

AGENDA

ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING (OC 04/18)

9 August 2018

Commencing at 5.30pm

City of Subiaco
241 Rokeby Road
Subiaco WA 6008



PHONE: (08) 9384 4003 FAX: (08) 9384 7511
EMAIL: admin@wmrc.wa.gov.au WEB: wmrc.wa.gov.au
ADDRESS: Wearne House, 40 Marine Parade, Cottesloe WA 6011
POSTAL ADDRESS: PO Box 47, Mosman Park WA 6912

Dear Chairman and Councilors

I advise that an Ordinary Meeting of the Western Metropolitan Regional Council will be held at the City of Subiaco, 241 Rokeby Road, Subiaco WA 6008 on **Thursday 9 August 2018** commencing at **5.30pm**.

Stefan Frodsham
Chief Executive Officer

Index

Item	Subject	Page
1	Declaration of Opening	4
2	Record of Attendance and Apologies	4
3	Disclosures of Interests	4
4	Public Question Time	4
4.1	Response to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice	4
5	Applications for Leave of Absence	5
6	Petitions, Approved Deputations and Public Statements	5
7	Confirmation of Previous Minutes (Attachment 1)	5
8	Announcements by Person Presiding Without Discussion	5
9	Reports of Committees and Officers	6
9.1	Safety Management Progress Report	6
9.2	Financial Statements (Attachment 2)	10
9.3	List of Payments and Sundry Debtors (Attachment 3)	13
9.4	Minutes of the CEOAC Meeting Held 17 July 2018 (Attachment 4)	15
9.5	Waste Delivery Agreement Future	17
9.6	Alternative Fee Model	20
9.7	Use of Transfer Station by Non-member Council Residents	24
9.8	WMRC Policies (Attachment 5)	28
9.9	WMRC Disability Access & Inclusions Plan (Attachment 6)	31
9.10	New Energy Presentation	33
10	Information Bulletins	35
10.1	Waste Educators Report	35
10.2	Waste Operations Report (Attachment 7)	41

10.3	Progress on Council Resolutions (Attachment 8)	43
11	Motions for Which Previous Notice Has Been Given	46
12	Questions By Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given	46
13	Urgent Business Approved by the Person Presiding or by Decision	46
14	Matters Behind Closed Doors	46
14.1	DiCOM Confidential Progress Report	46
14.2	WMRC Business Development	46
15	Closure of Meeting	46

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING

2. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

Councillors

Cr C Hohnen	Chairman	Shire of Peppermint Grove
Cr B Haynes		Town of Claremont
Cr S Stroud		City of Subiaco
Cr A Maurice		Town of Mosman Park
Cr M Rodda		Town of Cottesloe

Staff

Mr. S Frodsham	Chief Executive Officer	WMRC
Mr. P Thomson	Finance & Governance Manager	WMRC
Ms. A Hynes	Waste Operations Manager	WMRC
Ms. L Eustance	Waste Education Manager	WMRC
Ms. A Bell	Support Services Officer	WMRC

Leave of Absence

Visitors

Mr. P Ward	Barrister	Francis Burt Chambers
------------	-----------	-----------------------

Observers

Apology

3. DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

- 5. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**
Cr Rodda is on leave from 7 July to 1 August.

6. PETITIONS, APPROVED DEPUTATIONS AND PUBLIC STATEMENTS

7. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Minutes of the previous Ordinary Council Meeting held on 7 June 2018 have been circulated previously under separate cover and are at **Attachment 1**.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

Council accepts the minutes of the previous Ordinary Council Meeting held on 7 June 2018 as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PERSON PRESIDING WITHOUT DISCUSSION

9.1

SAFETY MANAGEMENT PROGRESS REPORT

Responsible Officer: Waste Operations Manager

Date: 27 July 2018

Attachment: Nil

SUMMARY

Risk and safety management issues are discussed below. Council are requested to note the report.

BACKGROUND

Nil

DETAILIncidents and Accidents

- Nil since previous report to Council

External Safety Review

A safety consultant (ASSSA) has been engaged to perform a gap analysis and risk register review with particular attention on WMRC's safety system including documentation, procedures and compliance.

The 2018/19 budget adopted included a substantial provision for safety consulting services. This was originally with a view to having a consultant available for 1-2 days per week as required to assist with bringing the WMRC's systems to a level where they can be maintained in house. With the appointment of a full-time CEO, it is considered the majority of this work can be done in house now, and so the safety consulting services has been discontinued for the time being.

Safety Actions

The following safety actions have occurred in June and July:

- A Safety Committee Meeting was held.
- Toolbox meetings were reinstated.
- A larger cabinet for acid storage was purchased to allow for more appropriate HHW storage.
- Clarified that a Dangerous Goods Transport licence is not required when collecting batteries from schools.
- Asbestos receipt requirements were updated to require double wrapping.
- Housekeeping at the Transfer Station was improved.
- A Job Safety Analysis was prepared for maintenance tasks involving rolling a silo on to its side.
- The following procedures have been audited:
 - Working at Heights
 - Asbestos Acceptance and Transfer
 - Loose Asbestos Containment
 - Hot Works

High Residual Risk Hazards

Hazards with a high residual risk rating are outlined below. These are unchanged since the last Council meeting.

Hazard	Current Controls	RRR Likelihood	RRR Consequence	RRR Risk Rating	RRR Classification	Actions Required + Target Dates
Silos over-tipping while being loaded and crushing people or equipment	Staff are trained in loading silos and will wait for Site Supervisor if they encounter a problem while loading. Persons are to keep out of downhill area of silos during loading. Property is to be kept out of this area. Covered by SP7-2.	Unlikely	Major	High	High Residual Risk	Further controls not considered reasonable or practicable: review if situation changes.
Persons (staff/customers) scavenging from waste storage areas/ Unauthorised site entry leading to injury	Administrative: staff are aware that waste should not be scavenged where it may pose a safety risk. Staff supervise customer drivers to ensure appropriate behaviour during opening hours.	Likely	Moderate	High	High Residual Risk	Further controls not considered reasonable or practicable: review if situation changes. Not a WMRC activity so cannot develop procedure/JSA/stop activity.

