



MINUTES

CERTIFICATION OF CONFIRMATION OF COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

5 AUGUST 2010

I, Cr Tony Cuccaro, hereby certify that the following minutes [pages 1 to 9] of the Meeting of **RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE** held on 5 August 2010 were confirmed at a meeting of the Committee held on 7 October 2010.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tony Cuccaro', is written over a horizontal line.

Signature

Cr Tony Cuccaro

Person presiding at the Committee Meeting held on 7 October 2010

RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

5 August 2010

(REF: COMMITTEES-11198)

A meeting of the Resource Recovery Committee was held at the EMRC Administration Office, 1st Floor, 226 Great Eastern Highway, BELMONT WA 6104 on **Thursday, 5 August 2010**. The meeting commenced at **5.06pm**.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	DECLARATION OF OPENING AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS	1
2	ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED	1
3	DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS	1
4	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN OR PERSON PRESIDING WITHOUT DISCUSSION	1
5	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS	2
5.1	<i>MINUTES OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 8 JULY 2010 (Ref: Committees-11101)</i>	2
6	PRESENTATIONS	2
6.1	<i>OUTCOMES OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY SITE LOCATION STUDY</i>	2
7	ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC	2
8	BUSINESS NOT DEALT WITH FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING	2
9	REPORTS OF OFFICERS	3
9.1	<i>RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY - PROGRESS REPORT (Ref: Committees-11261)</i>	3
10	CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC	9
11	GENERAL BUSINESS	9
12	FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE	9
13	DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING	9

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK



1 DECLARATION OF OPENING AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Acting Chairman took the chair and opened the meeting at 5.06pm. The Acting Chairman welcomed Mr John King and Mr Kevin Davidson to the meeting.

2 ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED

Committee Members

Cr Frank Lindsey (Acting Chairman)	EMRC Member	Shire of Kalamunda
Cr Gerry Pule	EMRC Member	Town of Bassendean
Cr Alan Radford	EMRC Member	City of Bayswater
Cr Glenys Godfrey	EMRC Member	City of Belmont
Cr David Fárdig	EMRC Member	City of Swan
Mr Simon Stewert-Dawkins	Director Operational Services	Town of Bassendean
Mr Doug Pearson	Director Technical Services	City of Bayswater
Mr Ric Lutey	Director Technical Services	City of Belmont
Mr Mahesh Singh	Director Engineering Services	Shire of Kalamunda
Mr Shane Purdy	Director Infrastructure Services	Shire of Mundaring
Mr Jim Coten	Executive Manager Operations	City of Swan
Mr Peter Schneider	Chief Executive Officer	EMRC

Apologies

Cr Tony Cuccaro (Chairman)	EMRC Member	Shire of Mundaring
-------------------------------------	-------------	--------------------

Deputy Committee Members - Observers

Cr Graham Pittaway	EMRC Member	City of Bayswater
Mr Kevin Davidson	Manager Health & Ranger Services	City of Belmont

EMRC Officers

Mr Stephen Fitzpatrick	Manager Project Development
Ms Mary-Ann Winnett	Personal Assistant to the Director Corporate Services

Visitors

Mr John King	Cardno
--------------	--------

3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Nil

4 ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN OR PERSON PRESIDING WITHOUT DISCUSSION

Nil



5 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

5.1 MINUTES OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 8 JULY 2010

That the Minutes of the Resource Recovery Committee meeting held on 8 July 2010, which have been distributed, be confirmed.

RRC RESOLUTION(S)

MOVED CR PULE

SECONDED CR RADFORD

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 8 JULY 2010, WHICH HAVE BEEN DISTRIBUTED, BE CONFIRMED.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6 PRESENTATIONS

6.1 OUTCOMES OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY SITE LOCATION STUDY

This presentation was given later in the meeting in conjunction with Report Item 9.1 Resource Recovery Facility Progress Report.

