



MINUTES

ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

TIME: 5.30PM

THURSDAY 23 APRIL 2015

CITY OF WANNEROO

Managing waste and recovering resources responsibly
Constituent Members: *Cities of Perth, Joondalup, Stirling, Vincent and Wanneroo*
Towns of Cambridge and Victoria Park



CONTENTS

1	DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS.....	3
2	ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES / LEAVE OF ABSENCE	3
3	DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.....	4
4	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	4
5	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON	4
6	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE	4
7	PETITIONS / DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS	4
8	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING	4
	8.1 Ordinary Council Meeting – 19 February 2015.....	4
9	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORTS	5
	9.1 Financial Statements for the months ended 31 January 2015 and 28 February 2015.....	5
	9.2 List of Payments made for the months ended 31 January 2015 and 28 February 2015.....	7
	9.3 Request from the City of Wanneroo to assist in the management of Green Waste.....	8
	9.4 Resource Recovery Facility “No Glass” Campaign	12
10	MEMBERS INFORMATION BULLETIN – ISSUE NO. 22	23
11	MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.....	23
12	URGENT BUSINESS.....	23
13	QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.....	23
14	MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC.....	23
	14.1 BioVision request to amend financing of the Resource Recovery Facility	24
	14.2 Provision of CEO Services to the Western Metropolitan Regional Council.....	25
15	NEXT MEETING	26
16	CLOSURE	26

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Chair opened the meeting at 5.33pm

2 ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES / LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Councillor Attendance

Cr R Fishwick JP (Chairman)	City of Joondalup
Cr B Stewart (Deputy Chairman)	City of Stirling
Cr J Bissett	Town of Victoria Park
Cr D Boothman	City of Stirling
Cr J Carey	City of Vincent
Cr J Davidson OAM JP	City of Perth
Cr R Driver	City of Wanneroo
Cr K Hollywood	City of Joondalup
Cr D Newton JP	City of Wanneroo
Cr S Proud	City of Stirling
Cr S Withers	Town of Cambridge

Absent

Cr E Re	City of Stirling
---------	------------------

MRC Officers

Mr B Callander (Chief Executive Officer)
Mr G Hoppe (Director Corporate Services)
Ms L Nyssen (Executive Support)
Ms L Douglas (Admin Officer)

MRC Observers

Peg Davies (Waste Education Officer)

Member Council Observers

Mr N Ahern (City of Perth)
Mr J Buckley (Town of Cambridge)
Mr N Claassen (City of Joondalup)
Mr D Forster (City of Perth)
Mr M Littleton (City of Stirling)
Mr A Murphy (City of Joondalup)
Mr J Paton (City of Vincent)
Mr C Pavitt (City of Wanneroo)
Mr S Sciberras (City of Stirling)
Mr D Simms (City of Wanneroo)
Mr J Wong (Town of Victoria Park)

Visitors

Nil

Members of the Public

Nil

Press

Nil

3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Interest Type	Financial Interest
Name and Position of Person	Gunther Hoppe, Director Corporate Services, MRC
Report Item No. and Topic	14.2
Nature of Interest	Council to consider my appointment of Acting CEO of Western Metropolitan Regional Council

4 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Nil

5 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON

Nil

6 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

7 PETITIONS / DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS

Nil

8 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

8.1 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING – 19 February 2015

The Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 19 February 2015 have been printed and circulated to members of the Council.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting of Council held on 19 February 2015 be confirmed as a true record of the proceedings.

RESOLVED

**Cr Bissett moved, Cr Hollywood seconded
That the recommendation be adopted.**

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (11/0)

9 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORTS
--

9.1	FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE MONTHS ENDED 31 JANUARY 2015 AND 28 FEBRUARY 2015
File No:	FIN/5-05
Appendix(s):	Appendix No. 1 Appendix No. 2 Appendix No. 3
Date:	7 April 2015
Responsible Officer:	Director Corporate Services

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide financial reporting in line with statutory requirements which provides useful information to stakeholders of the Council.

BACKGROUND

Reporting requirements are defined by Financial Management Regulations 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

The financial statements presented for each month consist of:

- Operating Statement by Nature – Combined
- Operating Statement by Nature – RRF Only
- Operating Statement by Function
- Statement of Financial Activity
- Statement of Reserves
- Statement of Financial Position
- Statement of Investing Activities
- Information on Borrowings
- Tonnage Report

DETAIL

The Financial Statements attached are for the months ended 31 January 2015 and 28 February 2015 and are attached at **Appendix No. 1 and 2** to this Item. The Tonnage Report for the 8 months to 28 February 2015 is attached at **Appendix No. 3**.

The complete suite of Financial Statements which includes the Operating Statements, Statement of Financial Position, Statement of Financial Activity and other related information are reported on a monthly basis.

