

Community Task Force - Meeting Notes

Date: 28th Sept 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	X	Noelene Wigmore	✓	Other: John King (Cardno)	o
Other:		Other:		Other:	
Present ✓ Apology = x Observer/Presenter = O					

Meeting Opened: 6:05pm

Meeting Chair: Joel Levin

Item	Issue/Topic	Discussion
1.	Previous Minutes	<p><i>Previous minutes are approved electronically as agreed by the CTF members. Past action items were reviewed.</i></p> <p>Item 2: Terms of reference endorsed.</p> <p>Item 3: CTF email address has been established. ctf@emrc.org.au</p> <p>Item 4: Web page has been established, waiting on some photos from CTF members. CTF members invited to offer suggestion for inclusion on the public web site. CTF members reminded about “subscribing” to discussion and document pages on the CTF website to get automatic emails/updates.</p> <p>Item 8: EMRC marketing department reviewed the Gidgegannup show and has decided that the show was primarily agricultural in focus and therefore not a fit for the EMRC Resource Recovery Project to have a stall/stand (footnote: the EMRC will actually have a marquee which will be promoting work being done in the Susannah Brook Catchment so we may be able to have some project material available).</p> <p>Item 9: Meeting schedule agreed.</p> <p>A letter was received from a resident between meetings. The EMRC has responded to this letter and a copy of this response was sent to CTF members. One CTF member noted that the letter mentioned a rumbling sound, the EMRC clarified that the sound came from a privately run facility (Landfill Gas and Power) which operates 24hr a day. It was also noted that while the concerns related more to the operation of the Red Hill site and not the RRF, there would be some concerns raised in this letter that would/could be picked up in the discussion about the Community Partnership Agreement and the Tender Evaluation Criteria.</p>
Action/Resolution 1.		CTF Terms of Reference were endorsed and to be signed at the next meeting Who 1 All

2. Project Update

John King from Cardno Limited (consultants to the EMRC on the RRF project), gave a presentation on the current status, various project milestones, and rationale for the consultation approach and approvals process. The full power point presentation is available in the CTF internal website.

Key Milestones :

Expression of Interest was called in May 2009 – completed July 2009 (this should come before the milestone above – data order please)

There are seven companies who were found to be acceptable tenderers for this project. There were two options for the EOI to give the EMRC flexibility on technology selection. 1) 90K-200K ton of waste per annum for energy from waste options, 2) 60K-150 ton of waste per annum for anaerobic digestion.

Decision was to seek EPA approval for all options under consideration, thus allowing for the environmental requirement to form part of the tender specification, rather than expecting tenders to 'retro fit' their designs

EMRC Council preliminary decisions on 24th Sept 2009;

- Site selection: Red Hill
- Contract style: Design and Construct (ie: EMRC will be the owner and operator) preferred to Build Own Operate
- Technology: Anaerobic digestion, gasification, pyrolysis are ranked higher than combustion and plasma but more information required. Bin collection system – three bin system to be considered in conjunction with AD otherwise a 2 bin system.

May 2010

Council resolved that:

- Red Hill was the preferred site,
- D&C contract preferred at this stage
- The RRF technology options include AD, gasification, pyrolysis and combustion. Plasma will only be considered if an integral part of one of these technologies
- A third bin be considered for household organic waste in conjunction with anaerobic digestion, otherwise a 2 bin system is recommended for the thermal technology options.
- Council proceeds with the environmental and planning approvals process based on the preferred site and technology options.

EPA Approvals

The Environmental approval and consultation process is expected to take until April 2012. The initial paperwork has been lodged with the EPA. The EPA has reviewed the documents and set the assessment level at a Public Environmental Review (PER) with a public review period of four weeks.

Continued next page...

2 Project Update Continued

Discussion: There was some discussion/concern about the impact on the community in having to 'comment' on up to 5 different technologies in a four week period. Two community groups have lodged a submission to the EPA requesting a higher level of assessment and longer period of time to consider their response to the different technology options. The EMRC would accept the decision of the appeals that are currently before the EPA.