7 ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

Nil

8 BUSINESS NOT DEALT WITH FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING

Nil



9 REPORTS OF OFFICERS

9.1 RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY - PROGRESS REPORT

REFERENCE: COMMITTEES-11261

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update Council on the progress of the Resource Recovery Facility (RRF) project.

KEY ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATION(S)

- The EPA will consider the referral information on the proposed RRF the week ending 30 July 2010 and are expected to publish the level of assessment on 2 August 2010.
- Westralian Airports Corporation has advised the building height limitations for the site options at Red Hill Waste Management Facility due to flight path considerations.
- Cardno are completing a draft report on the preferred location for the RRF at Red Hill Waste Management Facility (RHWMF).
- Nominations for the Community Taskforce close on 30 July 2010 and eleven nominations have been received to date.
- Doorknocking in the vicinity of Red Hill Waste Management Facility to notify residents of the proposed RRF and to inform them of the community taskforce nomination process was completed on 23 July 2010 involving approximately 125 households and 25 interviews

Recommendation(s)

That the report be received.

SOURCE OF REPORT

Manager Project Development

BACKGROUND

On 30 April 2009, Council resolved to proceed with the Expression of Interest process.

At the 27 August 2009 meeting of Council it was resolved:

"1. THE FOLLOWING RESPONDENTS TO THE EXPRESSION OF INTEREST ARE LISTED AS ACCEPTABLE TENDERERS:

- A. ENERGOS AS;*
- B. EVERGREEN ENERGY CORPORATION PTY LTD;*
- C. GRD MINPROC LIMITED;*
- D. MOLTONI ENERGY PTY LTD;*
- E. SITA ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS;*
- F. TRANSPACIFIC CLEANAWAY LIMITED; AND*
- G. WSN ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS.*



Item 9.1 continued

2. *THE FOLLOWING RESPONDENTS TO THE EXPRESSION OF INTEREST ARE NOT LISTED AS ACCEPTABLE TENDERERS:*
 - A. *ANAECO LIMITED; AND*
 - B. *THIESS SERVICES PTY LTD.*
3. *THE RESPONDENTS TO EXPRESSION OF INTEREST 2009-10 BE ADVISED OF THE OUTCOME OF THE ASSESSMENT.*
4. *THE ATTACHMENT REMAINS CONFIDENTIAL AND BE CERTIFIED BY THE ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND THE EMRC CHAIRMAN.*
5. *THE TENDER EVALUATION COMMITTEE BE ACKNOWLEDGED FOR THE SIGNIFICANT EFFORT PUT INTO EVALUATING THE EOI SUBMISSIONS."*

On 24 September 2009, Council resolved that:

- "1. *THE FOLLOWING PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE FORM THE BASIS OF CONSULTATION BETWEEN THE EMRC AND THE MEMBER COUNCILS AND THE COMMUNITY WITH THE INTENTION OF REPORTING BACK TO COUNCIL IN APPROXIMATELY MARCH 2010 WITH A FINAL RECOMMENDATION.*
 - A *RED HILL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY IS THE PREFERRED SITE FOR THE RRF BASED ON ENVIRONMENTAL, ECONOMIC AND PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS, COMMUNITY RESEARCH AND THE POTENTIAL VALUE OF THE EMRC HAZELMERE SITE AS A RESOURCE RECOVERY PARK.*
 - B *THE DESIGN & CONSTRUCT CONTRACT OWNERSHIP MODEL IS PREFERRED TO A BUILD OWN OPERATE CONTRACT MODEL.*
 - C *THE RRF TECHNOLOGY OPTIONS INCLUDING ANAEROBIC DIGESTION, GASIFICATION AND PYROLYSIS ARE RANKED HIGHER THAN COMBUSTION AND PLASMA AT THIS STAGE BUT MORE INFORMATION IS REQUIRED BEFORE A FINAL PREFERENCE CAN BE DETERMINED.*
 - D *A THIRD BIN FOR HOUSEHOLD ORGANIC WASTE COLLECTION IS CONSIDERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH ANAEROBIC DIGESTION TECHNOLOGY."*