The estimates for Provisions for Amortisation of Cell Development, Capping and Post Closure expenditure are based on the estimated rates per tonne calculated with reference to estimated excavation cost of various stages of the landfill and the life of the landfill. An adjustment is made (if necessary) at the end of the year based on actual tonnages on a survey carried out to assess the “air space” remaining and other relevant information.

Summary of results for the period ended 28 February 2015

	Actual	Budget	Variance
	t	t	t
Tonnes – Members	243,368	268,606	(25,238)
Tonnes – Others	13,878	23,660	(9,782)
TOTAL TONNES	257,246	292,266	(35,020)
	\$	\$	\$
Revenue – Members	28,893,430	32,018,801	(3,125,371)
Revenue – Other	3,797,354	4,936,746	(1,139,392)
TOTAL REVENUE	32,690,784	36,955,547	(4,264,763)
Expenses	30,780,541	34,024,129	3,243,588
Profit on sale of assets	9,159	7,722	1,437
Loss on sale of assets	(317,009)	(5,898)	(311,111)
NET SURPLUS	1,602,393	2,933,242	(1,330,849)

Commentary

Member tonnes for the 8 months to February 2015 are 25,238 tonnes below budget, primarily as a result of differences in the timing of waste deliveries and the closure of the Wanneroo Materials Recovery Facility.

Non-member tonnes are 9,782 tonnes below budget, primarily as a result of the loss of a large commercial customer early in the year which has developed its own facility.

Expenses are \$3.2 million below budget primarily as a result of delays in the commencement of a number of landfill projects, staff vacancies and the reduced tonnes to landfill, which in turn results in savings on the landfill levy and airspace.

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple Majority

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Financial Statements set out in Appendix No. 1 and 2 for the months ended 31 January 2015 and 28 February 2015, respectively, be received.

RESOLVED

Cr Stewart moved, Cr Boothman seconded

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (11/0)

9.2	LIST OF PAYMENTS MADE FOR THE MONTHS ENDED 31 JANUARY 2015 AND 28 FEBRUARY 2015
File No:	FIN/5-05
Appendix(s):	Appendix No. 4 Appendix No. 5
Date:	7 April 2015
Responsible Officer:	Director Corporate Services

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide details of payments made during the periods identified. This is in line with the requirement under the delegated authority to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), that a list of payments made from the Municipal Fund since the last Ordinary Council meeting be presented to Council.

COMMENT

The lists of payments for the months ended 31 January 2015 and 28 February 2015 are at **Appendix 4 and 5** to this Item and are presented to Council for noting. Payments have been made in accordance with the delegated authority to the CEO which allows payments to be made between meetings. At the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 4 September 2014, the Council delegated to the CEO the exercise of its power to make payments from the Municipal Fund. In order to satisfy the requirements of Clause 13(2) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations, a list of payments made must be submitted to the next Council meeting following such payments.

It should be noted that generally all payments are GST inclusive and the Mindarie Regional Council is able to claim this tax as an input credit when GST remittances are made each month to the Australian Tax Office.

Months Ended	Account	Vouchers	Amount
31 January 2015	General Municipal	Cheques	\$47,280.77
		EFT	\$5,374,405.22
		DP	\$442,752.99
		Inter account transfers	-
		Total	<u>\$5,864,438.98</u>
28 February 2015	General Municipal	Cheques	\$53,081.85
		EFT	\$3,832,669.51
		DP	\$432,230.13
		Inter account transfers	<u>\$4,200,000.00</u>
		Total	<u>\$8,517,981.49</u>

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple Majority

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the list of payments made under delegated authority to the Chief Executive Officer, for the months ended 31 January 2015 and 28 February 2015 be noted.

RESOLVED

**Cr Proud moved, Cr Davidson seconded
 That the recommendation be adopted.**

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (11/0)

9.3	REQUEST FROM THE CITY OF WANNEROO TO ASSIST IN THE MANAGEMENT OF GREEN WASTE
File No:	WST/28-02
Appendix(s):	Appendix 6
Date:	8 April 2015
Responsible Officer:	CEO

SUMMARY

The report seeks consideration of a request from the City of Wanneroo (CoW) for the Mindarie Regional Council (MRC) to assist in providing a recycling solution for the green waste it collects and receives.

BACKGROUND

The CoW provides a green waste service to its ratepayers and also produces green waste through its parks and gardens activities and has requested the MRC to assist them in determining the most appropriate solution for this waste stream. The CoW also provides bulk green waste collection services to the City of Joondalup (CoJ).