Safety Statistics	May – June 2018	12 Months Ending June 2018	Definition
(HiPo) High Potential Incident	None	None	Incidents involving personnel that didn't reach their ultimate potential and could have resulted in a fatality.
(LTI) Lost Time Injury	None	None	Any work-related injury or occupational illness that results in permanent disability or time lost from work of one day/ shift or more.
(ADI) Alternate Duties Injury	None	None	Any work-related injury or occupational illness which results in a person being unfit for full performance of their regular job on any day after the injury or illness.
(MTI) Medical Treatment Injury	None	2	Any work-related loss of consciousness, injury or occupational illness requiring more than First Aid treatment by a medical practitioner or registered medical personnel but not resulting in lost time.
(FA) First Aid Injury	None	None	Any work-related injury or occupational illness requiring one-time treatment and subsequent observation of minor scratches, cuts, and burns splinters etc. which do not require professional medical care.
(NM) Near Miss	None	2	An event which, under slightly different conditions, could have resulted in injury, damage or business loss.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

WMRC has duties under the Occupational Safety and Health Act 1984 (OSH Act) to, so far as is practicable, provide and maintain a working environment in which the employees of the employer are not exposed to hazards.

CONSULTATION

Nil

REPORT IMPLICATIONS

Policy Implications

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority of Council.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

9.1.1 That Council receive the Safety Management Progress Report.

9.2

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Responsible Officer: Finance and Governance Manager

Date: 22 July 2018

Attachment 2: May & June 2018 Monthly Management Accounts

SUMMARY

This report serves as a monthly summary of the Council's operating financial position. Its primary purpose is to allow Councillors to be able to track budgeted figures to actual outcomes throughout the financial year.

BACKGROUND

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

At its Special Council Meeting of 14 July 2016 meeting Council resolved inter alia to adopt a 10% value for reporting material variances in the Statements of Financial Activity. Accordingly, variances of 10% or more between actual and budgeted monthly figures are accompanied with explanatory notes.

DETAIL

Operating statements are presented for the periods ended 31 May and 30 June 2018.

As at 31 May 2018 Council had an operating deficit of \$289,449 compared to a budgeted operating deficit of \$111,004 with a variance of \$178,445. As at 30 June 2018 Council had an operating deficit of \$125,443 compared to a budgeted operating deficit of \$48,169 with a variance of \$77,274. The year-to-date as at 30 June 2018 operating deficit is \$1,120,767 compared to a budget operating deficit of \$697,445 with a variance of \$423,322. This year-to-date variance is primarily as a result of legal costs that are were under budgeted. With the transfer of \$1,025,118 from investments occurring in June the net loss for the financial year is now \$95,649 as compared with the budgeted loss of \$160,745, a variance of \$65,096.

When the extraordinary legal fees expense and subsequent re-imburement from Reserves are factored out of the operating income and expense, the underlying business result for the 2017/18 financial year shows an operating loss of \$95,649 as compared to the budgeted operating loss of \$160,745.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

In accordance with the Local Government Act 1995 and Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, a Statement of Financial Activity is required to be presented to Council as a minimum requirement. In addition, an explanation of the net current assets of the month to which the statement relates is also required.

In accordance with Regulation 34 (5), a report must be compiled on variances greater than the materiality threshold adopted by Council of 10%. As this report is composed at a summarised level, variance commentary considers the most significant items that comprise the variance.

CONSULTATION

None

REPORT IMPLICATIONS

Policy Implications

The Council's financial reporting is prepared in accordance with its accounting policies. These are reviewed periodically to ensure compliance with legislative and statutory obligations.

Financial Implications

The report represents the financial position of the Council at the end of May and June 2018.

Strategic Implications

Strategic action 6.4 in Western Metropolitan Regional Council's (WMRC) Corporate Business Plan is to "*deliver responsible financial management*". This includes a key action to "*provide accurate and transparent financial reporting*".

Given the uncertainties facing the WMRC it is considered prudent that adequate reserves are maintained.

COMMENTS

None

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

9.2.1 That Council note the financial statements for the periods ended 31 May 2018 and 30 June 2018.

9.3

LIST OF PAYMENTS AND SUNDRY DEBTORS

Responsible Officer: Finance and Governance Manager

Author: Support Services Officer

Date: 31 July 2018

Attachment 3: May and June 2018 Payments and Debtors

SUMMARY

The schedule of accounts paid for May and June 2018 are attached. The sundry debtors as at 31 July 2018 are also attached.

BACKGROUND

Nil

DETAIL

Nil

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Local Government Act 1995 and Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

CONSULTATION

Nil

REPORT IMPLICATIONS

Policy Implications

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

9.3.1 Endorse the schedule of accounts paid of \$367,048.46 and \$415,773.30 for the months of May and June 2018 respectively

9.3.2 Note the schedule of sundry debtors outstanding at 31 July 2018.

Responsible Officer: Chief Executive Officer

Date: 1 August 2018

Attachment 4: Minutes CEOAC Meeting 17 July 2018

SUMMARY

The minutes of the CEOAC meeting held on **17 July 2018** are at **Attachment 4**.

BACKGROUND

Nil

DETAIL

The CEOAC have recommended a course of action on the report entitled “Waste Delivery Agreement Workshop Agenda” at Item 4.2 in their minutes. This matter needs to be dealt with separately and is at Item 9.5 for consideration.

