratory batch of analysis. |
| USEPA | United States Environment Protection Authority |
| APHA | American Public Health Association |
| ASLP | Australian Standard Leaching Procedure (AS4439.3) |
| TCLP | Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure |
| COC | Chain of Custody |
| SRA | Sample Receipt Advice |
| СР | Client Parent - QC was performed on samples pertaining to this report |
| NCP | Non-Client Parent - QC performed on samples not pertaining to this report, QC is representative of the sequence or batch that client samples were analysed within |
| | |

QC - ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

RPD Duplicates: Global RPD Duplicates Acceptance Criteria is 30% however the following acceptance guidelines are equally applicable:

Results <10 times the LOR : No Limit

Results between 10-20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-50%

Results >20 times the LOR : RPD must lie between 0-30%

Surrogate Recoveries : Recoveries must lie between 50-150% - Phenols 20-130%.

QC DATA GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1. Where a result is reported as a less than (<), higher than the nominated LOR, this is due to either matrix interference, extract dilution required due to interferences or contaminant levels within the sample, high moisture content or insufficient sample provided.
- 2. Duplicate data shown within this report that states the word "BATCH" is a Batch Duplicate from outside of your sample batch, but within the laboratory sample batch at a 1:10 ratio. The Parent and Duplicate data shown is not data from your samples.
- 3. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting LCS data, Toxophene & Chlordane are not added to the LCS.
- 4. Organochlorine Pesticide analysis where reporting Spike data, Toxophene is not added to the Spike.
- 5. Total Recoverable Hydrocarbons where reporting Spike & LCS data, a single spike of commercial Hydrocarbon products in the range of C12-C30 is added and it's Total Recovery is reported in the C10-C14 cell of the Report.
- 6. pH and Free Chlorine analysed in the laboratory Analysis on this test must begin within 30 minutes of sampling. Therefore laboratory analysis is unlikely to be completed within holding time. Analysis will begin as soon as possible after sample receipt.
- 7. Recovery Data (Spikes & Surrogates) where chromatographic interference does not allow the determination of Recovery the term "INT" appears against that analyte.
- 8. Polychlorinated Biphenyls are spiked only using Arochlor 1260 in Matrix Spikes and LCS's.
- 9. For Matrix Spikes and LCS results a dash " -" in the report means that the specific analyte was not added to the QC sample.
- 10. Duplicate RPD's are calculated from raw analytical data thus it is possible to have two sets of data.



Comments

| Custody Seals Intact (if used) | N/A |
|---|-----|
| Attempt to Chill was evident | Yes |
| Sample correctly preserved | Yes |
| Organic samples had Teflon liners | Yes |
| Sample containers for volatile analysis received with minimal headspace | Yes |
| Samples received within HoldingTime | Yes |
| Some samples have been subcontracted | No |
| | |

Authorised By

Jean Heng Bob Symons Client Services Senior Analyst-Inorganic (NSW)

Dr. Bob Symons Laboratory Manager

Final report - this Report replaces any previously issued Report

- Indicates Not Requested

* Indicates NATA accreditation does not cover the performance of this service

Uncertainty data is available on request

Eurofins | mgt shall not be liable for loss, cost, damages or expenses incurred by the client, or any other person or company, resulting from the use of any information or interpretation given in this report. In no case shall Eurofins | mgt be liable for consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost profits, damages for failure to meet deadlines and lost production arising from this report. This document shall not be reproduced except in full and relates only to the items tested. Unless indicated otherwise, the tests were performed on the samples as received.