During discussions at the Strategic Working Group, the CoW and both the CoJ and the City of Stirling (CoS) have indicated that they would support the MRC's involvement in this type of venture. The CoS has indicated that it currently contracts out this service and would only be interested in participating in a new service when the contract expires on 8 October 2015 but has a 12 month extension. The MRC's remaining member councils indicated that they would not initially be interested in utilising this service, but there was broad support for the MRC proceeding in this direction.

The following table indicates the amount of green waste collected by the CoW, CoJ and the CoS.

Member Council	Green Waste (Estimated Tonnes)
City of Wanneroo	16,000
City of Joondalup	14,000
*City of Stirling	18,000

**City of Stirling has contracts in place for green waste and would only consider being part of any solution once the current contract has expired.*

Historically, the MRC has only provided services that are applicable to all of its member councils. The possibility for the MRC to diverge from this practice was the subject of discussion at the Strategic Workshop held on 22 January 2015, where a report developed by Hyder entitled "Service and Governance Options Review" (refer Appendix 6) was presented. The report reviewed the range of services provided by Regional Councils (or similar entities) across Australia and categorised them into the following five broad groups:

- 1. Full service - managing all waste services currently conducted by local councils in addition to owning and operating waste facilities*
 - 2 Infrastructure services – owning and operating some processing facilities and providing support services such as regional waste strategy, education services and tendering services*
-

-
3. *Centralised service delivery – managing services related to processing facilities but not collection services*
 4. *Basic service delivery – similar to MRC’s current operations*
 5. *Administrative management – no involvement with running a facility, just administrative support for member councils.”*

On review of the range of services provided across Australia and the waste management issues currently being raised in Western Australia by the Waste Authority, Department of Environment Regulation and Local Government (WALGA), Hyder made the following recommendation:

“Hyder recommends that MRC and its member councils adopt an infrastructure service model approach. This provides an opportunity to deliver the land, infrastructure and processing services where it is most beneficial to do so, or to outsource to the market where it is most efficient to do so.”

Hyder also considered that the success of the recommended model or any other of the models relies on a commitment from the member councils to the preferred approach and based on its research across Australia, the effective models have the following core elements:

- *Highest level commitment to a centralised strategy that has been developed in consultation with key parties.*
- *Availability of a realistic delivery mechanism for the strategy via appropriately qualified and resourced staff, funding and realistic timeframes.*
- *Alignment of the centralised strategy with government priorities and resourcing.*
- *Stability in council membership, and in core delivery staff and management, both within the councils and the regional council.*

DETAIL

The MRC has reviewed a range of solutions for this waste stream including:

- processing the waste into marketable soil enhancer/compost,
- processing the waste into marketable soil enhancer/compost and blending it with the Resource Recovery Facility (RRF) soil enhancer/compost, to bring the RRF compost into compliance with the Australian Standard, or
- procuring services for this waste product on behalf of the member councils.

A key consideration for either of the first two options is ensuring that the end product is produced to a standard that is required by the targeted end user group/market.

The pros and cons of this project were discussed at the Strategic Working Group meeting on Wednesday, 8 April 2015, where general support was given for the MRC to get involved in projects of this type. It was acknowledged that not all members may require these services and that any costs associated with these services would be paid for by the members who require the service, rather than being subsidised by the other members not utilising the services.

The MRC is well positioned to assist its member councils in dealing with waste issues and based on the aggregation of tonnes (economies of scale) it is likely to achieve a more cost effective outcome than councils operating in isolation.

CONSULTATION

The project has been presented to the Strategic Working Group.

LEGAL COMPLIANCE

Legal advice was sought to ensure that the current Constitution permits the MRC to provide services to some but not all member councils. The advice indicates that the MRC has the ability to provide this type of service.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Nil

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Any costs associated with new services provided by the MRC to a subset of its member councils will be ring-fenced to that contract, with costs separated in the MRC's accounts and an agreed proportion of the MRC's existing costs being allocated to the project. The project costs will be borne fully by the councils using the service.

STRATEGIC/COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE/BUSINESS PLAN IMPLICATIONS

Strategic Community Plan 2013/14 - 2033/34	
<u>Objective 1:</u> Strategy 1.2	Improve collaboration between participating councils as primary stakeholders on matters associated with waste management solutions
<u>Objective 2:</u> Strategy 2.2	Continually assess and utilise the best appropriate waste management solutions
<u>Objective 3:</u> Strategy 3.1	Identify and adopt approaches to waste minimisation, resource recovery and the associated community engagement

Corporate Business Plan 2013/14 – 2016/17	
Strategies	Actions
1.2.1	Continue with the Strategic Working Group and encourage attendance by all member council representation
2.2.1	Keep current with new developments in applied waste management, through networking with peer groups and conferences
3.1.4	Explore options with waste industry and member councils to improve/expand services

COMMENT

The request from the member councils to have the MRC assist in developing solutions for its green waste stream is aligned to MRC's strategic positioning and the recommendations contained in the "Service and Governance Options Review" developed by Hyder.