The CEOAC have recommended a course of action on the report entitled “Alternative Fee Model” at Item 4.3 in their minutes. This matter needs to be dealt with separately and is at Item 9.6 for consideration.

The CEOAC have recommended a course of action on the report entitled “Use of Transfer Station by Non-Member Council Residents” at Item 4.4 in their minutes. This matter needs to be dealt with separately and is at Item 9.7 for consideration.

There are no other recommendations to the WMRC from the CEOAC. Accordingly it is only necessary for the WMRC to receive the CEOAC minutes for 17 July 2018 under this item.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Nil

CONSULTATION

Nil

REPORT IMPLICATIONS

Policy Implications

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

9.4.1 The minutes of the CEOAC meeting on 17 July 2018 be received

Responsible Officer: Waste Operations Manager

Date: 27 July 2018

Attachment: Nil

SUMMARY

The future of the Waste Delivery Agreement is discussed below. Some modifications have been made to the report taken to the CEOAC meeting on 17 July 2018 for clarity.

BACKGROUND

Nil

DETAIL

At its 22 May 2018 meeting, CEOAC recommended to the WMRC that a Waste Delivery Agreement (WDA) workshop be convened, with a view to potentially extending the agreement. Discussion at the 17 July 2018 CEOAC meeting focused on whether there is strategic value in the agreement, or whether it should be allowed to lapse.

A brief discussion of the issues surrounding the WDA is given below.

The WDA and Establishment Agreement

The effect of the WDA needs to be considered in the context of the Establishment Agreement (EA). While the WDA is more explicit than the EA in its requirements, the EA has significant overlap with the WDA in terms of rights and requirements. Under the EA, a Member Council directing its waste to a third party is still responsible to pay WMRC as if that waste was going to the WMRC (Clause 7.2). That Member Council would thus end up paying twice for waste disposal – once to WMRC and once for disposal elsewhere.

The exemption from payment in the EA (clause 7.3) only applies where a Member Council itself carries out that purpose within its district. None of the Member Councils presently have the capability to receive or process MSW within their district, and none are likely to do so in the near future. Note also that the EA holds that funding any shortfalls in WMRC's budget is made up by Member Councils on a population basis.

Principal Terms of the WDA

The WDA, executed some time before 16 Feb 2012, provides that participants deliver all of their waste to WMRC in order that WMRC might comply with its waste supply obligations under the Waste Supply Agreement with DiCOM. This requirement acts to make more explicit the intent in the EA that the WMRC be responsible for handling Member Councils' waste.

The WMRC can grant exemptions to the requirement that all waste be delivered, except where an exemption would affect the WMRC's capacity to comply with the WSA (i.e. where it might lead to a shortfall in the WMRC's supply commitments). The WDA applies for a period of five years from the Commissioning Date of the DiCOM facility being 21 October 2013. A decision therefore needs to be made whether to renew or replace the WDA as from 21 October 2018; or to allow it to lapse.

WDA Existing Exemptions

While the provenance of the exemption schedule dated 16 Jan 2012 attached to the WDA is unclear, in practice the following exemptions are applied to the WDA:

- household kerbside recycling collections (yellow top bin);
- some bulk verge collections (including green waste verge collections); and
- in the case of Cottesloe's 3 bin system, the contents of its green bin.

WMRC Funding Model Not Addressed

While the EA makes clear how budget shortfalls should be made up, neither the EA nor the WDA set out on what basis Member Councils should contribute to the budgeted costs of the WMRC. A revised or replacement WDA could be a vehicle to address this shortcoming. Item 9.5 of this agenda suggests that such a model be based on an allocation of fixed costs on a population basis; and variable costs covered on the basis of delivered tonnes.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Nil

CONSULTATION

Nil

REPORT IMPLICATIONS

Policy Implications

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority of Council.

CEOAC RECOMMENDATION

4.2.1 That legal advice of the effect of the WDA lapsing be sought; and if no adverse impact is apparent, the WDA be allowed to lapse.

4.2.2 That strategic consideration also be given to rights for Councils to divert Third Bin Greenwaste or FOGO waste from the WMRC Transfer Station.

Responsible Officer: Waste Operations Manager

Date: 27 July 2018

Attachment: Nil

SUMMARY

A proposal to adopt an alternative fee model to fund the WMRC is below. This report originated at the CEOAC, and is copied below with no changes.

BACKGROUND

Nil

DETAIL

1. Introduction

Previous reports to the CEOAC and Council demonstrated that region-wide adoption of the three bin system will have a significant effect on the WMRC bottom line. The estimated reduction in tonnes from the region-wide adoption of a three bin system would lead to a significant increase in the Member Council General Waste Gate Fee of some \$30/T.

A suggested fairer funding model was outlined to CEOAC in May, where Councils with a three bin system in place would pay an additional charge to “make-good” the impact of this income reduction on other members. Councils with a three bin system in place would still have lower overall charges, while other Councils would not be unfairly disadvantaged.

At its 22 May 2018 meeting, CEOAC recommended to the WMRC:

that a further report be presented to the CEOAC modelling a single flat fee based on population to cover all services and comparing this with current total fees and charges for each member council.

The current fee model is not ideal, and the report below outlines two main alternative models: a single flat fee based on population, and a mixed fee model, with a single flat fee pro-rated on population for fixed costs, and a variable component for waste tonnes.

Note that the figures below are specific to member councils and do not take into account revenues from third party customers or draw down from WMRC reserves for operational deficits.

2. Model A: Historic and Current WMRC – Per Tonne Delivered Basis

The WMRC, as far as our records show, has always worked on the simple basis of balancing its costs and revenues by dividing costs by tonnes delivered to determine a rate per tonne for the various categories of waste.

