



**MINUTES**

**CERTIFICATION OF CONFIRMATION OF  
COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**7 OCTOBER 2010**

I, Cr Tony Cuccaro, hereby certify that the following minutes [pages 1 to 23] of the Meeting of **RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE** held on 7 October 2010 were confirmed at a meeting of the Committee held on 18 November 2010.



**Signature**

Cr Tony Cuccaro

**Person presiding at the Committee Meeting held on 18 November 2010**

## RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

7 October 2010

(REF: COMMITTEES-11470)

A meeting of the Resource Recovery Committee was held at the EMRC Administration Office, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, 226 Great Eastern Highway, BELMONT WA 6104 on **Thursday, 7 October 2010**. The meeting commenced at **5.00pm**.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>1</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF OPENING AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN OR PERSON PRESIDING WITHOUT DISCUSSION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS</b>	<b>2</b>
5.1	<i>MINUTES OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 5 AUGUST 2010 (Ref: Committees-11198)</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>PRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>BUSINESS NOT DEALT WITH FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>REPORTS OF OFFICERS</b>	<b>3</b>
9.1	<i>RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY - PROGRESS REPORT (Ref: Committees-11468)</i>	<b>3</b>
9.2	<i>WASTE AND RECYCLE CONFERENCE 2010 (Ref: Committees-11489)</i>	<b>13</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING</b>	<b>23</b>

---



## 1 DECLARATION OF OPENING AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Chairman opened the meeting at 5.00pm.

Cr Godfrey entered the meeting at 5.03pm.

## 2 ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED

### Committee Members

Cr Tony Cuccaro ( <b>Chairman</b> )	EMRC Member	Shire of Mundaring
Cr Gerry Pule	EMRC Member	Town of Bassendean
Cr Alan Radford	EMRC Member	City of Bayswater
Cr Glenys Godfrey	EMRC Member	City of Belmont
Mr Simon Stewert-Dawkins	Director Operational Services	Town of Bassendean
Mr Doug Pearson	Director Technical Services	City of Bayswater
Mr Kevin Davidson (Deputising for Mr Lutey)	Manager Health & Ranger Services	City of Belmont
Mr Shane Purdy	Director Infrastructure Services	Shire of Mundaring
Mr Colin Pumphrey (Deputising for Mr Coten)	Manager Fleet and Waste Services	City of Swan
Mr Peter Schneider	Chief Executive Officer	EMRC

### Apologies

Cr Frank Lindsey ( <b>Deputy Chairman</b> )	EMRC Member	Shire of Kalamunda
Mr Ric Lutey	Director Technical Services	City of Belmont
Mr Mahesh Singh	Director Engineering Services	Shire of Kalamunda
Mr Jim Coten	Executive Manager Operations	City of Swan

### Deputy Committee Members - Observers

Cr Graham Pittaway	EMRC Member	City of Bayswater
--------------------	-------------	-------------------

### EMRC Officers

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

## 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 5 AUGUST 2010**

That the Minutes of the Resource Recovery Committee meeting held on 5 August 2010, which have been distributed, be confirmed.

**RRC RESOLUTION(S)**

MOVED CR GODFREY                      SECONDED CR RADFORD

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 5 AUGUST 2010, WHICH HAVE BEEN DISTRIBUTED, BE CONFIRMED.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**6 PRESENTATIONS**

Nil

**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-11468

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

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

#### KEY ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATION(S)

- The EPA have set the level of assessment for the proposed RRF at Public Environmental Report (PER) with a four week public review period. Appeals against this level of assessment closed on 28 September 2010.
- Cardno are completing a report on the preferred location for the RRF at Red Hill Waste Management Facility (RHWMF).
- The first meeting of the Community Task Force (CTF) was held on 24 August 2010.
- A Community Forum on the Resource Recovery Project was held on Saturday 18 September 2010.

#### 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.
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."



*Item 9.1 continued*

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."

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."



*Item 9.1 continued*

*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 Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) have set the level of assessment on the proposed RRF at Public Environmental Report (PER) with a 4 week public review period. This was advertised in The West Australian newspaper on 13 September 2010 and appeals against this level of assessment closed on 28 September 2010. It is understood that some appeals have been lodged with the EPA.

Copies of the referral document were made available to attendees at the Community Forum and posted on the EMRC website after requests from community members for copies.

**Environmental monitoring for the PER**

Cardno have been preparing information required for the Environmental Scoping Document (ESD) on the proposed RRF. The ESD sets out the framework for the scope of the PER.

Once the ESD has been agreed by the EPA then the PER document can be prepared and will include modelling of air quality, odour and noise from the various RRF technology options being considered. Cardno have been obtaining quotations from suitably qualified consultants to undertake background air quality, odour and noise monitoring at Red Hill Waste Management Facility together with establishment of a weather monitoring station. The data will be collected over several months and then used for modelling of predicted levels of air quality, odour and noise for the various RRF technology options.