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple Majority

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

- 1. supports the concept of providing services to individual or a number of member councils on the basis that the cost of the service provision will be funded by the member councils that benefit from the services provided; and**
- 2. advise the Cities of Wanneroo, Joondalup and Stirling that it will work with them in finding solutions for their green waste streams.**

RESOLVED

Cr Bissett moved, Cr Driver seconded

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (11/0)

9.4	RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY “NO GLASS” CAMPAIGN
File No:	WST/208
Appendix(s):	Nil
Date:	10 April 2015
Responsible Officer:	Geoff Atkinson

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a detailed proposal in respect of the “No Glass” campaign for approval and to gain access to the \$200,000 set aside for this project.

The “No Glass” campaign is aimed at improving the quality of the soil conditioner produced by the Resource Recovery Facility (RRF), improving the diversion rate of the RRF and reducing the overall costs borne by the member councils.

BACKGROUND

At the Special Council meeting held on 26 June 2014 to approve the 2014/15 budget, questions were raised in relation to \$200,000 allocated for an education/behavioural campaign called the “No Glass” campaign aimed at reducing the amount of glass being placed in the green top bin by residents. The administration committed to providing a report to council to seek approval for the project prior to expending the funds.

Subsequently the Mindarie Regional Council (MRC) lodged a funding application to the Waste Authority originally seeking \$200,000 in funding. The Waste Authority indicated strong support for the project and requested that it be expanded. The MRC modified its submission to include the suggestions by the Waste Authority being, bin audits and gaining feedback from the participants through focus groups and other means of communication. This resulted in the project cost increasing to \$260,000, but this was considered acceptable based on a commitment of support from the Waste Authority. The project is for a campaign targeting up to 170,000 households and includes:

	Cost (\$)
Focus groups	5,000
Bin audits (baseline)	10,000
Sticker, flyer design and advert design	5,000
Flyer production	45,000
Flyer letterbox drop	15,000
Sticker production	80,000
Sticker application to bins and accompanying Flyer drop	45,000
Adverts, before stickers, at time of stickers, post stickers and summer follow up	20,000
Bin audits	20,000
focus group feedback, community survey	15,000
TOTAL	260,000

The proposed timing of the project has also been fluid as a result of the pending RRF shutdown. The RRF receives 100,000 tonnes of general household waste annually. The process results in the creation of approximately 25,000 tonnes of soil conditioner with a 51% diversion rate with approximately 25% of process losses. The soil conditioner is of a

high quality but due to an excessive amount of glass in the process it does not comply with the Australian Standard making it difficult to market. This is a result of the glass being placed in the general waste stream (green top bin) by the householders.

There are likely to be a number of benefits to member councils if this glass can be shifted out of the green top bin into the yellow top recycling bin including:

Improved quality of the soil conditioner

The quality of the soil conditioner produced by the RRF is of a high standard, except that it has too high a fraction of glass, which is devaluing the product and limiting its use.

The current Australian Standard requires there to be <0.5% dry matter of particle contaminants of glass, metal and hard plastics. The RRF soil conditioner typically averages just under 1.0%.

A drop in the glass fraction found in the RRF soil conditioner would see the product being far more usable and marketable, which in turn could improve the overall economics of the operation.

Reduced overall processing costs

Member councils are currently paying \$138.50 per tonne to have their green top bin waste processed by the MRC, either at the RRF or directly to landfill.

By comparison, member councils are paying in the order of \$30 to have their yellow top bin processed.

To the extent that glass can be transferred from the green top bin to the yellow top bin, it will result in a direct process cost saving to member councils.

Increased RRF diversion

Where there is less glass placed into the green top bin, there will be less glass generated as residue from the RRF process.

This has a twofold benefit in terms of reducing the landfill costs associated with RRF glass residues and generating an improved diversion rate for the RRF.

To date, the education to the community with regard to the green top bin has been largely centred around:

- placing organics in this bin,
- keeping Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) out of this bin,
- that a beneficial product, a soil conditioner, is being produced, and
- waste is being diverted from landfill.

Standard recycling campaigns as to what goes into the yellow top bin have also taken place with this bin being seen as the principal place of source separation.

Residents have never been specifically told not to put glass in the green top bin and have in fact even been told to put broken glass in it. This mixed messaging and lack of clear direction, as well as over flow glass 'contamination' from the yellow top bin, is resulting in the contamination we are experiencing in the green top bin.

DETAIL

In response to the level of interest the Waste Authority has shown in the MRC's "No Glass" campaign initiative, the MRC has been working with the Waste Authority to develop a template guideline. The guideline will be made available to other councils wanting to implement similar campaigns, with the MRC as a pilot case study. A summarised extract of the guidelines, tailored to the MRC, is presented below which outlines the objectives, actions and outcomes of the "No Glass" campaign.

