



Attendee		Attendee		Attendee	
Martin Chape (MC)	✓	Peter Jensen (PJ)	✓	Stephen Fitzpatrick (SF)	✓
Jan Foster-Hawkings (JFH)	✓	Peter Pearson (PP)	✓	Prapti Mehta (PM_)	✓
Noel Hales (NH)	✓	Noelene Wigmore (NW)	✓	Joel Levin (JL)	✓
Max Jamieson (MJ)	✓			Karen Kerlin (KK)	✓
Present ✓ Apology = x Observer/Presenter = O					

Meeting Opened: 6:05pm

Meeting Chair: Joel Levin

Item	Issue/ Topic	Discussion
1.	Opening	JL welcomed group members back to EMRC. Summarised the key milestones – CTF first met as a group August 2010; Ended partnership of CTF group in August 2011. Overviewed purpose of this evening’s meeting – as per email invitation, provide CTF with update on what’s happening with RRF followed by a discussion on what this may mean in terms of community engagement?
2.	Attendances and apologies	No apologies
3.	Disclosure of interests	Nil

<p>4. Items</p>	<p>a) EMRC Update SF presented update on RRF</p> <p>RRF journey so far:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA approval process – Public Environmental Review (PER) issued for comment July 2012; technology choice narrowed to anaerobic digestion and gasification. Two community information sessions held. • Ministerial approval for either of these two options above at Red Hill – July 2014 • EOI process ended in 2014 due to delays and uncertainties caused by the local government reform process • Since 2014, the market for alternative waste treatment has matured. Evident with treatment plants with Rivers Regional Council and Shire of Port Hedland • 2015 and 2016, Council considered contract model options and resolved to proceed with the project, but start tender process again • The location for RRF at Red Hill has changed to Lot 8 – furthest from nearby residences • During the original CTF and PER processes, the first stage of the tender process ran concurrently – EOI. <p>Current status of RRF – ready for tender</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMRC Council resolution – February 2016 • Flexible but complex tender to evaluate • EMRC has broadened the scope to accommodate advances in alternative waste treatment • Aiming to issue the tender in late July/early August • Committed to using the most efficient and cleanest technology • Want the RRF to be operated by skilled experts • More than one technology solution <p>Tender overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expect several consortiums to put in tenders • Tender process to proceed late July 2016 • Contract model options • RRF technology options • Siting options • Financing options • Single phased Request for Tender (RFT) procurement process is undertaken. <p>Community engagement strategy to be undertaken concurrent with that process</p>
------------------------	---

Options

- RFT options:
 - Waste Supply Agreement (WSA) or Design Build Operate and Maintain (DBOM)
 - Red Hill (DBOM and WSA) or other sites (WSA)
 - Range of technologies (anaerobic digestion, gasification, other – tender to nominate e.g. combustion)
 - Range of waste quantities based on:
 - Mixed waste and separated organics
 - EMRC only waste and Other Regional Councils

DBOM may be a better option for EMRC as EMRC would manage KPI's and the contractor

PJ – Waste from other Regional Councils is not part of the original scope, why include it now? Does it mean Red Hill is not the optimum location?

SF – Allowing for waste from other Regional Councils may create economies of scale and may be a better solution for the EMRC.

PJ – If you don't have approval for combustion, why would you tender?

SF – It may mean a fresh approval or a variation to the existing approval.

PM – Would EMRC need to purchase another site?

SF – No. If another site is proposed under a WSA model, will be up to the tenderer to obtain that site–buy lease.

PM – Is there a difference from a financial aspect between a DBOM or WSA approach? Would community pay for the RRF through rates, fees, charges?

SF – Yes, the community does pay for waste disposal through their rates – already do. The EMRC is undertaking this project to protect the community from a likely increase in landfill levies. EMRC currently pays approx. \$10M a year landfill levies to the Waste Authority. If we have a waste treatment facility, we would only pay for the portion of residue that would go to landfill, thus minimising further cost increases in the long term. Under the DBOM option, the EMRC owns the facility, under a WSA the contractor owns it.

MJ – Presumably, it would cost less to manage waste compared to landfill?

SF – Red Hill has a limited life span of approx. 30 years. An RRF would double the life span. The RRF option would be based on this being cheaper than landfill.

MJ – Would they dig up what's already in the landfill?

SF – Not planned for Red Hill but it has been done elsewhere but technically, it's difficult to control odours, asbestoses, certain gases.

MC – If there was another site for the transfer of waste, would that open up another can of worms? Local community would not be happy where the RRF would be.

SF – Would need to look at transport costs and the logistics. May need to look at a transfer facility. So yes, there is potentially the issue of Council waste going to a facility outside of the EMRC area. Kwinana’s facility has capacity for approx. 400,000 tonnes a year and we understand has a committed volume of about 200,000 tonnes a year (Rivers Council are contributing). An RRF has to be economically viable. In terms of the local community, there is an air quality buffer zone between residential and industrial in Kwinana to help manage air quality concerns.