Further, on 4 December 2009, Council resolved that:

- "1. *COUNCIL APPROVE A VISIT TO EASTERN STATES AND OVERSEAS RESOURCE RECOVERY REFERENCE FACILITIES TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY THE CHAIRMAN, RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE, MR JOHN KING, PROJECT DIRECTOR FOR CARDNO LIMITED AND THE MANAGER PROJECT DEVELOPMENT.*
2. *INFORMATION GAINED FROM THE VISIT BE REPORTED TO THE RRC AND COUNCIL IN EARLY 2010 AS PART OF THE FINAL RECOMMENDATION ON THE PREFERRED RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY OPTIONS."*

On 22 April 2010, Council resolved in relation to the reference facility visits that:

- "1. *THE REPORT BE RECEIVED.*
2. *INFORMATION GAINED FROM THE RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY VISITS BE APPLIED TO THE ANALYSIS OF THE PROJECT OPTIONS ON TECHNOLOGY, CONTRACT MODEL AND BIN COLLECTION SYSTEM.*
3. *THAT THE ATTACHMENT TO THIS REPORT REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND BE CERTIFIED BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND CHAIRMAN."*



Item 9.1 continued

On 20 May 2010, Council resolved that:

- "1. *THE FOLLOWING OPTIONS ARE CONFIRMED AS THE PREFERRED OPTIONS FOR THE RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY:*
 - A) *RED HILL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY IS THE PREFERRED SITE FOR THE RRF.*
 - B) *THE DESIGN & CONSTRUCT CONTRACT OWNERSHIP MODEL IS PREFERRED TO A BUILD OWN OPERATE CONTRACT MODEL AT THIS STAGE OF THE PROJECT.*
 - C) *THE RRF TECHNOLOGY OPTIONS INCLUDE ANAEROBIC DIGESTION, GASIFICATION, PYROLYSIS AND COMBUSTION. PLASMA TECHNOLOGY WILL ONLY BE CONSIDERED IF IT IS AN INTEGRAL PART OF ONE OF THESE TECHNOLOGIES.*
 - D) *A THIRD BIN FOR HOUSEHOLD ORGANIC WASTE COLLECTION BE CONSIDERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH ANAEROBIC DIGESTION TECHNOLOGY, OTHERWISE A TWO BIN SYSTEM IS RECOMMENDED FOR THE THERMAL TECHNOLOGY OPTIONS.*
2. *COUNCIL PROCEEDS WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND PLANNING APPROVALS TASK FOR THE RESOURCE RECOVERY PROJECT BASED ON THE PREFERRED SITE AND TECHNOLOGY OPTIONS."*

By way of explanation, the two contract ownership models being considered for the RRF are as follows:

Build Own Operate (BOO)

Under a Build Own Operate (BOO) contract delivery model, the Contractor will be required to build, finance, own and operate the facility for a fixed period of time (the economical life of the facility and anticipated to be for 20 years). Under this contract model, some of the Project risks, and in particular, the risk associated with the design, construction and performance of the RRF, are transferred to the Contractor.

Design and Construct (D&C)

Under a Design and Construct (D&C) contract delivery model, the Contractor would design and construct a facility that conforms to agreed standards and performance requirements. If the D&C model were adopted by the EMRC, the Contractor would also be required to operate the facility for a minimum of 12 months and up to two years after the completion of wet commissioning. Under this contract model, the operational and ownership risks would be assumed by the EMRC, particularly following transfer of operational responsibilities to the EMRC and expiry of warranties and defects liability periods. The EMRC may operate the facility using its own staff or let a separate contract for the operation of the facility under this D&C contract delivery model.

REPORT

Referral of proposal to Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)

The referral letter and referral form for the Resource Recovery Facility was lodged with the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority on 29 June 2010. The EPA is expected to consider the matter by 30 July 2010 and advertise the level of assessment on Monday 2 August 2010.