THE "NO GLASS" CAMPAIGN PLANNING FRAMEWORK

(utilising draft Waste Authority education guidelines)

Step 1 Background – current position

Other research needed to determine the current position

It is important to have a clear understanding of the current position – how much glass is in the green top bin and is there any difference between the member councils? This will determine the starting base line contamination before the project commences. It would also enable a targeted communication effort, focused on councils where the greatest change might be achieved.

Currently, the three Councils whose waste primarily goes to the RRF are Wanneroo, Joondalup and Vincent. If we can determine the current level of glass content in the green top bins from these three Councils, we will have a benchmark for the start of the program. This can then be used to monitor progress and measure change. The first bin audits will be undertaken at the start of the campaign.

This is also important to the Waste Authority as it wants to encourage the use of an evidence-based approach with a stronger research component both before and after to determine the effectiveness of the program.

Other infrastructure and/or service changes in the region

The RRF will enter a maintenance phase during August to October. During this period, all household waste from the region will be landfilled. It will be important to communicate the source separation message generally to the community ahead of the shutdown, to minimise recyclables going to landfill during this period, and then to re-focus the message on to glass ahead of the RRF starting up again.

Step 2 Situation Analysis - establish where you want to be

Specific waste targets

The MRC knows what the acceptable level of glass composition in the soil conditioner is, and its target is to reach that level through this communication program which addresses source separation behaviour.

The bin audits undertaken at Step 1 will determine type and volume of glass, and will determine the message provided to the community in each area.

Additional research needed

Some research is proposed at this point to test the message and the messaging. Focus groups are one option - one in each of the three Councils - but an alternative could be to use social media networks and ask the question: "What one message would it take to make you remember to never put glass in your green bin?" The MRC could use its Talking

Rubbish blog, and could communicate with Earth Carers on Facebook asking Earth Carers to ask their networks.

Additional information will come from the following research activities:

- Discussion with the waste education staff at the Town of Cambridge to see what can be learned from their results with their communication about glass.
- Cambridge undertook a program several years ago to trial an organics bin – we could revisit the research undertaken at that time to see what interventions worked best.
- The MRC will also liaise with other Regional Councils to see how they deal with the issue of glass in the green top bin.

Step 3 Aims and Objectives

The overall aim is to achieve a permanent reduction in the glass composition of the green top bin. This will be achieved by influencing source separation behaviour in relation to glass.

The SMART objective is to achieve a measurable decrease in glass contamination in green top bins in the three Council areas of interest by October/November 2015 when the RRF starts up again.

The required behaviour change will be achieved by following the components of the DEFRA model (p 32 of the Waste Education Guidelines): Enable, Engage, Encourage and Catalyse.

What will be measured to determine whether change is happening

Regular bin audits will determine whether, and to what extent, the composition of glass in the green top bins is decreasing.

Step 4 Target audiences

The target groups are all householders in the three Councils participating in the pilot program - Joondalup, Wanneroo and Vincent.

The pilot program will also need to engage with:

- Staff at the three Councils including counter staff and people who handle calls from residents about waste issues
- Elected members so they are fully informed and supportive
- Community groups and organisations that are part of the Councils' communication networks
- Schools in the areas.

It may also be part of the program that hard-to-engage groups may need to be targeted specifically, e.g. ESL (English Second Language) community groups.

Step 5 Branding and message - developing communication

The key message is “**no glass at all in the green top bin**”. However, as outlined in the strategy below, the first phase is a message about source separation, followed by the “**NO GLASS**” message.

Branding

For the pilot project, the MRC will co-brand with the Waste Authority and with the individual Councils. The Recycle Right website is of some use in this campaign as SMRC already has a “No Glass” in green top bin message. Co-branding with Recycle Right is being considered.

Step 6 Strategy and Communication Methods

Overall approach

In broad terms the program will involve several phases:

- Community awareness of contamination issues in the bins – February to May
- Bin audits to determine a baseline of glass contamination in the green top bin – April to May
- Preparing for RRF shutdown - focus the community on the source separation message – June
This will be the preparatory stage for the NO GLASS campaign to follow.
- RRF shutdown for maintenance – August to October.
Continue to focus on the importance of source separation to reduce recyclables going to landfill during this period. Launch the NO GLASS campaign.
- RRF starts up again – October / November.
Continue the NO GLASS campaign.
- Summer campaign – peak season for glass consumption – December to February. Campaign peaks.
- Final phase – March.
Final auditing to test glass levels in bins and to test glass levels in soil conditioner.