SF overviewed **Principal’s Objectives in tender pack**

- Compliance with health, environment, safety and other regulatory requirements
- Waste diversion policy targets of the Waste Authority
- Consistent with EPA/Waste Authority position paper on waste to energy
- To avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle or recover waste where practicable
- Increase useful life of Red Hill WMF
- Generates consistent, reliable and saleable renewable energy/compost/refuse derived fuel
- Provide cost effective resource recovery services
- Align with **Community Partnership Agreement**
- A proven service that meets the Member Councils’ and Other Local Governments’ needs
- Protects the Principal’s, Member Councils’ and Other Local Governments’ reputation

The tenders would be assessed against these objectives.

DBOM option

- EMRC owns the facility
- Contractor builds the facility, operates and maintains the facility for 30 years. This may be a 20 year contract plus 2 x 5 year extensions.
- Will be located at Red Hill Waste Management Facility
- Can be either Anaerobic Digestion (AD) with or without mechanical sorting, or Gasification technology
- Facility would process member Council waste

WSA option

- Contractor owns and operates the facility
- EMRC member Councils supply their waste for 30 year period of the contract and pay a gate fee
- Could be located at Red Hill Waste Management Facility
- Could be located elsewhere within or outside the region

- Technology
 - If located at Red Hill – tenderer to nominate (which may need an amendment to the Ministerial approval)
 - If located elsewhere – tenderer to nominate (which may need a new approval)
 - Could involve waste derived from other Regional councils

PJ – Are these technologies accepted world-wide?

SF- Yes, they are used and accepted world-wide. Just locally, the Western Metro Regional Councils put their waste in Shenton Park at a facility using anaerobic digestion where compost and biogas is produced. At Jandakot, there is the Richgrow biogas anaerobic digestion plant which does organic waste mainly from large grocery stores.

SF – Have been some issues with gasification based on a plant in UK that scaled their operations too quickly and didn't want to continue the development.

Status Quo – landfill

- The other alternative is to continue landfilling the member Council waste
- Limits the life of Red Hill
- Environmental impacts of landfill (odour, litter, leeching, birds)
- State government waste strategy targets not achieved
- Vulnerable to landfill levy increases
- Gate fee for landfill will eventually be more expensive

Community Engagement History

- Waste Management Community Reference Group (WMCRG) formed in 2002
- Community surveys 2005, 2006
- Community information sessions & regional workshop, 2005, 2006
- Focus groups, surveys 2009
- Community Task Force created 2010 after calling for nominations
- Community forum, 2010, Rosehill
- Community forums at EMRC on waste to energy technologies and anaerobic digestion technologies in 2010, 2011

Community Engagement Now

- Have recommenced engaging with community groups – Waste Management Community Reference Group, Community Task Force, Red Hill neighbours, email database, politicians and so on.
- We want the community to be aware of the changes to the scope of the tender before it is issued and make sure those changes are understood
- Build an informed stakeholder group through these meetings

Agreements

- EMRC and the Participants sign (member Councils)
- Participants required to deliver all Processible Waste to RRF
- Cannot withdraw from obligations unless the other Participants agree and another Participant accepts obligations
- DBOM Contract model only – financing and guarantee
 - Each Participant Member Council of the EMRC will be required to provide a guarantee to WA Treasury Corporation for the loan taken out by EMRC to fund capital costs of developing the RRF
 - The guarantees to be provided by the Participant Member Councils will be several based proportionally on the populations of the individual Member Councils

PP – The guarantee from member Councils may actually count against them.

SF – WATC will look at each member Council’s financial situation and their planning commitments.

PJ – But it will make member Councils commit to the RRF which is what the EMRC wants.

Waste Collection Systems

- Tenderers to be assessed against:
 - The flexibility in feed stock quality (including changes to waste collection systems)
 - The total cost of each Tender taking into account any required changes to the Participants’ current waste collection services
- Tenderers are required to detail in their Tender how changes to waste collection system would be accommodated if:
 - A Government requirement for a compulsory 3rd kerbside Bin; or
 - A Participant chooses to implement changes to their waste collection system

PJ - Is there some sort of assessment on their previous experience with waste?

SF – Tenderer will need to provide significant detail of reference facilities. The tender document is comprehensive.

Confidentiality, Probity and Sequence

- Personnel with access committed to maintain confidentiality and advise of any conflicts of interest.
- Overseen by probity advisor and a probity plan - impartiality, conflicts of interest, accountability and transparency, tender clarification process, tender decision making process
- Tender submission sequence



Tender Evaluation Process

- Value for Money Evaluation approach:
 - Compliance Criteria
 - Yes / No basis
 - Qualitative Criteria
 - Weighted criteria for Financial, Technical, Social & Environmental items
 - Value for Money Assessment
 - The total cost to the Principal and to the Participants (including impacts on waste collection systems and additional cost of transport to the RRF);
 - The assessment against the Qualitative Criteria; and
 - The degree to which each Tender demonstrates that it achieves the Principal's objectives (such as CPA).