**Site Location Study**

Cardno are preparing a final 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 recommendations from this study will be reported to the next meeting of the Resource Recovery Committee.

**Community Engagement**

The first meeting of the CTF was held on 24 August 2010 and the eight community representatives were welcomed by the EMRC CEO, Peter Schneider. A copy of the unconfirmed minutes of the meeting are attached (Attachment 1).

Of note was that the meeting agreed that:

- Observers would be allowed to attend the meeting if a member could not attend, provided that the observer was fully briefed and that they had no formal role in discussion or decision making and that the CTF member did not relinquish their role as a conduit back to the community.
- A website has been developed for CTF members only as a forum for discussion and sharing of documents.



- The draft agenda for the Community Forum was discussed and suggestions noted on the four topics.

*Item 9.1 continued*

The Community Forum on the Resource Recovery Project was held on 18 September 2010 at Rosehill Lodge in South Guildford and was attended by 61 community members. During the four hour forum, attendees received presentations, participated in facilitated table discussions, viewed and discussed information on the project and enjoyed lunch and afternoon tea. Key points from the community forum were:

- A welcome by the EMRC Chairman;
- A presentation from the Manager Project Development on the overall project;
- Closing thanks from the EMRC CEO;
- Attendees viewed and discussed display boards on the major issues on the project including sites, technologies and tender evaluation criteria.
- Table facilitators (mostly EMRC staff) led participants through a series of 4 topics, for which they were provided additional information. The topics were;
  - Topic 1 - Community benefits of the EMRC Resource Recovery Facility;
  - Topic 2 - Draft Tender Evaluation Criteria for the Resource Recovery Facility;
  - Topic 3 - What are some of the things that you would like to see in EMRC's Community Partnership Agreement?
  - Topic 4 - Technology Options for the RRF - benefits, disadvantages, concerns, what would you like to know more about.
- Technical advice was available to each table through the Manager Project Development and Mr Robert Sim from Cardno.
- The output from the forum - butchers paper sheets of comments and feedback sheets are being documented and themed.
- The Topic 3 output will go to the Community Task Force for consideration as part of the development of the community partnership agreement.
- Valuable feedback was received and will help EMRC target the community education process and issues to be considered in the development of the tender evaluation criteria.
- A report on the outcomes of the Community Forum will be provided to Council later this year and then to the community.

## **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.



*Item 9.1 continued*

## **MEMBER COUNCIL IMPLICATIONS**

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

## **ATTACHMENT(S)**

Unconfirmed minutes of Community Task Force Meeting, 24 August 2010 ([Ref: Committees-11487](#))

## **VOTING REQUIREMENT**

Simple Majority

## **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the report be received.

The Manager Project Development provided an update on the environmental approval process for the Resource Recovery Facility (RRF), the preparations for the environmental monitoring for the Public Environmental Review (PER), the site location study at the Red Hill Waste Management Facility (RHWMF) and the Community Task Force (CTF) progress.

## **RRC RECOMMENDATION(S)**

MOVED CR GODFREY                      SECONDED CR PULE

That the report be received.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

## Community Task Force - Meeting Notes

**Date:** 24th Aug 2010

**Venue:** EMRC office



Attendee		Attendee		Attendee	
Martin Chape	✓	Peter Jensen	✓	Stephen Fitzpatrick	✓
Jan Foster-Hawkings	✓	Greg Jones	✓	Prapti Mehta	✓
Noel Hales	✓	Peter Pearson	✓	Joel Levin	✓
Max Jamieson	✓	Noelene Wigmore	✓	<b>Other:</b> Peter Schneider	o
Other:		Other:		Other:	
Present ✓ Apology = x Observer = O					

**Meeting Opened:** 6:10pm

**Meeting Chair:** Joel Levin

Item	Issue/Topic	Discussion
1.	<b>Previous Minutes</b>	<i>Not required as it is the inaugural meeting</i>
no action arising		

2.	<b>Welcome</b>	<p>Joel Levin, Independent facilitator for the Community Task Force (CTF) welcomed the group and invited Mr Peter Schneider, CEO of the Eastern Metropolitan Regional Council (EMRC) to make a formal welcome to the group.</p> <p>Mr Schneider welcomed the group and thanked them for their nominations and willingness to be part of the CTF. He provided an overview of the EMRC functions and history with recycling and reduction of waste going to landfill. He talked about the EMRC vision for this facility and the importance of the CTF in helping to ensure this facility meets the social and environmental expectations of local and wider residents.</p> <p>CTF members were then asked to introduce themselves and why they are on the committee.</p> <p>Mr Schneider thanked the group once again and excused himself to allow the CTF to deliberate on their own.</p>
No action arising		

<p><b>3. Committee Objectives and timelines</b></p>	<p>The objectives (as described in the CTF terms of Reference)of the CTF were reviewed and three primary objectives identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Being a conduit for community opinion and views</li> <li>2) Drawing on community views and opinions and shaping a CPA that would guide the long term operations and performance of the facility</li> <li>3) Assisting with the development of the Tender Evaluation Criteria. These criteria will be used by the EMRC in the selection of the successful tenderer for the plant.</li> </ol> <p>There was some discussion about objective 3. Some CTF members wanted to have a broader discussion about the various technology options and the various impacts. There was concern that if the discussion was limited, the outcome would be compromised.</p> <p>It was clarified that the CTF and community <b>would be</b> having a broader discussion about technology options at the community forum but the decision and selection of the option would be made by the EMRC. As such the CTF has a critical role to distil the learning from the discussion about technology options so that the EMRC can address concerns and adjust the tender evaluation criteria if needed.</p>
<p><b>Action/Resolution 1.</b></p>	<p>CTF Objectives, as described in the CTF terms of reference were endorsed <span style="float: right;"><b>Who 1</b> All</span></p>

<p><b>4. Terms of Reference</b></p>	<p>The CTF reviewed and endorsed the rest of the Terms of Reference with the following clarification:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <b>Decision making:</b> The CTF would operate using a formal consensus process for decision making. (See attached document)</li> <li>2) <b>Visitors:</b> The meetings of the CTF are closed unless guests were invited by the CTF to provide specific information or background.</li> <li>3) <b>EMRC Staff:</b> After some discussion it was agreed that EMRC staff would be part of the CTF to enable the formation of the partnership agreement (ie: you need the partners around the table to have an agreement)</li> <li>4) <b>Quorum:</b> Half of the CTF membership plus one was deemed sufficient to have a quorum (ie: 6 of the 10 CTF members)</li> <li>5) <b>Observers:</b> Some concern was expressed about the use of proxies and the potential impact on the group process and decision making. However, the CTF also acknowledge the importance of maintaining a clear information flow back to community. As such the CTF endorsed the use of an appointed 'observer' should a CTF member not be able to attend. Observers attended on the understanding that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The CTF member that appointed the observer to fully brief them prior to the meeting to minimise disruption to the decision making process and timelines</li> <li>b) The observers had no formal role in discussion or decision making.</li> <li>c) The CTF member did not relinquish their role as a conduit back to the community. ie: The observer would report back the CTF member and the CTF member would then clarify with other CTF members and communicate with the community.</li> </ol> </li> <li>6) <b>Vacancies/resignation:</b> If a member of the CTF needed to step down the EMRC would call for nominations for this seat.</li> </ol> <p>All members of the CTF agreed that while there has been discussion about quorums and the appointment of an observer, each member of the CTF has made a commitment to the whole process as part of their nomination, which included attendance at meetings.</p>
<p><b>Action/Resolution 2.</b></p>	<p>Amended Terms of Reference to be circulate to CTF and EMRC for approval <span style="float: right;"><b>Who 2</b> Joel</span></p>

<p><b>5. Communication</b></p>	<p>The CTF discussed how it would communicate with each other between meetings and how it would fulfil its role as conduit to the wider community.</p> <p><b>Communication with each other:</b></p> <p>A website has been developed for CTF members only as a “virtual filing cabinet and meeting room”. Documents can be loaded onto the site for all CTF members to access and any CTF member can start a discussion topic on the site for other members to respond to. Other correspondence would occur as required.</p> <p>Individual CTF member contact details are confidential.</p> <p><b>Communication with the community:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes from CTF meetings would be ratified by the CTF prior to them being made public. Advertisements would be placed in local newspapers to inform the community these minutes are available.</li> <li>• An email address will be created to give the community direct access to the CTF. Emails will be sent to the facilitator who will forward to all (or relevant) CTF members.</li> <li>• Public website/pages will be established for the CTF that will have CTF minutes, profile of CTF members and other item relating to the CTF.</li> <li>• All CTF members also undertook to promote the CTF and inform other of meeting outcomes etc</li> </ul> <p><b>Confidentiality:</b> It was reiterated throughout the evening that items that have yet to be resolved by the CTF or individual opinions of various members of the CTF are confidential.</p>	
<p><b>Action/Resolution 3.</b></p>	<p>CTF member contact details are confidential. Contact with the community will be through personal networks or the CTF email address</p>	<p><b>Who 3</b> All</p>
<p><b>Action/Resolution 4.</b></p>	<p>Create public website or pages and email for the CTF</p>	<p><b>Who 4</b> Steve</p>
<p><b>Action/Resolution 5.</b></p>	<p>CTF members agree to review meeting minutes within three business days of receipt to enable prompt circulation to the community.</p>	<p><b>Who 5</b> All</p>
<p><b>Action/Resolution 6.</b></p>	<p>CTF members to send photo and a one paragraph bio to Joel for inclusion on the website</p>	<p><b>Who 6</b> All</p>