Table 1 below shows actual member council expenditure on WMRC services for 2017/18, and the percentage of the total contributed by each member council. Note that all contributions are made on a per tonne of waste delivered basis (i.e. as though all WMRC costs are variable).

Table 1: Actual Member Contributions – per tonne delivered basis

Member Council	2017-18 Member Contributions	% of Total
Claremont	\$787,485.00	20.86%
Cottesloe	\$530,504.00	14.05%
Mosman Park	\$742,863.00	19.68%
Subiaco	\$1,484,133.00	39.31%
Peppermint Grove	\$230,464.00	6.10%
Totals	\$3,775,449.00	100.00%

As discussed in Section 1 above, the current model does not stand up well when one or another council makes significant reductions in waste deliveries. The financial pain felt by other members as per tonne rates are forced upwards is in part due to WMRC overheads – which are in fact largely fixed costs – being treated as they were variable. Thus the current model acts to shift overhead costs from low waste per capita to high waste per capita councils. Member councils which deliver more waste per capita end up meeting overheads that arguably should be shared on an equitable basis.

3. Model B: Single Flat Fee – Population Basis.

Table 2 below shows what member council expenditure would have been for 2017/18 if it were charged as a single flat fee distributed on a population basis.

Table 2: Actual Member Contributions – Population Basis

Member Council	Indicative Flat Annual Fee 17/18 Member Expenditure	% Population of Region	Fee Difference vs Current Model A
Claremont	\$851,363.75	22.55%	+ \$63,878.75
Cottesloe	\$655,795.49	17.37%	+ \$125,291.49
Mosman Park	\$739,988.00	19.60%	- \$2,875
Subiaco	\$1,390,497.87	36.83%	- \$93,635.13
Peppermint Grove	\$137,803.89	3.65%	- \$92,660.11
Totals	\$3,775,449.00	100.00%	\$0

Benefits of a single flat fee model:

- administratively very simple,
- better budgeting certainty as unanticipated changes in tonnes do not lead to changes in income,
- does not result in an increasing per tonne fee even when overall costs are decreasing because of waste tonnes decrease, and
- may help to remove the current confusion about whether the WSA Gate Fee and the Member Council Gate Fee are linked and if so how.

The single flat fee model however *comes with a very significant disadvantage* in that member councils *derive no individual benefit* from efforts to reduce their waste deliveries - as any reductions in cost through reduced waste deliveries end up being shared equally amongst all. This model thus particularly benefits those Member Councils with higher waste per capita; disincentivises waste reduction; and should be rejected on these grounds alone.

4. Model C: Mixed Fee - Fixed and Variable Cost Basis.

A third model, which largely retains the benefits of Model B above, is a mixed fee model. The model recognises that the WMRC faces both fixed and variable expenses in providing services; and while councils delivering less waste should directly benefit from reductions in WMRC variable costs, they should still contribute to fixed costs on a per capita basis.

This is in many ways a fairer model, as councils producing relatively high waste levels per capita pay relatively more, while those reducing waste benefit from lower fees, thus incentivising waste reduction.

Under this model, a flat annual fee (apportioned by population) covers the fixed and semi-fixed costs associated with staffing; administration; governance; recycling services; problematic waste services; waste education services; the maintenance of infrastructure; and utilities. A variable charge, expressed in terms of a fee per tonne of waste delivered, then picks up the substantial WMRC costs associated with waste haulage; landfill disposal fees and the \$70 per tonne landfill levy.

Structuring costs in this fashion, where all fixed costs are met proportionally by members, greatly facilitates commercial pricing to be based on marginal costs, which will make us more competitive in the market, attracting more waste to the Transfer Station, with surpluses in effect diluting overheads and reducing member council costs. Table 3 indicates that with \$1.9m allocated to fixed costs, we could substantially reduce charges per tonne of waste delivered.

Table 3 shows how this might break down. Figures given are broadly indicative, and demonstrate only a minor change to the current sharing of costs; and that being attributable to Cottesloe picking up a fairer share of overhead costs.

Table 3: Actual Member Contributions – Mixed fee basis

Member Council	Fixed Component	Variable Components per tonne			Total	Difference Current vs Mixed
		MSW \$155	Bulk \$190	Green \$50		
Claremont	\$432,606	\$279,930	\$33,907	\$26,323	\$772,765	-\$14,720
Cottesloe	\$333,231	\$253,099	-	\$12,492	\$598,822	\$68,318
Mosman Park	\$376,012	\$271,355	\$59,337	\$24,984	\$731,689	-\$11,174
Subiaco	\$706,557	\$744,082	-	\$29,446	\$1,480,085	-\$4,048
Peppermint Grove	\$70,023	\$106,495	\$9,324	\$6,246	\$192,088	-\$38,376
Totals	\$1,918,428	\$1,654,961	\$102,569	\$99,491	\$3,775,449	\$0

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Nil

CONSULTATION

Nil

REPORT IMPLICATIONS

Policy Implications

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority of Council.

CEOAC RECOMMENDATION

That a mixed fee model be further developed, with an objective of applying it as soon as practicable.

9. 7

USE OF TRANSFER STATION BY NON-MEMBER COUNCIL RESIDENTS

Responsible Officer: Waste Operations Manager

Date: 27 July 2018

Attachment: Nil

SUMMARY

The report below discussed the significant amount of use of the transfer station's free and subsidised services by people other than member council residents.

BACKGROUND

Nil

DETAIL

WMRC provides a range of services on a free or subsidised basis to the public, including:

- Recycling of
 - Cardboard
 - Steel
 - Lead acid batteries
 - Mattresses and bases
 - E-waste
- Diversion of problematic wastes
 - Household Hazardous Waste
 - Asbestos

WMRC has recently begun collecting data on the people who use these services, noting which Council Area these people belong to. When considering Member Council resident use only, the figures demonstrate use of the services is roughly in line with area population.