Decision Process

- TEP Nominate Preferred Tenderer based on Tender Evaluation
- Received by EMRC Council
- Briefing of Member Councils & obtain agreement to proceed
- Contract Finalisation
 - Obtaining agreement for the financing of the RRF
 - Negotiation/clarification of contract conditions
 - Preparation of amendments to the Draft Agreement (if required)
- Any material changes referred to Member Councils
- Present final Contract to EMRC Council for adoption
- Signing by EMRC, Contractor and Participants

Timeline for decision

- Release Tender - late July/early August 2016
- Tender closes – early January 2017
- Nominate Preferred Tender - February 2017
- Brief member Council participants - April 2017
- Award - May 2017
- Finalise Contract - July 2017
- Adopted by member Council participants and signed - August 2017
- Commissioning – late 2019

This is a tight time schedule particularly with local government elections to be held in October 2017.

Community Partnership Agreement –How best can the tenderer design/operate RRF to align with CPA goals?

4.

b) Community Engagement and general discussion

JL used the whiteboard to summarise the key aspects community members may be most interested in:

- Technology selection process
- Siting
- Impact on rates (short and long term)
- Volumes of waste (including other councils and other waste)
- Different technology
- Summary of tender for public

PP – Need to talk to people now and advise what is being considered. Sound them out. Let them know what may happen.

PM - Is it part of the process to ask the community what they like or do not like about the technology options? Need to educate people about the technology options etc. on the website. Consider using ratepayers' associations to assist. At the point EMRC select an option, then you bring people together physically to explain the selection, why, what it involves.

NH – People are frightened of what they don't know. Keep them well-informed. Advise what is going on but stress that we all produce rubbish so it is everyone's responsibility to manage it.

JL –Where would you go to obtain information?

PJ – Need to give the community opportunity to comment. A forum may help educate new people in the area. It's also a good place for people to vent.

JFH – At the end of the day, councils make decisions. Once the tenderers are short-listed, then educate the community.

PJ – If the model chosen is DBOM, then nothing is different. If WSA, then give new information.

PP – Need to do the groundwork before preferred tendered is selected. Need to keep community informed. Where we do shift the CPA? IE if something different is put on the table?

NW – Will the tender release be in the paper?

SF – Yes, and on TenderLink. Plus, we will put information on our website.

PM – Was it originally discussed that the CTF would read the tenders?

SF – The panel will consist of:

- Talis rep (John King)
- Steve and Dave from EMRC
- Reps from Member councils – Tech advisory committees
- Probity officer
- Legal
- If there is an opportunity to have a CTF rep take a look, then yes.

JL – Is that of interest to the CTF?

(generally, yes)

MJ – Could be useful. Information can help handle fear.

JL – What kind of information do you, as CTF members, want during the process?

MJ – Email updates during the timeline period.

MC – A paragraph to be cut and pasted into ratepayers' communication channels. Plus on the Facebook pages of the member councils.

PJ – Gidgegannup Facebook page has about 800 Likes.

MC – Also need to cultivate the local press.

SF – We do issue media releases. We will be talking to local media and trade media about the RRF tender. We are also briefing politicians.

PJ – On Facebook would be good. And other group's Facebook sites. Gidgegannup has about 800 Likes. (Meeting advised the EMRC does not engage in social media at present).

PP – The moment the EMRC makes it public it may be considering combustion, you will get comments!

SF – Combustion is the most widely used world-wide. Japan has 13 combustion plants

PJ – Has the market for anaerobic digestion products improved?

SF – About the same. Perception about the compost is that it is derived from waste. It needs a fair amount of processing to get the quality up.

MC – Is there room on the Red Hill site to co-locate other industries?
SF – Potentially, there is a lot of land. And a 500m buffer zone.

MJ – You could consider a You Tube segment to explain what is happening. The link could be given to other groups’ social media pages. **KK** – What about visual images? Population growth and estimated waste growth going to landfill if waste not adequately managed?

NH – Yes, the more we improve now, the less angst in the future.

JHF – How do we turnaround the selfish thinking? It not impacted, people don’t care.

PJ – We can talk to our own groups. We just need to refine the message.
KK – I will work with Steve to produce a summary paragraph

PP – Is the basic tender going to be public?
SF – The tender will go on Tenderlink. We are considering a bond to access the documentation. This is common in State Government practise to protect the IP in the tender.

PP – How about something without the detail. A summary page.
PJ – Can the slides be shared?
KK – I will talk to Steve about modified slides and a tender summary page.

SF – We are currently giving presentations to all member councils.

2. Meeting Closed	8.00pm		
-------------------	--------	--	--

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:**

ACTION LIST

ACTION/RESOLUTION

WHO

The EMRC to provide email updates to CTF to reflect timeline of activity	STEVE
The EMRC to consider revised slides suitable for community groups to view/use	
The EMRC to draft a summary paragraph about the RRF to date to be emailed to community groups. This could be read out at meetings, inserted into newsletters or posted onto websites and Facebook pages with a link to the EMRC website.	
The EMRC to produce a summary of the tender. The summary is to be uploaded to their website which can be downloaded at no cost.	
The EMRC to advise CTF about a community representative on the selection panel.	