<b>6. Community Forum</b>	<p>The draft agenda for the community forum was circulated and feedback provided on the proposed structure and questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members were keen to ensure the process is not 'steering' people to just think about the positives. There needed to be enough room to talk about concerns.</li> <li>• Members felt people may need more time to 'sit with' and consider the draft tender evaluation criteria before commenting</li> <li>• Some layout changes to question 3 were suggested</li> <li>• Members felt there would be value in including a project overview at the forum for community members who may not have much background.</li> </ul> <p>Members also considered how the workshop might be promoted. EMRC's current planned promotion;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local newspapers</li> <li>• CTF member promotion</li> <li>• Website</li> <li>• Letterbox drop to residents within 1km of the Red Hill site</li> <li>• Advertising through the respective progress associations</li> <li>• Contact to the existing database of interested people</li> <li>• Greenpage newsletter.</li> </ul> <p>The role of the CTF at this forum will be to interact and listen to as many people as possible and encourage people to make contact with them. The CTF will also stay behind after the forum to discuss their findings.</p>
<b>Action/Resolution 7.</b>	EMRC to review session question and timing in light of CTF feedback <span style="float: right;"><b>Who 7</b> Prapti</span>

<b>7.</b>	<b>Other items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Other promotion:</b> It was suggested EMRC consider a stall at the Gidgegannup show as a way of profiling the project.</li> <li>• <b>Meeting location:</b> members decided to hold meetings at the EMRC office, with the option to move to other locations if required</li> <li>• <b>Site tour:</b> Members recommended the EMRC open day and Red Hill Site tour as a way for other members to further familiarise themselves with the site.</li> <li>• <b>Meeting Date:</b> Meeting to remain on Tuesday and occur every 6-7 weeks</li> </ul>
<b>Action/Resolution 8.</b>		EMRC to review timing and potentials of a stall at the Gidgegannup show <span style="float: right;"><b>Who 8</b> Steven</span>
<b>Action/Resolution 9.</b>		Draft schedule of meetings for members to book into diaries. <span style="float: right;"><b>Who 9</b> Joel</span>

<b>8.</b>	<b>Meeting Closed</b>	8:10pm
<b>9.</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>	TBA

These minutes have been ratified by ALL members of the CTF as a true and accurate record of the meeting  
 Signed on behalf of CTF Members:  Joel Levin (Independent Facilitator) Date: 31<sup>st</sup> Aug 2010

## ACTION LIST

<b>Action/Resolution 1.</b>	Objectives Agreed	<b>Who 1</b> All
<b>Action/Resolution 2.</b>	Amended Terms of Reference to be circulate to CTF and EMRC for approval	<b>Who 2</b> Joel
<b>Action/Resolution 3.</b>	CTF member contact details are confidential. Contact through personal networks or the CTF email address	<b>Who 3</b> All
<b>Action/Resolution 4.</b>	Create public website and email for CTF	<b>Who 4</b> Steve
<b>Action/Resolution 5.</b>	CTF members agree to review meeting minutes within three business days of receipt to enable prompt circulation to the community.	<b>Who 5</b> All <b>Who 6</b> All
<b>Action/Resolution 6.</b>	CTF members to send photo and one paragraph bio to Joel for inclusion on the web site	<b>Who 7</b> Prapti
<b>Action/Resolution 7.</b>	EMRC to review session question and timing in light of CTF feedback	<b>Who 8</b> Steven
<b>Action/Resolution 8.</b>	EMRC to review timing and potentials of a stall at the Gidgegannup show	<b>Who 9</b> Joel
<b>Action/Resolution 9.</b>	Draft schedule of meetings for members to book into diaries.	



## 9.2 WASTE AND RECYCLE CONFERENCE 2010

**REFERENCE: COMMITTEES-11489**

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

To report on the outcomes from the 2010 Waste and Recycle Conference held in Fremantle as it relates to EMRC.

### KEY ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATION(S)

- Four EMRC Councillors, several EMRC officers and four Waste Management Community Reference group (WMCRG) members attended the four day conference and exhibition in Fremantle held between 14 and 17 September 2010.
- Presentations from keynote speakers were generally good, particularly the West Sussex County Council keynote speakers.
- The standard of conference papers presented on a wide range of waste management and resource recovery topics was generally good.
- Current information and trends in waste management and resource recovery technologies from overseas were presented.
- Good networking opportunities were available throughout the conference.

#### **Recommendation(s)**

That the report be received and conference information be used where relevant in the development of the EMRC's Resource Recovery Project and associated waste education and community engagement programs.

### SOURCE OF REPORT

Manager Project Development

### BACKGROUND

At the 22 July 2010 meeting of Council, it was resolved that:

- "1. COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS NOTE THE DATES OF THE FORTHCOMING CONFERENCE.*
- 2. COUNCILLORS GODFREY, PULE, LINDSEY CUCCARO AND PITTAWAY BE AUTHORISED TO ATTEND THE WASTE AND RECYCLE 2010 CONFERENCE.*
- 3. FOUR PLACES BE OFFERED TO THE WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP IN THE EVENT THAT SOME MEMBERS MAY WISH TO ATTEND."*

### REPORT

Four EMRC Councillors, several EMRC officers and four WMCRG members attended the annual Waste & Recycle Conference in Fremantle, the theme for which was "Our Generation: How does it measure up?"