Council	Percent Use (Member Councils Only)	Population %
Cottesloe	17%	17%
Claremont	28%	23%
Mosman Park	12%	20%
Subiaco	37%	37%
Peppermint Grove	6%	4%

Preliminary data (covering part of April, and all of May and June 2018), show that a very high proportion of people using these services at the transfer station are not member council residents. Some 48% of these services are provided to non-residents. Member council residents effectively subsidise the use of this service by other councils.

Council Area	Use of Transfer Station
Cottesloe	9%
Claremont	14%
Mosman Park	6%
Subiaco	19%
Peppermint Grove	3%
Total Member Councils	52%
Nedlands	17%
Cambridge	19%
Other (largely MRC Councils)	12%
Total Outside Region	48%

Of the 48% coming from outside the region, 17% are from Nedlands, and 19% from Cambridge. This is not surprising, given that the Brockway Transfer Station is located within the City of Nedlands and the Town of Cambridge is nearby. Cambridge is a member of the MRC, which operates transfer stations which can be accessed by member Council residents. Of the other users of the Transfer Station, most are from MRC Councils.

The cost of providing these recycling and problematic waste services for 2018-19 is budgeted to be \$371,420. The most substantial portion of these costs are fixed, and represent staffing and site costs. Of the staffing costs, the HHW program has the most significant costs. The costs of handling and diversion are relatively low given the small quantity of tonnes and the funding arrangements for HHW and e-waste. As most of these costs are fixed, no significant reduction in costs would be achieved if the provision of these services were restricted to member council residents only. Costs might even be increased if WMRC lost access to the HHW and e-waste funding arrangements as a result of ceasing to provide these services to the general public.

This significant use by non-member residents contrasts with the situation at other Transfer Stations, as shown in the table below. This is based on a small sample of data collected for WALGA in August 2017 reflecting the residence location of users of the HHW programme at each facility. It can be clearly seen that other waste transfer facilities appear to have a negligible proportion of use by outside of region residents. This is dramatically different for WMRC.

Similar Facilities	Use by own residents	Use by Regional Council group residents	Use by WMRC residents
City of Stirling (Balcatta)	68%	>80%	<1%
MRC (Tamala Park)	N/A	>99%	0%
City of Cockburn	83%	>90%	0%
EMRC (Red Hill)	N/A	>96%	0%
WMRC (Brockway Road)	N/A	~50%	~50%

There are a variety of ways WMRC could attempt to recover some or all of the costs associated with providing these services to members of the public who are not member council residents:

- Request an ex-gratia payment from the City of Nedlands and Town of Cambridge, noting the free and subsidised services being provided to their residents.
- Reach an agreement with City of Nedlands and Town of Cambridge that they be invoiced annually for a reasonable amount associated with the provision of these services to their residents. On a proportional basis, this would amount to \$63,141 for Nedlands and \$70,570 for Cambridge.
- Begin to only providing free and subsidised services to member council residents. This is potentially problematic for several reasons, most of which could be mitigated to an extent.
 - Restricting access is likely to have the unintended consequence of non-WMRC residents disposing of HHW in their rubbish bins to the detriment of the environment.
 - Requiring proof of address at the Transfer Station places a large administration burden on the Weighbridge Attendant.
 - May be able to mitigate by issuing “Recycling” Tip Passes to member council residents allowing them to access the services at no charge, rather than carding everyone coming through. In part this would transfer the administration burden to member councils.
 - Anticipated difficulty enforcing.
 - May be able to mitigate by increasing staffing (potentially only short term) or installing physical barriers such as boom gates.
 - Could not apply consistently to all free and subsidised services as WMRC has commitments under the HHW and e-waste funding arrangements to provide these services to the general public.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Nil

CONSULTATION

Nil

REPORT IMPLICATIONS**Policy Implications**

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority of Council.

CEOAC RECOMMENDATION

9.7.1 That WMRC approach the City of Nedlands and the Town of Cambridge about the situation and proposing that agreement be reached on these local governments making a fair and reasonable contribution towards the cost of providing considerable recycling and HHW services to their residents.

Responsible Officer: Waste Operations Manager

Date: 27 July 2018

Attachment 5: Policy 4 – Council Meetings
 Policy 5 – Members Sitting Fees
 Policy 6 – Tip Passes
 Policy 9 – Sexual Harassment
 Policy 12 – Code of Conduct
 Policy 24 – Occupational Safety and Health

SUMMARY

This report seeks Council approval for reviews and changes to a number of WMRC Council Policies; and to note the progress made on developing an HR Manual.

BACKGROUND

Most of WMRC's internal policies are required to be reviewed every two years. Many of the reviews due in 2017 were deferred, and as a result a substantial amount of Council policies are overdue for review. Several policies are presented for review and approval in this item. It is intended that the remaining policies due for review be addressed at the October 2018 council meeting.

In addition to the policy review, the development of an HR manual, as per the December 2017 Council decision, is underway.

DETAIL

A review of a number of Council policies has been conducted and is presented to Council herein. A summary of changes made to reviewed policies is as follows:

Policy Reviewed	Summary of Changes Made
Policy 4 - Council Meetings	No changes proposed.
Policy 5 - Members' Sitting Fees	The changes reflect that the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal (SAT) annually determines and publishes a range of members' sitting fees; and the WMRC decides upon its applicable rates as part of the annual WMRC budget setting process. The current WMRC approved fees are no longer listed in the proposed new policy.
Policy 6 - Tip Passes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tip passes may be issued in place of refund when addressing complaints • Clarification of the value tip passes can be used for.

Policy 9 - Sexual Harassment	The Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinator is the CEO
Policy 12 - Code of Conduct	Section added for staff and elected members' signatures.
Policy 24 – Occupational Safety and Health	No changes proposed.

