

CITY OF ARMADALE

MINUTES

**OF TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM,
ADMINISTRATION CENTRE, 7 ORCHARD AVENUE, ARMADALE ON TUESDAY, 3
JUNE 2014 AT 5:30 PM.**

PRESENT: Cr G Nixon (Chair)
Cr R Butterfield
Cr G A Best
Cr K Busby (5.35pm)
Cr C Frost (5.32pm)
Cr M S Northcott

APOLOGIES: Cr J A Stewart

OBSERVERS: Cr C Wielinga
Mrs Y Loveland

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr K Ketterer Executive Director Technical Services
Mrs S McKellar Minute Secretary

PUBLIC: 0

*“For details of Councillor Membership on this Committee, please refer to the City’s website
– www.armadale.wa.gov.au/your_council/councillors.”*

DISCLAIMER

The Disclaimer for protecting Councillors and staff from liability of information and advice given at Committee meetings was not read as no members of the public were present.

DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Nil.

QUESTION TIME

Nil.

DEPUTATION

Nil.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

T38/6/14 RECOMMEND

Minutes of the Technical Services Committee Meeting held on 5 May 2014 be confirmed.

**Moved Cr R Butterfield
MOTION CARRIED (4/0)**

ITEMS REFERRED FROM INFORMATION BULLETIN

- **Outstanding Matters and Information Items**
Various Items
- **Monthly / Quarterly Departmental Reports**
Technical Services Works Programme

Committee noted the information, and no further items were raised for discussion and/or further report purposes.

CONTENTS

TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

3 JUNE 2014

1. PROPERTY SERVICES	
1.1 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING - FIRST FLOOR KITCHEN UPGRADE.....	4
2. WASTE SERVICES	
2.1 THREE BIN COLLECTION SYSTEM	8
3. MISCELLANEOUS	
3.1 ROBERTS ROAD, KELMSCOTT.....	15
4. COUNCILLORS' ITEMS	
NIL.....	16
5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TECHNICAL SERVICES REPORT	
5.1 RIVERS REGIONAL COUNIL - ALTERNATIVE WASTE TREATMENT	16

1.1 - ADMINISTRATION BUILDING - FIRST FLOOR KITCHEN UPGRADE

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/416/14
DATE : 19 May 2014
REF : TD
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director
MANAGER : Technical Services

In Brief:

▪ Provision has been made in the 2013/2014 Budget for the refurbishment of the Administration Building First Floor Kitchen to a commercial kitchen status which can accommodate the City's current and future requirements.

▪ **Recommend:**

That Council note the report on the refurbishment of the Administration Building First Floor Kitchen.

Tabled Items

Nil.

Officer Interest Declaration

Nil.

Strategic Implications

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments.
 - 2.6 Council buildings and facilities that meet community needs.
 - 2.6.1 Maintain Council buildings, facilities and public amenities to the determined levels of service.
 - 2.6.2 Implement improvements to buildings amenities and facilities, as required, to enhance the services to the community.

Legislation Implications

General assessment of relevant legislation (eg Local Government Act) has not revealed any restrictions.

Council Policy/Local Law Implications

General assessment has not revealed any applicable Policies/Local Laws.

Budget/Financial Implications

Works can be accommodated within the 2013/2014 Budget.

Consultation

- Intra Directorate.
- Design Consultant.
- The City's Catering Contractor.

BACKGROUND

The existing kitchen in the Administration Building has been identified as dated and in need of modernisation. The upgrade of the kitchen is the final stage of the upgrade of the first floor facilities in the Administration Building, and follows on from upgrades to:

- Council Chamber.
- Public toilets.
- Committee Room.
- Councillor's Lounge and Dining Room.

An initial nominal budget provision was therefore made on the 2013/2014 Capital Works Programme, however once detailed designs had been progressed, it was identified that the provisions on the Budget were inadequate to complete the full range of required works to meet the catering and occupational health and safety requirements of a commercial kitchen.

A submission was therefore made through the mid year Budget review process for additional funding to complete the full scope of the refurbishment works.

This funding proposal was supported, subject to a further report to the Technical Services Committee, as resolved by Council at its Ordinary Meeting of 24 February 2014 (CS17/2/14), detailed in part as follows:

“That Council . . .

3. *Be provided with a further report (via the Technical Services Committee) on the budget amendments referred to in part 2 of this recommendation marked with an asterisk, prior to implementation of these works.”*

Those projects “marked with an asterisk” included the proposed kitchen upgrade. This report addresses this requirement.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The proposed works comprise the following elements:

- Enlargement of the floor area to include an existing storage area, which currently houses the outdated public address (PA) system for the function and reception areas;
- Replacement of the analogue PA System with a digital system;
- An improved ergonomic layout to promote efficient work flow;
- An improved waste management system with recycling provision;
- Improved storage facilities;
- Inclusion of a wet storage area, accessed off the passage;
- New floor and wall tiles; and
- New refrigeration and freezer facilities.

Maximum use of existing equipment is included in the planning.

It is proposed to commence the refurbishment after the Budget meeting cycle and associated workshop schedules have been concluded. With an anticipated construction time for the refurbishment works estimated at eight weeks, and giving consideration to Council's meeting schedule, it is proposed that the works commence in July 2014 to minimise disruption, and as authorised by the Chief Executive Officer.

During refurbishment of the upstairs lounge, arrangements had been made with the City's caterer for meals to be prepared off site and delivered at the scheduled meal time. It is proposed that this arrangement be repeated during the kitchen refurbishment works, with the meals still to be taken in the lounge area.

Funding

The estimated project cost of \$183,000 can be accommodated by utilising Carry Forward funds of \$83,000, and the approved \$100,000 allocation in the mid year Budget Review considerations.

Project Costing Estimates	
Services	\$ 66,000
Equipment	\$ 22,000
Construction	\$ 95,000
Total	\$183,000

Proposed Project Funding	
Carry Forward Funds	\$ 83,000
Mid Year Review Funding	\$100,000
Total	\$183,000

CONCLUSION

The proposed kitchen design is well aligned with the modernisation requirement of such a facility, will improve the working conditions of staff in the kitchen, and will provide for an improved image of the City.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

RECOMMEND

That Council note the report on the refurbishment of the Administration Building First Floor Kitchen.

Committee Discussion

The allocation of funds towards the kitchen upgrade was discussed, as opposed to the allocation of funds to other priorities, and considering the current use of the function area as offices. The Executive Director Technical Services responded by emphasising the risks attached to the Occupational Health and Safety and ergonomic requirements of such a kitchen, and urged the Committee to assess the upgrade of the kitchen on its own merits, and detach the consideration of the agenda item from the accommodation and other considerations.

Suggestions regarding a partial upgrade or temporary works were discussed as considered impractical and which could lead to abortive works being undertaken prior to a fuller upgrade at a later stage.

After extensive discussion, the Committee reached a consensus view to defer the consideration of this item until the matter of the accommodation in the administration building had been received.

T39/6/14 RECOMMEND

That the refurbishment of the kitchen be deferred pending the report on the accommodation requirements, and that the funds be carried forward into the 2014-2015 financial year.

**Moved Cr G Nixon
Seconded Cr C Frost
MOTION CARRIED (5/1)**

2.1 - THREE BIN COLLECTION SYSTEM

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/191/14
DATE : 25 March 2014
REF : SW
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director
MANAGER : Technical Services

In Brief:

- The State Government's Waste Authority WA (WAWA) is providing up to \$7.5 million funding for a two year trial of a three bin system.
- Councils wishing to participate are to submit applications for funding by 30 June 2014.

Recommend:

That Council not participate in the Waste Authority three bin system trial.

Tabled Items

Nil.

Officer Interest Declaration

Nil.

Strategic Implications

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments.
 - 2.10 Best practice integrated waste management.
 - 2.10.2 Implement continuous improvement of recycling, reuse, and minimisation of waste.

Legislation Implications

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following is applicable:

- Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act 2007.

Council Policy/Local Law Implications

General assessment has not revealed any applicable Policies/Local Laws.

Budget/Financial Implications

The adoption of the recommendation contained in this report has no direct financial implication.

Consultation

- Rivers Regional Council.
- City of Bunbury.
- City of Subiaco.
- Eastern Metropolitan Regional Council.

BACKGROUND

The Waste Authority WA (WAWA) was established on 6 May 2008, with the appointment of its five members. The WAWA, which replaces the Waste Management Board, commenced full operation on 1 July 2008.

Some of the main areas of responsibility for the Authority include:

- Developing, promoting and reviewing a waste strategy for Western Australia and coordinating its implementation;
- Promoting community awareness and understanding of resource efficiency, waste avoidance and resource recovery;
- Working with local government to coordinate local efforts to prevent waste;
- Administering the Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Account; and
- Advising and making recommendations to the Minister for the Environment on matters relating to the *Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act 2007*.

The Western Australian Waste Strategy: “*Creating the Right Environment*” was approved by Cabinet and subsequently launched on 6 March, 2012. This document sets out the long term strategic directives and priorities for the next decade for the State Government.

On 15 January 2014, the Environment Minister announced the two-year, \$7.5 million programme or trial called “*Better Bins Kerbside Collection System*” (Better Bins System), that would provide local governments in Perth and major regional centres with funding to trial a three-bin system to improve kerbside recycling rates. The three bins would be for:

- General household waste;
- Recyclables; and
- Green waste/organics.

Many Councils already have a two bin collection system similar to the City of Armadale that collects general household waste and recyclables. This trial aims to add a third bin for greenwaste and/or organics.

The State Waste Strategy contains landfill diversion targets of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) of 65% by 2020. The WAWA believes the Better Bins System to be consistent with this target.

The Better Bins System is to address collection systems and provide source separation at the point of waste generation and collection. In this regard, the WAWA proposes to allocate \$7.5 million from the Waste Levy to local governments wishing to trial a pilot programme.

The programme proposes to support local governments by establishing guidelines for best practice kerbside collection systems, and by providing financial incentives to achieve higher recovery rates through the implementation of these systems. The intention is for a roll-out of three bins across the entire local government area in the longer term.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The WAWA seeks expressions of interest to be submitted by 30 June 2014, with the programme scheduled to run over a two year period, commencing in the latter part of 2014, and concluding in 2016. The aim of the trial is to maintain the three bins along with complementary support of the system through education campaigns and enforcement of correct bin use.

The three bin system is proposed to comprise the following:

- A 80/120/140 Litre MGB (mobile garbage bin) with red lid for general waste collected weekly;
- A 240 Litre MGB with yellow lid for co-mingled recycling collected fortnightly; and
- A 240 Litre MGB with lime green lid for garden organics collected fortnightly.

If food waste was included with garden organics, a weekly collection would be required, and the general waste would be collected fortnightly. Provision would have to be made for households with babies in nappies or those requiring a weekly collection.

For a Council to participate in the trial, the following would have to be taken into account when implementing a three bin system:

- Community acceptance and willingness to pay;
- Education/communication requirements to enhance source separation;
- Housing density at present and into the long term future;
- Alternative Waste Treatment options;
- Space allocation for bins both within a property and on the verge;
- Waste avoidance as a first priority in the waste hierarchy;
- Collection and transport of waste (cost and carbon implications);
- Processing facilities at the landfill site or Alternative Waste Treatment (AWT) facility (gate fee & transport distances);
- The end product – its quality and available/sustainability of markets to be able to sell the end product;
- An exit strategy if the trial is not successful; and
- Other factors such as carbon emissions.

The participating Council must also:

- Introduce a collection system consistent with the Better Bins guidelines;
- Implement complementary measures to support the better practice collection system in the form of communication, education, marketing, demonstrations etc.;
- Cooperate with an independent auditor to undertake audits throughout the programme – as a minimum, there will be audits before the implementation of the new system and at the conclusion of the trial;
- Prepare and submit progress reports and a final evaluation report; and

- Comply with all requirements set out in the *Better Bins Funding Guide* and cooperate with the WAWA and associated contractors.

There are two alternatives for the collection of separated organics with the three bin system:

- A fortnightly greenwaste collection processed either by mulching or windrow composting. This represents 29% of the waste currently collected in the refuse bin.
- A weekly organic collection including greenwaste, food, soiled paper etc. processed either by windrow or in-vessel composting. This represents 55% of the waste currently collected in the refuse bin.

With both of these alternatives the collection will be increased to allow for the collection of four bins per fortnight compared to the current three bins being collected every fortnight. This is an increase of 33% in collection costs alone, not considering the carbon footprint increase related to the additional collection trucks.

COMMENT/ANALYSIS

The processing of the organics bin and end markets is a major factor in determining a way forward for source separation as there are few processing facilities and no competitive market. Currently, the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council (SMRC) produces compost, but has found difficulty in establishing a steady market for their product, especially considering the high standards demanded by the regulatory authorities regarding the contamination allowances of such products. Most of their compost is sold at very low process to the agricultural sector outside Perth. There are other local authorities that find themselves in similar difficulties where compost does not move (sell) fast enough.

Transport

An additional bin will require separate collection and therefore additional trucks on residential streets. There are already significant difficulties collecting bins in built-up areas where there is on street parking and limited verge space. With numerous developments yet to be completed without turnarounds for trucks and the limitations of laneway collections, additional transport and bin-lifts may amount to increased insurance claims.

The distance to and from any proposed organics processing site must also be considered.

Transport considerations would include the procurement of an estimated two (2) additional trucks and the appointment of more drivers for an in-house collection, or an additional contractual arrangement for an outsourced collection.