The Minister for Environment and Youth, the Honourable Donna Faragher MLC officially opened the conference and announced that the Waste Authority had funded the Colmax glass recycling facility in Kewdale but made no mention of the State Waste Strategy.



*Item 9.2 continued*

The pre-conference workshop on “*Decision-makers on Change Management and Community Engagement*” was interesting and noted the differences between the situation in the UK and in Western Australia. Of note was:

- Shared joint vision.
- The key message for the West Sussex County’s waste strategy is – “By working in partnership West Sussex local authority will reduce landfill by being leaders in waste prevention and recycling by turning rubbish into resources”.
- They used a Public Finance Initiative (PFI) scheme for the delivery of their waste services - an output driven contract with a recycling target and it has courtesy and polite customer service at the heart of the contract.
- A team of trained volunteers go out and show people how to segregate, compost, etc.
- Looked at advanced thermal treatment (gasification) ahead of incineration.
- Moving towards using biogas for transport.
- Use a 3 bin system – fortnightly recyclables and greenwaste, weekly/fortnightly residuals.
- 100,000 tonnes per year of compost from the greenwaste is going to organic farms.
- Local government not good at explaining why.
- Too many rules and regulations.
- Need to demonstrate you are going to be a good neighbour.
- The strategy developed was adopted by all waste authority councils in the County.
- Need a timeline, key message, create a culture of achievement, branding, use of media and media training, information.
- Use staff debriefings – make them champions, use intranet, payslip adverts, internal newspapers.
- They used a contact centre, staff were briefed all the way through, MORI polls (like Gallop polls) to test scenarios, County Council magazines and member Council magazines.

There were five keynote speakers including:

**1. Peter Gemell (Director, Everything Infrastructure Australia) – “Public Agencies and the Private Sector – Harnessing the Differences”.**

- The key message was the need to recognize differences between private and government organizations involved in procurement projects. While every effort is often made to align the organizations through things like relationship contracts (eg alliances) there are inevitable differences that will not go away. For example, these might include governance requirements of the government organisation, or the shareholder interests of private companies. Other examples given were the fact that for big projects where a consortium is involved, members of the consortium may otherwise be competitors. This may introduce significant pressures in getting a united position between the consortium members. This is important regarding the distribution of risk. Members of the consortium would be trying to push risk onto other members, as well as back to the government.
- The role that banks play (particularly with PPP’s) is also very important and can influence behavior of the parties. The key is to get the banks committed to the process as early as possible and not have them come in after the ‘deal has been done’, as they will inevitably change the deal.
- The key is to work to understand these differences and pressures, and to work together to accommodate them in the project process. This might amount to no more than allowing time for the other parties to get their act together – i.e. to have their tug of war, on the part of the private party, or to get approvals for the government agency.



*Item 9.2 continued*

- 2. Juliana Mansvelt (Senior Lecturer, School of People, Environment and Planning, Massey University, New Zealand – “Waste Not, Want Not? Consumption Geographies and Generational Change.”**
  - Ms Mansvelt contrasted the differences in consumption and waste disposal behaviours of the different generations in her own family.
- 3. Chris Darwin (Great-great-grandson of Charles Darwin, BSc in Psychology and Physical Geography) – “Charles Darwin and how he thought”.**
- 4. Philip Russell (Head of Wastes Management Services, West Sussex County Council, England) – “Delivering an effective wastes management service”.**
  - Have a 55-60% aspirational target for recycling.
  - Philosophy of ten commandments:
    - Waste treatment services take a long time to implement (typically 8 to 10 years);
    - You can have the best technology but if the community doesn’t want it, it is a dead deal;
    - Have a strategy that is owned by the community through community engagement;
    - Know your waste composition;
    - Do not covert your neighbours waste or their treatment plants;
    - Passing on risk costs you money;
    - Do you and the funders share the same understanding of the proposed deal;
    - Avoid challenge on bids – have good advisors;
    - Have the widest remit in the advert for your service; and
    - Practice what you preach.
- 5. Julie Wilkinson (Strategy and Services Manager, Wastes Management Services, West Sussex County Council, England) – “Waste Prevention and Behaviour Change”.**
  - Waste reduction is better than recycling.
  - Waste prevention isn’t recycling.
  - Benefits of waste prevention – meets demands of EU legislation, reduces demands on finite resources, reduces transport impacts, reduces costs of waste management, encourages social inclusion.
  - Social marketing techniques - not one behaviour but many e.g. purchase of recycled toilet paper versus recycled notepaper.
  - Resident/customer/audience centred - ensure always customer focused, focus on perceived benefits.
  - Action will only occur if benefits outweigh the costs.
  - Motivations to change behaviour – moral, charitable personal responsibility, skill and knowledge.
  - Community driven – over 80 trained and active volunteers attend over 100 events per year.
  - They provide business waste advisers for small businesses.
  - “Better tomorrows” campaign.
  - Mission and targets.
  - Boards need a mix of people.