HR MANUAL

At its December 2017 meeting, the WMRC approved the following recommendations:

- delete HR Policies No 1 - 8 and where appropriate the CEO to oversee the establishment of a Human Resources Manual to contain non-legislative industrial requirements and the procedures underpinning those policies; and
- funds for the preparation of a Human Resources Manual be considered for inclusion in the 2018/19 Budget Year.

What were HR Policies 1 – 8 have been transferred into a draft HR Manual. The following new HR Policies have now been developed internally for inclusion in the manual:

- Recruitment and Selection Policy
- Hours of Work Policy
- Uniform, Dress Code and Hygiene at Work

In the main, in developing the HR Manual we will be able to rely on the suite of relevant standard HR policies that are available to us as a subscriber to WALGA's Employee Relations service, such that there should be no call on budget.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

The changes proposed to the reviewed and proposed policies are in accordance with legislative requirements as referenced in the individual policies.

CONSULTATION

Nil

REPORT IMPLICATIONS

Policy Implications

Refer to Detail section above.

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 9.8.1 Re-endorse Council Policy 4 – Council Meetings**
- 9.8.2 Re-endorse Council Policy 5 – Members Sitting Fees**
- 9.8.3 Endorse the amendments to Council Policy 6 – Tip Passes**
- 9.8.4 Endorse the amendments to Council Policy 9 – Sexual Harassment**
- 9.8.5 Endorse the amendments to Council Policy 12 – Code of Conduct**
- 9.8.6 Re-endorse Council Policy 24 – Occupational Safety and Health**
- 9.8.7 Note the progress made on an HR Manual**

Responsible Officer: Chief Executive Officer

Date: 31 July 2018

Attachment 6: Draft Disability Access and Inclusion Plan (DAIP)

SUMMARY

This report seeks Council approval for the new WMRC *Disability Access and Inclusion Plan 2018 – 2023* (DAIP).

BACKGROUND

The Disability Services Act 1993 requires all local government and selected State Government agencies to develop a DAIP.

DAIP assist public authorities to plan and implement improvements to access and inclusion across seven outcome areas, in regards to services and events, buildings and facilities, information, quality of service, complaints, consultation processes and employment. These plans benefit people with disability, the elderly, young parents and people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

A DAIP may remain current for a period of no more than five years from the date of its lodgment with the Department of Communities.

CURRENT DAIP

The WMRC's current *DAIP 2012 – 2016* was approved by Council in June 2012 and an amendment to it approved in April 2014. It expired in 2016.

NEW PROPOSED DAIP

Following consultation with the Department of Communities, the attached new draft DAIP was prepared by the CEO.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

The draft DAIP has been developed to conform to the requirements of the *Disability Access and Inclusion Resource Manual* issued by the Department of Communities; and meets the requirements of the *Disability Services Act 1993* and *Disability Services Regulations 2004*.

CONSULTATION

The draft DAIP has been the subject of public consultation as required by the *Disability Services Regulations*, specifically way of a public notice in the local newspaper and another on the WMRC website. The notices provided for comment on the draft DAIP by email, telephone, post or in person. In the event, no comments were received excepting those made by the responsible agency, Department of Communities; and the attached version of the draft DAIP reflects the comments made by that agency.

The draft DAIP invites ongoing feedback from interested parties; which can be incorporated into an amended DAIP at any time in accordance with the Regulations.

REPORT IMPLICATIONS

Policy Implications

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

9.9.1 Council approve the WMRC DAIP 2018 – 2013 and require it to be lodged with the Department of Communities.

9.10

New Energy Presentation

Responsible Officer: Chief Executive Officer

Date: 1 August 2018

Attachment: Nil

SUMMARY

There are two major waste to energy projects being explored in Perth. Waste to Energy can be a cost effective alternative to landfilling, and may be a viable destination for residuals generated from AWT Plants.

BACKGROUND

New Energy is investing in a waste to energy facility for the Perth region, to divert significant amounts of residual waste from landfill and to extract energy from the waste. This facility will use internationally proven combustion technology and become part of the new generation of alternative waste treatment in Perth, and part of the solution for sustainable waste management into the future.

The New Energy facility will assist in extending the life of currently available landfills in the metro area, reduce trucking costs to remote landfills, and increase diversion rates for local government. Industrial customers will have an option for reducing their waste disposal costs and improving their triple bottom line performance.

DETAIL

Jason Pugh from New Energy will provide a brief presentation about the New Energy facility.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Nil

CONSULTATION

Nil

REPORT IMPLICATIONS

Policy Implications

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

9.10.1 That Jason Pugh be thanked for his presentation and the information noted

10.1

Waste Education Update

Responsible Officer: WASTE EDUCATION MANAGER

Date: 27th July 2018

Appendices: Nil

SUMMARY

An information bulletin detailing Waste Education team activity for the period.

BACKGROUND

The Waste Education team provide community waste education and support Member Council staff in the WMRC Member Council area with the aim of Making Good Waste Practices Normal in the Western Suburbs.

Contents include:

1. CIE Grant Funding Success
2. Support for Member Council activities and Community events
 - **History of Plastics talk**
 - **Claremont Library events**
 - **Recycling Matters factsheet**
 - **Schools' support**
 - **Subiaco Farmers Market**
3. Other
 - **Summary of waste education activities FY 2017/18**
 - **Waste and Recycle Conference**

DETAIL

1. CIE Grant Funding Success

The team learnt of success in early July in their \$75,005 grant application to DWER to evaluate and amplify community waste education. The grant will allow assessment of the existing Earth Carers program and identification, development and piloting of an improved waste education toolkit. This project will run to end May 2019.

2. Support for Member Council activities and Community events

- History of Plastics talk

This free talk at the Grove was a Plastic Free July event and attended by around 50 people, most of whom were not 'regulars'.