One member raised community concerns about the planned phases of the project going through the EPA Public Environmental Review process for all of five technologies (or any combination thereof). It was felt that after public submissions are closed and the EPA approve all of those five technologies (or any combination thereof) before the preferred technology is selected and then publicly announced. Should this occur, then the public will have no further right of appeal once they know which technology has been selected. The member then stated that the process should be to select the preferred technology first, before the PER process takes place, in order to clarify the project and allow the public its normal rights to respond in the normal manner.

During discussion it was noted that the Mindarie Regional Council public submission period, the government funded an independent person to work with the community to assist them with a peer review of the PER.

The resulting discussion affirmed that the proposed staging of the process highlighted the role and importance of the Community Partnership Agreement and Tender Evaluation Criteria.

Planning and Development Approvals: EMRC would also seek to obtain the various developments and planning approval prior to the tender. This would make the tender process, much more accurate, as with the inclusion of the EPA requirements.

Request for Tender – Expected 2012. The tenders would be asked to submit the technology option that best fitted the various environmental, planning, economic, social and technical requirements. The Community Partnership agreement and the Tender Evaluation criteria would form part of these requirements.

Tender Selected (ie: technology decision made): 2012-2013

Plant operational: 2015

3. Order of Business	<p>The CTF discussed how they might develop the Community Partnership Agreement (CPA) or the Tender Evaluation Criteria (TEC). After some discussion it was acknowledged that both documents would need to be developed simultaneously as the various requirements to be discussed would be suited for either the CPA or the TEC.</p> <p>It was noted that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CTF's role in the development of the TEC would to provide EMRC advice on desirable criteria as opposed to providing a final set of TEC's. • Due to the range of technology options being considered, the CPA and TEC would have two levels of detail. One would be overarching statements that would apply to the any technology option and some statement that are specific for different technology options. • While time may change the volumes and processes used at the RRF, the CPA needs to be drafted in a way that remains relevant, regardless of changing 'operational' circumstance. Eg: focusing on noise and odour emission will remain constant regardless of volume or technology used. <p>The CTF will begin working on these documents at the next meeting. In preparation for this work CTF members are invited to do the following;</p>	
Action/Resolution 2.	<p>A briefing session will be held 45 minutes prior to the next CTF meeting (Nov 2nd) for members wanting more information on the technology options.</p>	Who 2 All / Steven
Action/Resolution 3.	<p>CTF members to review the raw data from the community forum and identify key themes</p>	Who 3 All
Action/Resolution 4.	<p>A site tour to the Mindarie facility in Neerabup to be arranged along with a meeting with their Community Engagement Advisory Group.</p>	Who 4 EMRC to organise
Action/Resolution 5.	<p>CTF members are invited to the Red Hill open day on November 6th</p>	Who 5 All

4. Community Forum	<p>Raw data, which had been themed into broad headings (economic, social, environmental, legal, waste management systems), from the Community Forum held on 18 September 2010 was distributed to the CTF for information. There was a brief discussion about the community forum and the data.</p> <p>The CTF requested that the raw data be made available to the community. It was agreed that the data would be placed on EMRC's public website. The CTF would use this raw data to inform the development of the CPA and TEC.</p> <p>The CTF also requested that the responses from question four (focusing on technology) be included. These were not originally included as the focus did not relate to the formation of the CPA or TEC.</p>	
Action/Resolution 6.	<p>Raw data from the Community forum to be posted on the public site.</p>	Who 6 EMRC

5. Meeting Closed	8:10pm	6. Next meeting	November 2 nd 2010
--------------------------	--------	------------------------	-------------------------------

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: 3/11/2010

ACTION LIST

Action/Resolution 1.	CTF Terms of Reference were endorsed and to be signed at the next meeting	Who 1 All Who 2 All / Steven
Action/Resolution 2.	A briefing session will be held 45 minutes prior to the next CTF meeting (Nov 2 nd) for members wanting more information on the technology options.	Who 3 All
Action/Resolution 3.	CTF members to review the raw data from the community forum and identify key themes	Who 4 EMRC to organise
Action/Resolution 4.	A site tour to the Mindarie facility in Neerabup to be arranged along with a meeting with their Community Engagement Advisory Group.	Who 5 All
Action/Resolution 5.	CTF members are invited to the Red Hill open day on November 6 th	Who 6 EMRC
Action/Resolution 6.	Raw data from the Community forum to be posted on the public site.	