Meanwhile Cardno are preparing information that will be required for the Scoping Document on the proposed RRF.

Height Restrictions on RRF

Following advice from the Civil Aviation Safety Authority, EMRC advised Westralian Airports Corporation (WAC) of the proposed RRF at RHWMF and the four siting options being considered. This included details of the anticipated building dimensions and stack height, based on information supplied by the acceptable tenderers. WAC have advised that there are height restrictions applicable to building structures and exhaust stacks as the proposal is beneath Protected Airspace of Perth Airport, being a Runway 24 Approach, PANS-OPS Surface.



Item 9.1 continued

Based on WAC height restrictions, site 2 (Greenwaste composting area on Lot 1) would be the most constrained in terms of a maximum stack height of around 66 metres (for a thermal technology option) which may be sufficient but further advice would be needed from the technology providers of combustion options. The three other site options would be able to accommodate all technology options and stack heights to a maximum of 80 metres.

Site Location Study

Cardno are preparing a report on the preferred site location at RHWMF to facilitate the environmental impact assessment process and to aid the development planning for Red Hill. The four site location options investigated are:

1. West of proposed Hills Spine Road on Lot 12;
2. Greenwaste composting area on Lot 1;
3. Lot 11 and part of Lot 2 - Transfer station area plus an area of completed landfill on Lot 11; and
4. Lot 11 - Southern end of Lot 11.

The investigation by Cardno has assessed the following parameters:

- The footprint for each technology option for the processing building together with the footprint for the whole operational area for two capacities (Anaerobic digestion - 60,000 tpa and 150,000 tpa; Gasification - 90,000 tpa and 190,000 tpa; Combustion - 90,000 tpa and 200,000 tpa);
- The soil loadings for the different technology options;
- The cost of establishing foundations to meeting loading requirements;
- In the case of the Lot 11 site options (Options 3 and 4 above), the costs of excavating and backfilling existing landfill and the cost of establishing piling foundations;
- Issues related to excavating landfill such as screening, disposal, odour, landfill gas and leachate management;
- Maximum allowable building and stack height considerations;
- Distance to residences;
- Service requirements and
- Costs of lost airspace for the various site options.

The results of the study will be presented to the RRC on 5 August 2010.

Community Engagement

Nominations for the community task force (CTF) opened on 28 June, closing on 30 July. Advertisement of the CTF has been done in all six community newspapers and the Gidgegram, the EMRC website and via the EMRC email and address database.

The recruitment phase has also involved doorknocking in a 1 km radius around Red Hill to inform residents of the proposed RRF and to invite their nomination to the CTF. Approximately 120 residences were visited within the 1 kilometre area and 25 interviews conducted. A report is being prepared on the feedback received from the interviews.

At the time of writing this report, eleven nominations for the CTF have been received. All applications received will be assessed against the selection criteria with the aim of selecting eight candidates.

Planning for the community forum is underway. This is aimed at gathering feedback from the community on issues of concern that can then be addressed by the CTF and the project team in formulating the CPA.

A presentation on the project was provided to the Mount Helena Resident & Ratepayers Association on Monday 19 July 2010 and was well received.



Item 9.1 continued

STRATEGIC/POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The Resource Recovery Project contributes to Key Result Area 1 - Environmental Sustainability of EMRC's Strategic Plan for the Future, specifically Objective 1.3:

- 1.3 To provide resource recovery and recycling solutions in partnership with member Councils

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The cost of using consultants Cardno is budgeted at approximately \$250,000 in the 2010/2011 Budget under – Resource Recovery – Implement Resource Recovery Project Plan. This includes budget provisions for the tasks related to the environmental approval process and community engagement.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

The Resource Recovery Facility and/or Resource Recovery Park will contribute toward minimising the environmental impact of waste by facilitating the sustainable use and development of resources.