- Claremont Library events

The History of Plastics talk was also given at the Claremont Library as part of their regular series of community talks.

The team ran a popular worm farming workshop for primary school kids at the Library



Claremont Library – talk and kids with worms

- Recycling Matters factsheet

This factsheet incorporating recently-agreed information from the three recycling processors has been provided to all Member Councils for their websites.

- Schools' support

The team has supported Jolimont and Mosman Park Primary Schools, and Perth Modern School with information on composting and worm-farming. It is also improving risk management of school battery collections.

- Subiaco Farmers Market

The team held a no-sew bag making stall to support the plastic bag ban at Subiaco Farmers' Market.



No-sew shopping bag at Subi Farmers Market

3. Other

- Summary of waste education activities FY 2017/18

A summary of the Waste Education team's workshops and events across Member Council areas to date has been completed.

Analysis of the focus of the main activities (events, workshops, programs, talks etc) undertaken by the team through the 2017/18 financial year has the results shown below. The proportionally large amount of time spent with the Town of Cottesloe relates to the bin tagging project funded through a DWER Better Bins grant.

	All	Claremont	Cottesloe	Mosman Park	Peppermint Grove	Subiaco
Waste Education Time – events/ workshops etc only	52%	3%	25%	5%	2%	12%

The main events hosted by the team are the organics workshops (4 per year) and the Earth Carers course (2 per year). The provenance of attendees at these events is as summarised in the table below.

	Total attendees (inc out of area)	Claremont	Cottesloe	Mosman Park	Peppermint Grove	Subiaco
Organics Workshops -Total Attendees since May 2016	158	24	40	40	0	51
Earth Carers Courses -Total Attendees since May 2010	399	37	30	31	1	64

- Waste and Recycle Conference

Amy Warne will be presenting at the conference 5-7 September.

MEDIA

Social Media Content

The team's social media presence continues to be an effective free medium for publicising waste education issues and events with a reach of 3,538 (up 31% on the last report). The highest ranking post publicised the Recycling Matters Factsheet and reached 1,959 people (organic reach, not paid).

The image shows a screenshot of a Facebook post from the page 'Earth Carers'. The post text reads: 'In WA our recycling centres are willing and able to take your recycling. Take a look at the Recycling Matters Fact Sheet and find out what can and can't go into your kerbside recycling bin.' It includes a link to a fact sheet. The post features a graphic with a recycling symbol and the text 'Recycling Matters! Let's do our bit.' and the Earth Carers logo. To the right of the post is a 'Performance for your post' box with the following data:

Performance for your post		
1,959 People Reached		
40 Reactions, Comments & Shares		
24 Likes	13 On Post	11 On Shares
1 Love	1 On Post	0 On Shares
7 Comments	6 On Post	1 On Shares
8 Shares	8 On Post	0 On Shares
177 Post Clicks		
14 Photo Views	38 Link Clicks	125 Other Clicks
NEGATIVE FEEDBACK		
1 Hide Post	0 Hide All Posts	
0 Report as Spam	0 Unlike Page	

Below the performance box, it says 'Reported stats may be delayed from what appears on posts'. The post also shows '1,959 people reached' and a 'Boost Post' button.

Recycling Matters facebook post

Print Media Content

The following articles have been featured in The Post



See good ... Libby Eustance, left, and Amy Mickelberg are happy to be reusable bag ladies. Photo: Paul McKeown

Boomerang bags come back

By DAVID COHEN

It's just three weeks until the plastic-bag ban - but Libby Eustance is prepared. The Western Metropolitan Regional Council waste education manager has a nifty Boomerang Bag for when she goes to the shops on or after July 1.

Libby, waste educator Amy Mickelberg, and Earth Carers volunteers took over the fair court at the Cottesloe Central shops to sew and give away the reusable bags.

"We made them from scrap fabric, such as old curtains and duona covers," Amy said. "It takes up to an hour of

cutting, ironing, sewing, chalking, and drinking tea to make each bag."

She said West Australians used 399 million plastic bags last year, and about five million ended up as litter.

"There is resounding support for WA's plastic bag ban, but people need to remember their reusable bags for there to be an impact," she said.

"The global movement Boomerang Bags works to reduce the use of plastic bags by getting the community to make reusable bags from recycled fabric."

"There are 30 Boomerang Bag groups around Perth but we would love to see more in the western suburbs."

Woodwards at Cottesloe Central started the plastic bag ban early, on April 4 (NSR, February 17).

A store spokesperson said the change meant about 60,000 fewer plastic bags a month would be in the Peppermint Grove and Cottesloe environment.

People wanting to set up a Boomerang Bag in their area can check it out at boomerangbags.org.

The Waste Education program is supported by Subiaco, Claremont, Cottesloe, Mosman Park and Peppermint Grove councils.

To find out more about the Earth Carers program see www.earthcarers.org.au.

The Post p26 9th June 2018



Keep it, say Christine Parfitt, left, and Claremont CEO Liz Ledger promoting Ms Parfitt's talk about plastics. Photo: Paul McKeown

Rents stop cup discounts

High rents in the western suburbs mean cafes are reluctant to give coffee discounts to people to show up with keep cups, Plastic Free July activist Christine Parfitt says.

She will give a talk at Claremont library next month on the history of plastic and its impact on the environment.

"The History in a Coffee Cup talk is one of the ways Claremont council is getting behind Plastic Free July."

"Taking your keep cup to a cafe is called the Responsible Coffee movement," Ms Parfitt said.

In Claremont, Stand In Room on Bay View Terrace, and the

Goods Shed cafe across the rail line are part of it.

"The movement is certainly catching on. After ABC TV program War on Waste, sales of cups increased by about 400%.

But high rents in the western suburbs make some cafe owners reluctant to give people a discount when they bring their keep cup in."