Standardised communication would occur across the MRC region including:

- Info on MRC and Council websites and social networking pages
- Info in Council newsletters, ads and communication to residents including rates notices if possible, including future waste guides
- Communication of the message at community fairs and events through the presence of the Roaming Recycler mobile display, and direct to Earth Carers
- Information developed for staff, elected members, community groups and schools
- Sign at Tamala Park landfill

With several Councils involved in the pilot there is the opportunity to trial some different communication methods to determine the effectiveness of each. Our expectation is that communication effectiveness improves with frequency and with increased personal engagement.

Our strategies across the three Councils could explore the relative effectiveness of one of these. As Wanneroo and Joondalup share much of the same local media, they could work together, with an expanded approach in Vincent.

Recommended communication strategies:

Wanneroo and Joondalup	Vincent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bin stickers attached to bins - Flyer delivered to each household - Ads in local papers every third week - Shopping centre and library displays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bin stickers attached to bins - Flyer delivered to each household - Ads in local papers every third week - Shopping centre and library displays <p>Plus Trialling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bins checked and personal contact made with householders who are not complying. Could get EarthCarers or the MRC casual pool involved. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase the frequency of ads in local papers
<p>Escalate during peak season by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing the frequency of ads - Also investigate use of social media 	<p>Escalate during peak season by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing the frequency of ads - Also investigate use of social media <p>Plus Trialling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do another flyer to each household

Step 7 Campaign Activities

Specific communication material and activities to be developed/undertaken include:

- Bin stickers (quantity for Joondalup, Wanneroo and Vincent) – design and production
- Bin stickers – application
- Flyers (separate print runs for Joondalup, Wanneroo and Vincent) – design and production
- Flyers – distribution through a distribution company
- Newspaper ads – design and placement
- Signage at Tamala Park
- New NO GLASS IN GREEN BIN banner for use with *Roaming Recycler* displays
- Bin checks – process of how this will be done, who will do it, and what process will be followed if non-compliance

The MRC will work with the Waste Authority on the development of this material.

The bin audit work is a separate contract, to be scoped, costed and funded by the MRC. It is critically important to the ability to gauge whether or not the program has worked.

Step 8 Timeline

Month	Project activity	Specific communication tasks
May	Bin audits to determine a baseline of glass contamination in the green top bin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review audit findings • Determine key messages • Brief designer to develop ad, flyer and banner • Coordinate communication with Councils
June	<p>Preparing for RRF maintenance phase.</p> <p>Phase one is the source separation message.</p> <p>This will be the preparatory stage for the NO GLASS campaign to follow.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test message and presentation • Finalise ads - First ads run across all three Councils by late June • Finalise stickers – Stickers to be placed on bins progressively during June and July. • Flyer to be delivered to households to advise about source separation and NO GLASS message (delivered in tandem with bin stickers) • Brief Council staff and elected members • Info onto websites • Book displays in shopping centres and libraries
August – October	<p>RRF shutdown for maintenance.</p> <p>Continue to focus on source separation to reduce recyclables going to landfill during this period.</p> <p>NO GLASS CAMPAIGN STARTS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ads run every three weeks during this period • Displays in shopping centres and libraries • Bin checking in Vincent – develop strategy to manage non-compliance
October - November	<p>RRF starts up again.</p> <p>Continue the NO GLASS campaign.</p> <p>November - Bin audits to determine whether any change in glass content in green top bin.</p> <p>Refocus before the peak season if the results are not being achieved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ads run every three weeks during this period • Prepare second flyer for Vincent • Review audit findings • Determine whether any change required to the message or types of glass to be targeted • Bin checking continues in Vincent

December - February	<p>Peak season for glass consumption.</p> <p>Escalate the NO GLASS campaign to avoid excess/overflow bottles going into green top bin.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ads run every two weeks during this period • Flyer to be delivered to households in Vincent • Bin checking continues in Vincent
March 2016	<p>Final auditing to test glass levels in bins and to test glass levels in soil conditioner.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication activity finishes • Final ad to the community to report on results achieved and to say thank you

If the MRC proceeds with this project the Waste Authority has indicated it would fund the additional elements of the project such as bin audits, focus groups and additional communications. Whilst no final financial commitment has been made by the Waste Authority it is clear that they will fund the flyers, stickers and additional communications estimated to be approx. \$150,000 if these works are completed in this financial year. The Waste Authority has indicated that it will provide support for communications over the length of the project (12 months) and additional funding may be applied for in 2015/16.

The MRC and member councils will largely be responsible for bin audits, internally. In addition to managing the audit work to support this program, the MRC will provide funding and staff for the administration support for this project. This will include:

- Project managing
- production of newsletters
- website and social media updates
- media releases
- display support material (events/shopping centres) and
- monitoring and reporting of the project's effectiveness.

Member Councils will support the process by assisting in the collection of bins for the audit. There is the potential for the bin auditing to be outsourced with the funds being received from the Waste Authority.