*Item 9.2 continued*

Key issues noted from the various concurrent sessions attended were as follows:

**Giles Perryman, ASK Waste Management, The Development of AWT Guidelines – A Summary of the WMAA Project.**

- The WMAA received grant funding from the Waste Authority to develop guidelines for AWT projects.
- Report highlights the gaps in policy, regulations, standards, definitions, etc that need to be filled before AWT guidelines can be produced.
- A number of issues were identified relevant to AWT facility development including community consultation, facility siting, financial viability, emissions, risk, products and residues.
- A copy of the paper is attached (Attachment 2).

**Brendan Doherty, SMRC – “The Second Wave – Exceeding 90% Resource Recovery”**

- SMRC member Councils deliver 160,000 tonnes of recyclables, green waste and MSW per year to the RRRC, with 66% of the material diverted from landfill, 54,000 tonnes per annum of residual waste requiring landfill disposal or some other form of further processing.
- SMRC strategic plan for diversion of kerbside collected MSW, recyclables and green waste from landfill targets a 95% reduction in waste to landfill.
- SMRC research and development projects have identified new technologies and operating approaches that may achieve target landfill diversion rates exceeding 90%. These include weekly collection of recyclables, pyrolysis of compost screening residuals and other waste to energy applications such as gasification and production of biodiesel from depolymerisation of plastics residuals.
- In conjunction with waste to energy facilities, maximum recovery rates exceeding the SMRC target of 95% could be achieved by broadening the markets and alternative disposal opportunities for residual wastes such as textiles, clothing and household junk, general mixed and thin film plastics (other than containers), inert wastes such as concrete, masonry and sand etc; and char and bottom ash from waste to energy processes.

**Peter Dyson, Moltoni Energy, “Waste to Energy: Is it a Waste Issue or an Energy Issue?”**

- Commented on projected population increase for Perth to 2,056 of another 1.8 million people, 820,000 new households, 1.8 million tonnes waste to landfill, another 4,000 GWh of electricity required.
- 600 KWh electricity capable of being generated from waste to energy plants.
- A lot of European countries and the US achieving sustainable waste management with waste to energy as an integral part of the waste strategy.
- Also gaining heat energy for steam, heating, cooling, water purification.
- Examples of Hitachi Metals in Japan (plasma gasification of MSW and auto-shredder waste), Edogawa and Ariake plants, Japan.
- Modelling shows gate fees of \$70 to \$100 per tonne achievable in Australia for MSW.
- Plant life greater than 50 years, can reduce waste to landfill by up to 95%.

**Pablo Perez-Reigosa, Coffey Environments, “Energy from Waste across Europe – Current Statistics and Trends.”**

- 420 energy from waste (EfW) plants across Europe treating 71 million tonnes of household and other waste
- Supplied electricity for 8 million households and heat for 15.3 million households



*Item 9.2 continued*

- Contributes towards greenhouse gas reduction.
- 5 step waste hierarchy in sustainable waste management in EU.
- State of the art EfW saves between 100 to 350 Kg CO<sub>2</sub> per tonne of waste.
- Drivers for capacity growth in EfW in Europe include the landfill ban and future transport requirements if there are not EfW plants.
- Energy efficiency factors being applied in EfW plants.
- Average capacity of EfW plants varies from country to country (ranges from 600,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) in Netherlands to 200,000 tpa in Spain, 100,000 tpa in Italy down to 50,000 tpa in Finland and Norway.

**Julie Wilkinson, West Sussex County Council, “*Building and Maintaining (and /or repairing) the trust touching on the Political Interface.*”**

- Opposition – how much are you willing to put up with? If outside groups join in they can defeat the proposal.
- Active communication and early engagement is best.
- Face to face involvement is better than impersonal methods.
- Find supporters who can help you.
- Being in touch with the right people with the information they need at the right time.
- Technology opposition – sell the benefits, choose the right site.
- Officers need to support members.

Papers presented by EMRC staff included:

“Creating a Generation of Battery Recyclers” - Ms Tania Wells, EMRC Waste Education Officer; and  
“The role for community engagement in alternative waste treatment development” - Mr Steve Fitzpatrick, Manager Project Development.

Both presentations were well received.

The EMRC also set up a display in the trade exhibition section featuring EMRC products and services.

Overall the conference provided current information on trends in waste management and resource recovery, some good advice on successful community engagement processes and good networking opportunities. The conference organisers need to look at reducing the number of concurrent streams as some sessions were poorly attended and there are often conflicts for participants with several relevant papers being presented at the same time.

The WMCRG members will report on their conference experience at their 8 November 2010 meeting.