MEMBER COUNCIL IMPLICATIONS

Member Council	Implication Details
Town of Bassendean	} Nil
City of Bayswater	
City of Belmont	
Shire of Kalamunda	
Shire of Mundaring	
City of Swan	

ATTACHMENT(S)

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the report be received.

Mr John King of Cardno gave a presentation on the outcomes of the Resource Recovery Facility (RRF) site location study at Red Hill.

Mr Stewert-Dawkins left the meeting at 5.12pm and returned at 5.14pm.

Discussion ensued

Cr Pule referred to the maximum allowable height of stacks on site and asked what the buffer zone was in relation to safety for planes in the flight path. The Manager Project Development advised that the maximum height allowable for plant structures of 368 metres Australian Height Datum (AHD) provided a safety level required by Westralia Airports Corporation (WAC) and Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA).



Item 9.1 continued

Cr Lindsey referred to the figures in relation to loss of landfill air space and asked how the figures had been calculated and felt that over a period of time it would be necessary to compare the up-front capital cost to the present economic value. Mr King advised that it was a complex issue and the figures given in the presentation were provided to give an indication of the overall mix of issues being taken into account and the difference between sites a, b and c.

The Acting Chairman thanked Mr King for the presentation.

The Manager Project Development provided an update on the environmental approval process, advising that there were several different assessment levels that could be applied to the proposed Resource Recovery Facility (RRF) and the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) were still considering which level to apply. Cardno are currently preparing the information required for the Scoping Document for the proposed RRF and this was expected to be completed by the time the decision was made on the assessment level.

The Manager Project Development advised that nominations for the Community Task Force (CTF) closed on Friday 30 July 2010 and 15 nominations were received. The EMRC will assess the applications and a report would be submitted to Council on 19 August 2010 for approval.

In response to Cr Färdig's query on whether the EMRC had investigated the best way to manage the group the Manager Project Development advised that an independent professional facilitator would run the meetings with support and minute taking provided by EMRC. The information pack sent out with the CTF nominations had outlined the objectives, meeting schedule and what the EMRC expected to be achieved by the dates provided in the timeline.

In response to Cr Färdig's query on whether there was any reason that all 15 nominations couldn't be accepted the Manager Project Development advised that the EMRC had identified a requirement for eight (8) community members and two (2) EMRC officers as a reasonable sized group for the task.

The Manager Project Development advised that some of the Red Hill Community Liaison Group (RHCLG) members had suggested proxies or deputies to represent some of the community groups.

Cr Pule felt that a larger CTF group would need a larger quorum and suggested some general deputies be appointed that could be seconded to attend if it was difficult to get a quorum. The Manager Project Development suggested there could be issues with general deputies and that the EMRC would look at these issues with the facilitator.

Cr Godfrey stated that she disagreed with increasing the size of the CTF as it could become an unwieldy committee and difficult to manage.

RRC RECOMMENDATION(S)

MOVED CR PULE

SECONDED CR FÄRDIG

That the report be received.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY



10 CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

Nil

11 GENERAL BUSINESS

The CEO advised that the Shire of Kalamunda had agreed to receive a briefing from the EMRC and the EMRC would follow up with the Shire of Kalamunda to confirm a date.

In response to Cr Godfrey's query on whether consideration could be given to providing a presentation on the history of the Western Metropolitan Regional Council (WMRC) and how they linked into the EMRC, the CEO advised that it would be investigated.

The Manager Project Development advised that all registrations for attendance at the Waste and Recycle Conference 2010 had been completed and confirmation will be sent to attendees.

12 FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE

The next meeting of the Resource Recovery Committee will be held on **Thursday, 9 September 2010 (if required)** at the EMRC Administration Office, 1st Floor, Ascot Place, 226 Great Eastern Highway, Belmont WA 6104 commencing at 5.00pm.

Future Meetings 2010

Thursday	9 September (if required)	at	EMRC Administration Office
Thursday	7 October	at	EMRC Administration Office
Thursday	18 November (if required)	at	EMRC Administration Office

13 DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 5.40pm.

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK