general

purpose

committee

3

section

organisation

and

resources

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE

SECTION 3 - ORGANISATION AND RESOURCES.

oooO END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS Oooo

ITEM: 100 **Rural Fire Service Estimates 2002 - 2003**

FILE NUMBER: GF004/001 PT2/GMA/OGI25LAX.G08

REPORT:

Changes to the operation of the Rural Fire Service now requires estimates for the 2002/2003 financial year to be submitted by 30 September 2001. The attached estimates have been prepared by the Fire Control Officer for the Committee's consideration, with the proposal recognising:

1. *"The standard of fire cover"* survey conducted by the Rural Fire Service in 1993.

2. The need to continue with the plan to upgrade major equipment. It should be noted that it is now Rural Fire Service policy that no vehicle in the fleet is to be over 15 years old. The proposal will allow the Council to provide the brigades with the following improvements:

   (a) The replacement of one Category One heavy tanker.

   (b) The replacement of one Category Two medium tanker.

   (c) The replacement of three Category Nine light tankers.

   (d) Provision of an additional personnel carrier.

As a result of the coronial enquiry into the Wingello incident there has been a need for additional personal safety equipment and a requirement to provide lagging, to areas such as fuel hoses and electrical wires under tankers, where these could be the subject of burning and thus loss of operational control of the vehicle should it traverse areas of fire.

Aside from very small indexation the following are the additional requests from Council:

- Additional $10,000 (ten thousand dollars) for radio/pager maintenance.
- $15,000 (fifteen thousand dollars) for services to the Wilberforce Building. The Rural Fire Service will pay for electricity but not for other services.
- $20,000 (twenty thousand dollars) for the part-time/casual staff engaged on the weekends.
- $30,000 (thirty thousand dollars) for extensions to Rural Fire Service stations. This one is proposed at Lower McDonald.
- $14,000 (fourteen thousand dollars) for the changeover of a Group Captain vehicle.
- $25,000 (twenty five thousand dollars) for additional safety equipment.

In the current financial year the Council's contribution is proposed at $814,903 (eight hundred and fourteen thousand nine hundred and three dollars) with the 2002/2003 proposal $746,396.74 (seven hundred and forty-six thousand three hundred and ninety-six dollars and seventy-four cents).

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Rural Fire Service estimates for 2002 - 2003 be adopted and forwarded to the Rural Fire Service.

ATTACHMENTS:

AT-1 Fire Estimate for 2002/2003.

Fire Estimate for 2002/2003

oooO END OF ITEM 100 Oooo

ITEM: 101 **South Windsor Waste Depot - Pre-treatment Process**

FILE NUMBER: P2018/70 PT01, P2018/55 PT 20/EVD/OGI25LBX.V14

PREVIOUS ITEM: 126, GPC Section 1 - Environment (29.06.1999)
PREVIOUS ITEM: 126, Ordinary (13.07.1999)

REPORT:

Council has been requested by the Western Sydney Waste Board to participate in the construction and use of a Metropolitan Solid Waste (ie household garbage) Pre-treatment Plant to be constructed at Council's Waste facility in South Windsor.

This issue was last considered by Council on 13 July 1999 where it resolved to sign the Heads of Agreement document between the Waste Board and Council. In this document the Waste Board undertook to:

1. eliminate fees paid by Hawkesbury City Council to the Environment Protection Authority;
2. minimise the quantity of pre-treated waste being disposed of as landfill;
3. improve the quality of landfill such that landfill can operate more economically; and
4. assist Council to make the operation of landfill more cost effective and efficient.

Outline of the Proposal

The proposal of the Western Sydney Waste Board is to construct a pre-treatment plant using approved technology on an area of land owned by Council which was the old landfill site at South Windsor. This is immediately adjacent to the gatehouse, currently occupied by Council's supply of fill material. The proposal of the pre-treatment plant is to reduce metropolitan solid waste, ie household garbage, into three major streams which then can be reused. The goal of the Waste Board is to reuse the vast majority of the material treated at the plant and of the 55,000 tonnes proposed to be processed only 1,000 tonnes per year would go to landfill.

The Waste Board has gone through an extensive analysis program to establish the appropriate technologies in this industry and then call tenders for the construction and operation of the pre-treatment plant.

Recent Progress

As a result of the tenders called by the Waste Board, a successful applicant has been received and the Waste Board is now able to indicate to Council the range of prices involved in the processing of waste through the pre-treatment plant. The need for the range of prices arises from the lowest price, being where the Waste Board can dispose of all the products of the pre-treatment plant to third parties, to the higher price for the whole output of pre-treatment being taken to landfill. The prices quoted are the prices needed to landfill the material at Eastern Creek. The price ranges are between $89 and $112 per tonne.

The Waste Board also proposes to pay Hawkesbury City Council two fees:

1. the host fee, which is a fee for the use of the site; and
2. an operation fee which is a fee to cover the cost of Council operating the gatehouse and weighbridges which are proposed to be constructed by the successful tenderer.