## **STRATEGIC/POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Two of the host organisations are WALGA and the WMAA. The EMRC supports both of the organisations by participating in their activities and by cooperating and sharing information with others.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The expenditures for councillor and officer attendance at conferences are budgeted each year. Similarly, an allowance of \$4,500 is made each year in the Resource Recovery Budget for WMCRG members to attend local conferences and seminars.



*Item 9.2 continued*

## **SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

## **MEMBER COUNCIL IMPLICATIONS**

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

## **ATTACHMENT(S)**

Paper by Giles Perryman, ASK Waste Management, "The Development of AWT Guidelines-A Summary of the WMAA Project ([Ref: Committees-11494](#))

## **VOTING REQUIREMENT**

Simple Majority

## **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

That the report be received and conference information be used where relevant in the development of the EMRC's Resource Recovery Project and associated waste education and community engagement programs.

The Chairman advised that he had attended the Waste and Recycle Conference 2010 and had been very impressed with the speeches given by EMRC's Waste Education Coordinator and Manager Project Development and he congratulated everyone involved in the conference.

## **RRC RECOMMENDATION(S)**

MOVED CR PULE

SECONDED CR RADFORD

That the report be received and conference information be used where relevant in the development of the EMRC's Resource Recovery Project and associated waste education and community engagement programs.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

# The Development of AWT Guidelines— A Summary of the WMAA Project

## **PRESENTER:**

Mr Giles Perryman  
ASK Waste Management

## **CONTACT DETAILS:**

Phone: +61 (8) 9759 1418  
Email: giles@askwm.com  
Postal Address: 33 Windlemere Drive, Dunsborough, WA 6281

## **Introduction**

Five Alternative Waste Treatment (AWT) facilities have already been approved and established in Western Australia under the current regulations and available guidance. However, to move towards best practice for the assessment of proposals the development of guidelines will assist both project proponents and regulatory assessors.

During the initial stages of this project it was apparent that there are a number of measures relating to the production of AWT facility guidelines that are yet to be determined. This report highlights the gaps in policy, regulations, standards, definitions, etc that need to be filled before guidelines can be produced.

## **Methodology**

The report's findings are applicable to both metropolitan and regional areas in Western Australia and the key AWT technologies included are:

Biological technologies:

- Anaerobic Digestion (AD).
- Composting.

Thermal technologies:

- Gasification.
- Incineration.
- Pyrolysis.

The project has considered the treatment of a number of waste streams, including:

- Municipal Solid Waste (MSW);
- Commercial and Industrial (C&I) waste; and
- Some specific waste stream fractions, such as waste wood, etc.

The project included several stages; initially several AWT facility operators in Western Australia were contacted to gather feedback about their experience of the environmental approvals process and on-going operational monitoring, with the aim to determine any issues that needed to be addressed.

The consultation stage was then widened to include Eastern States and international jurisdictions to determine both issues arising from the assessment and operation of AWT facilities and any measures adopted to overcome or manage the issues. The data collected was analysed and potential measures that could be used in Western Australia to address existing and likely issues have been recommended.

The report has been peer reviewed by members of the Western Australian branch of the Waste Management Association of Australia (WMAA)—AWT Working Group to verify that the report is comprehensive, accurate and balanced.

### **Project Outcomes**

The issues highlighted by overseas jurisdictions mirrored the Australian findings, but were more wide ranging. While not all of the issues identified may be relevant to facility assessment, they are relevant to operations and economic viability; therefore they are included in the list of issues below.

1. Community consultation; sufficient level of consultation with the local community.
2. Facility siting; land zoning and buffer zones, etc.
3. Financial viability; ensuring the long-time financial viability of a facility.
4. Risk; management of unknowns/changes in the operating environment (i.e. regulatory, social, political factors, etc).
5. Energy recovery; the efficiency of energy recovery and the use of 'waste' heat from the process.
6. Reducing recycling; concern that AWT facilities utilise material that could be recycled, i.e. adherence to the waste hierarchy.
7. Facility emissions; all gaseous emissions, including odours, to the atmosphere.
8. AWT residues; the status of residues from an AWT facility.
9. AWT products; the status of products from AWT facilities and their use.

### **Conclusion**

Following the review and analysis completed for this report, while considering the specific factors faced by Western Australia (e.g. geographic size, remote location from markets, a relatively small population, etc), the following conclusion can be drawn.