Apart from safety and general wear and tear on roads, there is also the carbon emission impact from running additional trucks.

Processing

The final product, whether it be mulch or compost and the quality standards demanded is the main consideration with processing organic waste. The feedstock needs to consist of clean green waste or a full organics collection because the amount of contamination and the level of processing will determine the cost and the salability of the product.

It is believed that processing MSW to Australian Standards for sale to residential market is cost prohibitive. Markets such as Main Roads WA will not use compost that is not Australian Standards certified. Finding markets for the end product will require detailed investigation and analysis and may be the responsibility of the City or the processing plant, depending on the method of disposal.

Facilities that will receive the collected greenwaste for processing would have to be identified prior to submitting the grant allocation. There are very few facilities that will accept green waste for processing at present. This will become even more problematic once the market gets flooded with all the “green waste” that could possibly be generated by local governments.

Education and Communication

A community survey would have to be undertaken prior to the introduction of a three bin system to gauge community support and acceptance of a third bin, as well as any additional associated costs.

Education is paramount to the success of any collection system to ensure the quality of end products. Extensive advertising and public liaison would be required to educate and remind residents to keep the greenwaste or organic waste bin uncontaminated to ensure a quality product. A lapse in advertising and education will dramatically increase the levels of contamination in the third bin. This will lead to an increase of the waste portion that will have to go to landfill. The City of Bunbury have the services of 1.5 full time employees available for education “on the road and at shopping centres etc.” promoting the correct use of the three bin system. The Town of Cambridge provides frequent reminders in their local newspaper, at some considerable cost.

Funding and Costs

The \$7.5 million of funding allocated by the WAWA for this project appears to be inadequate to fund a significant trial. Depending on the take up, the funds could be spread sparingly and would result in a programme being primarily funded by local government. The estimated net implementation costs, after the trial programme financial contribution, to be funded from municipal funding sources or additional waste rates, are estimated at \$2.8 million. The on-going costs will be the responsibility of local government to expand the bin roll-out and meet annual operational costs. These longer term annual costs are estimated to be considerably higher at approximately \$8 million, and could result in a cost impost on households of up to \$37 per year. This cost is not considered reasonable considering the number of unknowns and lack of success with current processes. The above costs include a provision for the savings related to landfill levy cost avoidance.

The funded programme does not allow for an opt-out process, meaning all households would pay for the additional bin whether they use it or not.

Advantages and Disadvantages

Advantages:

- Opportunity to participate in a broader, comprehensive trial with a final evaluation report to guide future waste collection decisions;
- Diversion from landfill and potential recovery of organic waste for use;

- Potential to supply residents with processed product dependent on quality and cost;
- Support the State Waste Strategy's target to divert 50% of waste from landfill by 2015 and 65% by 2020;
- Reduced landfill disposal costs provided green waste processing costs are lower;
- Reduction of landfill levy where waste is diverted from landfill;
- In the event that Waste to Energy (WtE) is the chosen technology for RRC, a higher calorific value residual product may be provided; and
- Potential carbon emission reduction and associated cost at \$23 per tonne (dependent on federal government decision to maintain the price on carbon).

Disadvantages:

- Financial cost to ratepayers that does not appear to justify environmental and social benefits (high cost, low benefit);
- Increased capacity to generate more household waste – which is contrary to the first tier of the waste hierarchy, to avoid and reduce household waste;
- Contamination;
- Potential over-supply of product due to increased capture of green waste creating a glut in the market;
- High cost to produce an Australian standard grade product suitable for open markets;
- Potential to spread plant disease/pathogens through under processed mulch;
- Lack of available space to store bins on properties;
- Limited time to gauge community support and acceptance;
- Additional truck movement in residential streets, adding to risk and increasing wear and tear; and
- Increased carbon emissions from additional transport.

The Better Bins Kerbside Collection Guidelines state that:

“The Waste Authority supports a three-bin system (general waste, co-mingled recycling and green waste) as it encourages source separation, which is important to maximize recovery”.

Due consideration must be given to whether the proposed programme could realistically achieve the intended aim – i.e. to reduce waste deposited in landfill.

The Eastern Metropolitan Regional Council (EMRC) currently receives greenwaste from Bayswater that implemented a third bin system some 5 years ago, which is the same system as the proposed trial programme. The experience of the EMRC is that there is a very high level of contamination, and that a large proportion of the third bin collection is diverted to landfill in any event, due to the difficulty to process the contaminated greenwaste/organics collections.