There is also a lease payment from the operator of the pre-treatment plant to Council for the use of the land. The host fee currently proposed is to be $5 per tonne, the operational fee is to be $3 per tonne, and the lease of the land is $10,000 per year.

Proposal

The Waste Board proposes that Hawkesbury City Council, together with Penrith, Blacktown and Baulkham Hills Councils, supply metropolitan sited waste to the pre-treatment plant. The initial capacity of the plant will be 55,000 tonnes. Of this, it is proposed that Hawkesbury City Council supplies 15,000 tonnes which represents this Council's whole domestic waste stream, that is, the waste collected by Council's garbage fleet.

There are two agreements proposed, being a participation agreement between all the Councils and the Waste Board to deliver the waste to South Windsor and a cooperation agreement between this Council and the Waste Board on how the site will be operated, and the fees to be paid to Hawkesbury Council and the material that may be land filled as a result of the process.

Blacktown, Penrith and Baulkham Hills Councils have agreed to participate in the process and deliver the amount of metropolitan solid waste required to the Waste Board at the pre-treatment plant. Blacktown Council has set the range of $89-$112 per tonne as suitable as this appears to be more competitive for them than transporting their waste to the Eastern Creek facility.

Budget Impacts

In essence, Council's ratepayers should be no worse off with this proposal than if the rate that Council would have to charge for the garbage service with or without the pre-treatment process is the same. An analysis for the proposal has been carried out to determine the impact on Council's budget. In order to carry out the analysis, the assumption was made that the loans and interest owed by the Waste Budget have been paid out.

The cost to landfill Council waste in this situation is approximately $57 per tonne, on the assumption there are 28,000 tonnes to landfill.

Three projections were made on the material going to the pre-treatment plant:

The first scenario involved 15,000 tonnes being contributed to the pre-treatment plant with a capacity set at 55,000 tonnes, income from host fees and operational fees and a lease of $450,000 per year. The cost to landfill in comparison would then be $61 per tonne, an increase over current costs. The host fee would need to be increased to $7.50 per tonne and the operational fee increased to $4.50 per tonne to make this option viable.

The other two scenarios tested involved Council contributing 20,000 tonnes and Council contributing 28,000 tonnes being its total waste stream to the pre-treatment plant. In both these circumstances, with the pre-treatment plant set at 55,000 tonne processing capacity, Council would be financially worse off.

The pre-treatment plant is technically capable of processing up to100,000 tonnes but this capacity cannot be tested until the Environmental Impact Statement required to be submitted with the plan is prepared and analysed. If the capacity of the plan is increased to 90,000 tonnes and the fees are increased to $10.00 per tonne for the host fee and $5.50 per tonne for the operational fee, then Council would be able to process all 28,000 tonnes currently going to landfill and maintain current costs.

The greater proportion of Council's waste that can be diverted to the pre-treatment will obviously increase the life of the landfill site. As an example, the current cell has a capacity of approximately 85,000 tonnes and will be filled in three years. If the amount of landfill is reduced from 28,000 tonnes per year to, say, 13,000 tonnes per year (that is 15,000 tonnes to the pre-treatment plant) then that same cell would last for six and half years.

Conclusion

Using the assumptions made by the Waste Board concerning the operation of the pre-treatment plant, being its capacity of 55,000 tonnes; Council's contribution of 15,000 tonnes; a host fee of $5 per tonne; an operational fee of $3 per tonne; and a cost of pre-treatment between $89-$91, Council would not be financially better off. To make the proposal viable then the proposed fees to Council would have to increase.

It can be seen from the above that, should the host and operational fees be increased and the capacity of the plant increased, then Council's whole waste stream could be put through the pre-treatment plant and Council would maintain current costs.

Under these circumstances, it would seem appropriate for the Mayor and General Manager to continue negotiation of the co-operation and participation agreements with the Waste Board, provided the above parameters are adhered to. It is in Council's best interest to minimise the amount of material going to landfill therefore increasing the life of the landfill as long as possible. This can be achieved by changing the above parameters in Council's favour and this should also be further negotiated.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that:

1. Council delegate to the Mayor and the General Manager the authority to negotiate the details of the co-operation and participation agreements with the Western Sydney Waste Board under the parameters of a pre-treatment price of $89 (eighty nine dollars) per tonne; host fees and operational fees to be at least $7.50 (seven dollars and fifty cents) and $4.50 (four dollars and fifty cents) respectively, with Council's proportion of the waste limited to 15,000 (fifteen thousand) tonnes.

2. The Mayor and General Manager further negotiate with the Western Sydney Waste Board to maintain Council's favourable financial position by the increase of the capacity of the pre-treatment plant and an increase in the host and operational fees to $10 (ten dollars) and $5.50 (five dollars and fifty cents) respectively, if this can be achieved within the environmental constraints of the operation of the pre-treatment plant.

ATTACHMENTS:

There are no supporting documents for this report.

oooO END OF ITEM 101 Oooo