- There are a number of regulatory/policy areas that need to be determined before complete AWT guidelines can be produced;
- There are a number of methodologies or measures that need to be determined prior to the production of AWT guidelines;
- There is a lack of awareness in the wider community about waste management, State strategies and future developments. While a number of regional and local governments are very active in this arena, a State-wide approach is required under solid leadership;
- There appears to be a lack of awareness in the political community, particularly at a State level. Without a good level of understanding, the waste industry and regulators may not receive the political support required to develop a 21st century approach to waste management in Western Australia;
- It is unlikely that any non-MSW processing facilities will be established in Western Australia given the current regulatory and economic environment (i.e. the low cost of waste disposal);

- Western Australia has a number of specific factors generally due to its geographic size, relatively small population and distance from interstate and international markets, that mean measures adopted by other jurisdictions may not be directly applicable;
- There is little difference in the guidance required for an AWT facility based in the Perth metropolitan area or in regional Western Australia. However, due to the additional challenges relating to economies of scale and distance from markets for regional areas, careful consideration must be made when developing policy and regulation to ensure significant barriers are not inadvertently created that could inhibit resource recovery;
- There is a range of wider issues relating to AWT facilities that needs to be addressed in order to create an environment that will foster the establishment of AWT infrastructure in Western Australia;
- The cost and process required to achieve connection to any of the electricity grids in Western Australia is expensive and complex, this is a barrier to energy generating technologies, especially smaller scale systems that could be utilised in regional areas;
- Due to the very low cost of waste disposal in regional and rural areas of Western Australia the processing of the majority of wastes for recycling and recovery is uneconomic when compared to disposal; and
- Undetermined policy, regulation and standards can result in uncertainty for the AWT industry, which can manifest itself as higher fees to allow for potentially 'unfavourable' decisions in the future. This uncertainty can mean a higher cost of processing or a reluctance to proceed with projects.

## **Recommendations**

In order to achieve the waste recycling and recovery targets proposed in the State's draft Waste Strategy a number of additional AWT facilities are likely to be required throughout the State. The first six recommendations relate to the production of AWT facility guidelines, while the following ten recommendations enhance the likelihood of more AWT facilities being established in the foreseeable future.

### Energy recovery

1. The State Government, in liaison with the waste management industry should determine the benchmark for minimum net energy conversion efficiencies [for thermal and anaerobic digestion (AD) facilities], including potential heat recovery. The standards need to include a 'developmental stage' for facilities and consideration must be made for the lower efficiency of smaller scale facilities in regional areas.
2. The Waste Authority to fund research into the composition and calorific values of Western Australian waste streams. This data will assist in the establishment of efficiency standards and provide an indication of the potential energy that could be generated.
3. The State Government to ensure that as part of the assessment process the potential markets for heat (or cooling via trigeneration) have been properly considered and assessed for any proposed energy generation AWT facility. If there are no current opportunities to use the heat, facilities should be designed for easy retrofitting of heat capture equipment, in case an opportunity does present itself in the future.

### Waste Hierarchy

4. The State Government to develop a process for proponents to show that the waste hierarchy has been adhered to, where practical, while ensuring the economic viability of an option, so that an AWT facility will not have a negative impact on higher tiers of the hierarchy. The development of this process must allow for the specific factors faced by Western Australia (distance from markets, population, etc) and particularly regional areas.

#### Facility emissions (to air)

5. The State Government to determine an air emission standard for AWT facilities and to determine the existing baseline air quality levels across the Perth metropolitan area.

#### Diversion rates

6. The State Government to develop a methodology and 'scorecard' for the reporting of AWT facility diversion rates. This would be used to assess planned facilities and during the operation of established facilities.

The following recommendations do not relate directly to the production of AWT facility guidelines, but would assist in providing an environment that would enable the AWT industry and in some cases the wider waste management industry, to flourish.

#### Community concerns/perceptions

7. A significant effort is required to provide education and awareness within the State's wider community about waste management, strategies and targets for the future. The details required for such a programme are beyond the scope of this report, but are likely to start with the lobbying of the State Government to gain support for the need for waste management to be viewed as an essential service.
8. The State Government to support the development of reference sites that could be used to demonstrate the use of AWT technologies to the community.
9. The State Government needs to recognise waste management as an 'essential service' for the State and consider its importance alongside other key issues such as water and energy use.

#### Facility siting

10. State Government need to liaise with the waste management industry to determine a future strategy for the siting of waste infrastructure within the State.

#### Economic viability

11. To provide an economic environment that will foster the development of recycling and recovery of waste (other than MSW) in Western Australia, the cost of waste disposal will need to increase or the disposal of certain targeted waste streams banned. The State Government should implement regulatory and/or economic measures to ensure that waste disposal becomes the 'expensive' option of last resort, rather than the easy 'cheap' option. This is exacerbated in regional Western Australia where disposal fees are generally significantly lower than in the Perth metropolitan area.



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

Nil

**11 GENERAL BUSINESS**

Nil

**12 FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY COMMITTEE**

The next meeting of the Resource Recovery Committee will be held on **Thursday, 18 November 2010 (if required)** at the EMRC Administration Office, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Ascot Place, 226 Great Eastern Highway, Belmont WA 6104 commencing at 5.00pm.

**Future Meetings 2010**

Thursday                      18 November (if required)                      at                      EMRC Administration Office

The Chairman advised that the 18 November meeting would be required.

**13 DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING**

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 5.35pm.