The Rivers Regional Council, on behalf of the member Councils conducted an analysis of the proposed system and trial programme, and concluded that:

- The proposal would not be as effective as envisaged;
- Similar current systems in practice have been shown to be ineffective and very costly;
- There is no market for any compost products produced;
- The trial cost impost on ratepayers would be high;
- The longer term implementation (post trial) costs are very high with a low return; and
- The probability of the proposal achieving the stated aims is very low.

At its Ordinary Meeting of 20 February 2014, the Rivers Regional Council (RRC) gave consideration to a report on the Better Bins initiative using preliminary estimates of costs associated with the programme. The RRC recommended against participation in the programme. The City of Armadale's own investigations support this view.

The system is considered to be at best marginal and it is therefore recommended that it not be supported.

OPTIONS

1. Maintain the current collection through the two bin system.
2. Adopt the three bin system to the WAWA specifications for a period of two years and review after that, taking into consideration the additional resource requirements and cost to ratepayers.

CONCLUSION

The comment and analysis contained in this report clearly indicates that the introduction of a three bin system in the City would have a limited benefit and would have a high cost impost on ratepayers, and is therefore not recommended.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

Committee Discussion

The Committee discussed the positive and negative aspects of the three bin trial, and determined that the negatives outweigh the positives for the City of Armadale. The main area of concern was the longer term cost impost on the residents of the City which were considered unreasonable and unnecessary.

T40/6/14 RECOMMEND

That Council not participate in the Waste Authority WA three bin system trial.

**Moved Cr C Frost
MOTION CARRIED (6/0)**

3.1 - ROBERTS ROAD, KELMSCOTT

At the Council meeting held on 12 May 2014, Cr Butterfield referred the following matter to the Technical Services Committee.

“That the matter of sealing the unsealed portion of Roberts Road, Kelmscott be referred to the Technical Services Committee.”

Comment from Cr Butterfield

Cr Butterfield recently received a written request from residents, to have the unsealed portion (approximately 300m) of Roberts Road, Kelmscott, bituminised. Associated street lighting and a ‘No Through Road’ sign was also requested. The request was signed by all of the affected residents of Roberts Road, Kelmscott.

Officer Comment

Following the request for the installation of a ‘No Through Road’ sign along Roberts Road, Kelmscott, this will be carried out in the following week.

The request for sealing of the road and provision of street lighting will necessitate a site assessment and preparation of indicative budget costs, for consideration for inclusion in a future Council Works Programme. In this regard the residents will be contacted and a site meeting arranged.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

T41/6/14 RECOMMEND

That the works be included in the future Works Programme starting or beginning 2014-2015 financial year.

**Moved Cr R Butterfield
MOTION CARRIED (6/0)**

Cr G Best retired from the meeting at 6.13pm.

COUNCILLORS' ITEMS

Nil

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TECHNICAL SERVICES REPORT

**5.1 Rivers Regional Council – Alternative Waste Treatment Tender –
Evaluation Site Tours**

This report has deliberately omitted specific details as to the technologies and tenderers, as the tender assessment process is still underway, and disclosure of such details would compromise confidentiality of the process, and encroach on probity requirements.

The Rivers Regional Council (RRC), on behalf of the seven Member Councils (Cities of Armadale, Gosnells, Mandurah and South Perth, and Shires of Murray, Serpentine Jarrahdale and Waroona) is responsible for planning long term waste management strategies and identifying issues associated in the field of waste management.

The RRC, in partnership with the Member Councils, has investigated the feasibility of establishing an Alternative Waste Treatment facility for the region.

The RRC therefore advertised a tender for the “Receipt and Processing of Waste for Resource Recovery” for the handling of waste generated in the seven Councils. As part of the evaluation process, a Tender Evaluation Panel (TEP) was established to assess the submissions. Part of the assessment process was to carry out site visits of complying tenders.

In the capacity of TEP Member, the Executive Director Technical Services was required to attend the tender evaluation site visits to view waste treatment facilities similar to the tendered facilities. The site visits were undertaken between 28 April, 2014 and 9 May, 2014.

The site visits provided invaluable assessment of plants similar to those contained in the submissions, and allowed for the TEP to gain valuable insight into:

- The physical layout and scale of the plant;
- The operational scope and processes;
- The management and control systems for each;
- The management structures;
- Technical details of the specific technologies;
- How the environmental aspects have been addressed; and
- How the social aspects have been addressed.

As an outcome of the site visits, the assessment scores could be finalised and a final recommendation determined by the TEP.

The processes ahead include workshops on the tender and assessments, to be held with each member Council, followed by formal consideration by each member Council and RRC. It is envisaged that the complete process will be completed by the end of August 2014.

For information.

MEETING DECLARED CLOSED AT 6.20pm