With the Waste Authority's financial assistance, greater flexibility exists in the budget to improve the campaign's success. The assistance will be provided in support of rather than as a replacement of MRC funding.

Step 9 Monitoring and evaluation - Evaluate effectiveness

Two measures will determine the effectiveness of the campaign:

- reduced levels of glass in bins as measured through bin audits;
- a reduction in the glass fraction in the RRF soil conditioner. BioVision (operators of the RRF) will perform ongoing in-house and independent soil conditioner testing as part of their testing regime.

CONSULTATION

Discussions at MRC's Waste Education Strategic Steering Group (WESSG) and Community Education and Engagement Group (CEAG) have frequently revolved around the glass problem.

The 'No Glass' campaign was devised and discussed at WESSG early in 2014 and the draft sticker and flyer were produced and distributed through WESSG to gain comments from Member Councils.

The 'No Glass' campaign was also discussed at the MRC Strategic Working Group meetings and the Group was invited to review the drafts and to provide feedback or any suggested alterations from their Councils.

LEGAL COMPLIANCE

NIL

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

NIL

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The MRC is seeking approval to spend the \$200,000 allocated to the campaign in the 2014/15 budget and will include a further \$200,000 in the 2015/16 budget for approval to provide bin auditing, project management and support, application of stickers on bins, general advertising and communications to complete the project.

Funding of \$150,000 (estimated) can be expected from the Waste Authority if expended in 2014/15 and it has been indicated by the Waste Authority that further funding will be available in 2015/16.

STRATEGIC/COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE/BUSINESS PLAN IMPLICATIONS

The campaign has strong alignment with the MRC's strategic plan, demonstrated below.

Strategic Community Plan 2013/14 - 2033/34	
2.1	Operate waste management activities effectively
2.2	Continually assess and utilise the best appropriate waste management solutions
2.3	Make ongoing reviews of waste streams to ensure optimal recovery/diversion is being achieved
3.1	Identify and adopt approaches to waste minimisation, resource recovery and associated community engagement
The glass is an identified problem in the RRF soil conditioner. This campaign will improve the marketability and range of uses for the end product. This will reduce the overall processing costs for the member councils and improve waste diversion from landfill.	

Corporate Business Plan 2013/14 – 2016/17		
Strategies	Actions	Responsible Officer
1.2.3	Assist the Waste Education Strategic Steering Group (WESSG) in raising their profile at the Council level	CEO
1.5.6	Pursue opportunities which may present savings to the organisation	DCS
2.3.2	Educate member councils and community as to how best manage their problematic wastes	DCS
2.3.3	Pursue alternative treatment options for the RRF residue to improve waste recovery/diversion performance and better uses for materials recovered	DCS
2.3.4	Education team to continue to pursue an education campaign focussed on achieving improved long term waste recovery/diversion performance and better uses for materials recovered	DCS
3.4.4	Engage with existing member councils to improve waste recovery/diversion targets through sorting at source and varied collection strategies	CEO/DCS
3.5.2	Develop new opportunities to educate the community about the waste hierarchy and the impact they can have on improving waste outcomes	DCS
3.5.3	Provide leadership on improving waste recovery/diversion through participation in relevant forums, committees and public consultation groups	CEO/DCS
3.5.4	Evaluate projects and initiatives against a framework which takes into account their economic, social and environmental outcomes	CEO/DCS
This project supports a number of the Corporate Business Plan's actions. These include improving waste diversion/recovery through education to also achieve a number of economic, social and reputational benefits.		

COMMENT

This issue has been widely talked about since the opening of the RRF in 2009 and this project is a direct result of these discussions, with the intent of proactively seeking to deal with a problem waste stream. For a limited investment there are potentially significant enduring financial gains to be made, along with an improved reputation.

This project is seen as a positive partnership with the Waste Authority and their willingness to help fund the project is seen as a strong endorsement of the value proposition associated with the campaign.

It is believed that the “No Glass” project being proposed will result in a quick and significant change in people’s behaviour simply because they are receiving clear instruction on the matter for the first time.

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Absolute Majority

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

A. That the Council:

1. Approves the implementation of the “No Glass” campaign as detailed in this report; and
2. Endorses the expenditure of the \$200,000 allocated to this project in the 2014/15 Budget.

B. That the Council:

1. Approves a further allocation of \$200,000 in the 2015/16 Budget to ensure the continuation of the campaign in the 2015/16 financial year; and
2. continues to work with, and lodge funding applications to, the Waste Authority on the campaign.

Absolute Majority Required

RESOLVED

**Cr Bissett moved, Cr Boothman seconded
That the recommendation be adopted.**

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (11/0)

10 MEMBERS INFORMATION BULLETIN – ISSUE NO. 22

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Members Information Bulletin Issue No. 22 be received.

RESOLVED

Cr Bissett moved, Cr Davidson seconded

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (11/0)

11 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

12 URGENT BUSINESS

Nil

13 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

14 MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

The Chairperson requested that in accordance with clause 7.9(3) of the Mindarie Regional Council Standing Orders Local Law 2010 and s5.23 of the Local Government Act 1995, Council proceed to meet “behind closed doors” to allow the Council to consider Confidential Items 14.1 and 14.2 of this agenda.

Cr Bissett moved, Cr Davidson seconded

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (11/0)

Member Council CEOs were invited to stay. Member Council Officers and MRC staff left the chambers. Doors were closed at 5.40pm.

14.1	BIOVISION REQUEST TO AMEND FINANCING OF THE RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY
File No:	WST/147-04
Appendix(s):	Nil
Date:	7 April 2014
Responsible Officer:	Director Corporate Services

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

A. That the Council:

- 1. Provide its consent under Section 21.5 of the Resource Recovery Facility Agreement for BioVision 2020 (Pty) Ltd to enter into a bridging loan arrangement with ANZ Banking Group Ltd, with a maturity date of 31 December 2018, subject to:**
 - a. BioVision 2020 (Pty) Ltd formalising the request to enter into the bridging loan arrangement in writing to the Mindarie Regional Council;**
 - b. The principal of the loan not exceeding \$4.5 million;**
 - c. BioVision 2020 (Pty) Ltd providing written confirmation to the Mindarie Regional Council that there will be no financial impact on the Mindarie Regional Council as a result of BioVision 2020 (Pty) Ltd entering into, or drawing down on, this bridging loan arrangement with the ANZ Banking Group Ltd; and**
 - d. Any request to draw down on the facility being dealt with as 'emergency funding' under Section 21.5(c) of the Resource Recovery Facility Agreement.**
- 2. Request that BioVision 2020 (Pty) Ltd provide the Mindarie Regional Council notice of the new \$4.5 million bridging loan arrangement, along with a copy of the facility agreement as required under Section 21.5(d) of the Resource Recovery Facility Agreement.**

- B. That the Council Delegate the authority to provide consent for any draw down against the \$4.5 million bridging loan arrangement, as required under Sections 21.5(a) and 21.5(c) of the Resource Recovery Facility Agreement, to the Chief Executive Officer.**

Absolute Majority Required

RESOLVED

**Cr Withers moved, Cr Newton seconded
That the recommendation be adopted.**

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (11/0)

NOTE: The Chief Executive Officer has NOT released Report 14.1 for Public information as Councils decision may impact on a contract entered into.

14.2	PROVISION OF CEO SERVICES TO THE WESTERN METROPOLITAN REGIONAL COUNCIL
File No:	GOV/41-02
Appendix(s):	Nil
Date:	10 April 2015
Responsible Officer:	CEO

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

- 1. Acknowledges the resolution of the Council of the WMRC supporting the secondment of MRC's Director Corporate Services, Mr Gunther Hoppe as indicated in the Details section of this report.**
- 2. Advise the WMRC that the MRC supports its resolution and approves the secondment of Mr Hoppe to the WMRC to take up the part time role as its Acting Chief Executive Officer based on the following conditions:**
 - a. The secondment will be for a period of twelve (12) months and payment will be made by the WMRC to Mr Hoppe in accordance with the table included in the Financial Implications section of this report;**
 - b. The position will be part time for two (2) days per week (790.4 hours per year). The days/hours will be flexible to work in with the needs of both the WMRC and the MRC;**
 - c. Additional days/hours over and above those detailed in 2.b. above will be paid at the rate of \$90.90 per hour; and**
 - d. All other rights and obligations for this position (secondment) will be the subject of an employment contract negotiated between the WMRC and Mr Hoppe.**

RESOLVED

**Cr Stewart moved, Cr Bissett seconded
That the recommendation be adopted.**

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (11/0)

NOTE: The Chief Executive Officer has NOT released Report 14.2 for Public information as Councils decision may affect an employee.

The Chairperson sought that the meeting be reopened.

Cr Hollywood moved, Cr Boothman seconded

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (11/0)

The meeting was reopened at 5.55pm

The Chairperson read out the resolution and the votes, made behind closed doors, of Council Item 14.1 and 14.2 as detailed above.

15 NEXT MEETING

Next meeting to be held on Thursday 2 July 2015 in the Council Chambers at City of Stirling commencing at 5.30pm.

16 CLOSURE

The Chairman closed the meeting at 5.57pm and thanked City of Wanneroo for their hospitality and use of their meeting facilities.

These Minutes were confirmed by the Council as a true and accurate record of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on 23 April 2015.

Signed Chairman

Dated this day of 2015