Ms Parfitt, who works at the Western Metropolitan Regional Council, will discuss a number of local initiatives aimed at reducing plastics entering the ocean.

"My background is in marine science and I have extensive knowledge of the plastic prob-

lem both in Australia and overseas, especially from a marine perspective," she said.

Claremont mayor Jack Barber said the council had a strong focus on environmental sustainability, with a new public recycling bin trial starting in the town centre, as well as other initiatives on the horizon.

"The Plastic Free July - History of Plastic session is at the Claremont Community Hub and Library at 9.30am on Thursday July 5.

Plastic Free July began at the WMRC in 2011 with 49 participants and has more than two million people taking part worldwide.

The Post 22nd June 2018

Page 20 - P01, July 15, 2018

Earth Carers reach out

By DAVID COHEN

Future students of the popular Earth Carers course will be able to study online, thanks to a \$75,000 state government grant.

Since 2010, more than 400 people have done the course, run by the Western Metropolitan Regional Council.

It involves sessions on three weekday evenings and two weekend days.

Waste education manager Libby Eustance said people loved learning how to adopt low-waste strategies in their homes, but not everyone had enough time to commit to the five sessions.

"This grant will allow us to use the success of the Earth Carers course to deliver a program to a wider audience by providing the course online and establishing peer support," she said.

Ms Eustance said many people who had taken part had established their own waste reduction programs.

One was Swanbourne resident Wilma van Bostel, a 2010 graduate who has been instrumental in bringing the Repair Lab movement to Perth.

"I found the program to be very useful in expanding my knowledge," Wilma said.

"But perhaps more importantly, it opened up a new wealth of contacts, which proved very useful when setting up my own initiatives."

"Having a community of like-minded individuals to share ideas and gather support has really helped in getting the message out there and changing people's waste behaviour."

Wilma and Victoria Park resident started Repair Lab



Waste reduction experts Libby Eustance, left, and Wilma van Bostel have some great ideas for you. Photo: Billie Iardough

last year as a project for their advanced Earth Carers course.

People take items to the lab to be fixed, instead of throwing them away and adding them to landfill.

"Our aim is to have them pop up all over WA," Wilma said.

"They are run by volunteers and the events are an amazing community attraction."

A Repair Lab is planned for this year at the Grove Library.

The new Earth Carers program should be ready by early next year.

Other local recipients of grants in the state government's Community and Industry Engagement \$1million-plus program were the Rottnest Island Chamber of Commerce and Rottnest Perth.

The Rottnest chamber got \$2,400 to engage island businesses in waste management.

The Post p20 28th July 2018

STAFF LEAVE

Amy Warne is on leave until 15th August

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

WMRC Establishment Agreement 1998 6.1 (c)

CONSULTATION

Nil

REPORT IMPLICATIONS**Policy Implications**

Nil

Financial Implications

All Waste Education activities are provided for in the existing budget.

Strategic Implications

Activities are aligned to Key Strategy 4 of the Strategic Community Plan 2012/3 “Increase the knowledge and engage the local community to improve waste management”. They also contribute to Key Strategy 1 “Achieve a comprehensive, cost effective waste management service across the region”, Key Strategy 2 “Increase the number of Councils, businesses and people using our services” and Key Strategy 3 “Reduce waste to landfill”.

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

10.1.1 That Council note the Waste Education report to 27th July 2018

10.2

WASTE OPERATIONS PROGRESS REPORT FOR MAY/JUNE 2018

Responsible Officer: Waste Operations Manager

Date: 18 July 2018

Attachment 7: Waste Receipts Data
External Signage for Brockway Transfer Station

SUMMARY

This report provides updates on the status of waste operations. Council is required to receive the report.

BACKGROUND

Nil

DETAIL

Waste Statistics

Total waste receipts (excluding AWT waste) for the year are very slightly down from 2016-17. Member Council Waste tonnes are down 5% compared to 2016-17.

Commercial waste tonnages increased nearly 15% from 2016-17. Commercial Green Waste tonnes decreased some 25% from 16-17. Attachment 7 provides waste receipts data to 30 June 2018.

Signage at JFR (Jim) McGeough Resource Recovery Facility

At its meeting on 7 December 2017 Council resolved:

That a preliminary design and estimate be prepared for the manufacture and installation of a replacement sign and presented to the WMRC at a future meeting for consideration with Mr Diggins being advised accordingly.

A proof of the suggested layout of the sign is Attachment 7. The provision of the sign will cost \$1,300 ex GST.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Nil

CONSULTATION

Nil

REPORT IMPLICATIONS

Policy Implications

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority of Council.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

10.2.1 **That Council receive the Waste Operations Report.**

10.3

PROGRESS ON COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

Responsible Officer: Chief Executive Officer

Date: 1 August 2018

Attachment 8: Progress on Council Resolutions

SUMMARY

A schedule showing progress on WMRC resolutions up to and including the 7 Jun 2018 meeting is presented in **Attachment 8**. The schedule is extracted from the master schedule which has a record of all WMRC resolutions from 2007. Only resolutions not finalised are shown on the schedule as presented.

BACKGROUND

In October 2007 Council decided that an information bulletin item tracking the progress of Council resolutions be presented at future meetings.

DETAIL

Refer to **Attachment 8**

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Local Government Act 1995

CONSULTATION

Nil

REPORT IMPLICATIONS

Policy Implications

Nil

Financial Implications

Nil

Strategic Implications

Nil

COMMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple majority

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

10.3.1 That the information be received.

- 11. MOTIONS FOR WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

- 12. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

- 13. URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION**

- 14. MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS**
 - 14.1 DiCOM Confidential Progress Report
 - 14.2 WMRC Business Development

- 15. CLOSURE OF MEETING**