

**GUILDFORD MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY REDEVELOPMENT
COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP (CRG)****MEETING MINUTES**

Thursday 3 September 2020 4:00 pm to 5.00 pm

Venue: Zoom video conference

ATTENDEES AND DISTRIBUTION	
PRESENT	
John Mulholland	Cleanaway, Regional Manager WA
Les Egerton	Cleanaway, Environmental Business Partner
Ian Hocking	Cleanaway, Project Manager
Sang Chi	Cleanaway, Manager of Business Recycling
Barbara Dundas	Guildford Association, President
Robert Watson	South Guildford Community Association, Secretary
Gregory Peterson	Member of the Bassendean Preservation Group; Friends of Bindaring Park
Lenda Oshalem	Newgate Communications
Shona Gallacher	Facilitator
APOLOGIES	
Vera Waldby	City of Swan, Place Manager and Stakeholder Relations
Cassie Rowe	State Member of Parliament, Member for Belmont

Item	Description	Action
1	<p>INTRODUCTIONS/ATTENDEES/APOLOGIES</p> <p>Shona Gallacher provided apologies for Cassie Rowe, State Member of Parliament, Member for Belmont and for Vera Waldby, City of Swan, Place Manager and Stakeholder Relations.</p>	
2	<p>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES AND REPORT ON ACTIONS</p> <p>Shona Gallacher asked if there were any additions or amendments to the Meeting Minutes from Thursday 23 July 2020, two were provided and outlined within 2.1 and 2.2 below.</p> <p>2.1 Wording amendment – Gregory Peterson commented that within Section 1.1 the spelling of Bindaring required amendment.</p> <p>2.2 Clarification of waste run off inclusion – Barbara Dundas requested clarification that the previous mention of on-site water containment to prevent fire waste run off of up to one million litres had been included within the Meeting Minutes. It was confirmed and agreed this had been covered within Section 4.9 of the Thursday 23 July 2020 Meeting Minutes.</p> <p>2.3 Approval of minutes – No other amendments or changes were offered by the CRG Members and the Meeting Minutes for Thursday 23 July 2020 were approved and confirmed.</p> <p>2.4 Overview of report on actions – Lenda Oshalem provided a report of the actions from the July meeting and confirmed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 11 June 2020 meeting minutes had been published on the Cleanaway website. 2. The provision to the CRG of a table of development differences that refers to any differences between the old and new plant that will contribute to future fire mitigation to be discussed at this meeting before providing an update to community via available channels including City of Swan and Cleanaway website. <p>2.5 Table of development differences – Lenda Oshalem shared the table of development differences onscreen with the CRG Members present and invited Ian Hocking to talk through the fire safety enhancements it detailed for the new plant. (copy attached to these Minutes)</p>	<p>ACTION</p> <p>Lenda Oshalem to arrange July meeting minutes to be published on the Cleanaway website.</p>

Item	Description	Action
2.5 (a)	National Construction Code (NCC) – Ian Hocking confirmed the previous facility was built to the NCC 2016 specifications.	
2.5 (b)	Fire hydrant water supply – Ian Hocking confirmed in the original facility the fire hydrants ran off the mains water, which was accepted as the most common approach at the time. Ian Hocking confirmed that on the new site the hydrants will be driven by the pumps that are on the fire tanks. This approach helps to ensure that any pressure fluctuations within the mains can be overcome. This also ensures there is time for the on-site fire hydrants to be used until the Brigade arrives with a booster to the water tank.	
2.5 (c)	Water mains capacity – Barbara Dundas reflected that the Hyne Road water main operated on a one-way system that reached a dead end. Barbara asked for confirmation that the fire hydrant approach would be able to carry the water capacity required if the hydrants were pumping. Ian Hocking explained that during the design process the pressure within the mains had been tested and deemed sufficient for the water capacity required. Ian Hocking explained that if a reduction in pressure were to occur the Brigade would connect to the booster and use the fire truck to suck water from the mains and regulate the pressure.	
2.5 (d)	On-site power supply for the delivery of water– Robert Watson enquired what power supply is used on site for the delivery of the water and asked if there was any concern of potential future disruption to power supply. Ian Hocking confirmed that fire regulations require that diesel pumps be installed on-site. Ian Hocking explained the new facility will have two diesel pumps, whereas the previous facility had only one diesel pump. Ian Hocking explained the NCC 2016 outlines how much diesel is needed on-site to be viable to run the pumps off and every four weeks the pumps are subject to independent testing. Ian Hocking confirmed there was no electrical supply to the pumps.	
2.5 (e)	Previous ordinary hazard special – Ian Hocking confirmed the table of development differences refers to the delivery capacity of the sprinkler head in the previous and new facility. Ian Hocking	

Item	Description	Action
	<p>confirmed the previous facility was able to deliver 30 litres per second from each sprinkler head. The new facility will be able to pump out 52 litres per second, which is far in excess of what is required by the Code and almost double the previous delivery capacity. Ian Hocking confirmed it is the increase to 52 litres of water being delivered per second that has resulted in the need to have 850,000 litres of water on site.</p>	
2.5 (f)	<p>Bunker baled paper and plastic – Ian Hocking confirmed that within the new facility there are separation walls between the baled paper and baled plastics sections and there is also a ceiling on top of the bunker. Inside the bunker there are sprinklers fitted. As a result of the ceiling the bunker is able to cope with the high levels of water that may be used to try and stop the fire spread.</p>	
2.5 (g)	<p>Bunker design – Barbara Dundas asked for confirmation that the bunker was enclosed, and the bunker roof was connected to walls. Ian Hocking confirmed this was correct and that the bunker comprised of three sides of masonry. The purpose of the masonry is to withstand two hours of smoke, two hours of heat and two hours of flame. Ian Hocking confirmed the bunker ceiling supports the sprinkler system.</p>	
2.5 (h)	<p>Sprinkler connection – Barbara Dundas asked for further clarification on the sprinkler mechanism. Ian Hocking confirmed the sprinkler system runs off the mains and the mains sit above the bunkers. When a high temperature is reached the sprinkler glass will automatically break open and commence the sprinkler system.</p>	
2.5 (i)	<p>Water run off containment – Barbara Dundas asked once the sprinkler system is engaged, does the bunker door open and does the bunker fill with water. Ian Hocking confirmed once the sprinklers are set off water can escape down the front of the bunker and there are also water cannons that target water directly into the bunkers. Ian Hocking confirmed any water that is delivered via the sprinkler system is caught within the building itself via a large on-site pit with a capacity of one million litres.</p>	

Item	Description	Action
2.5 (j)	<p>Containment pit – Barbara Dundas asked whether the one million litre containment pit caught all the fire water run-off from within the whole warehouse.</p> <p>Ian Hocking confirmed this was correct and reflected that the effective capture of water had been an important Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) requirement in the design process.</p>	
2.5 (k)	<p>Water cannons – Ian Hocking explained the operation of the water cannons was similar to the effect of water hydrants being open at full flow. Ian Hocking confirmed there are three water cannons across the front of each bunker on an elevated platform. The cannons sit around 6 metres off the ground and can therefore be directed to different areas, such as the tipping floor. Ian Hocking confirmed that in-house training on the operation of the cannons had been conducted.</p>	
2.5 (l)	<p>General fire approach – Barbara Dundas asked whether water was predominantly used to fight plastic fires.</p> <p>Ian Hocking noted in the first instance water was applied to any on-site fire to help reduce heat and stop the fire spread. It was accepted that once the Brigade arrive, they were then responsible for the approach to fire management by the use of whatever means the Brigade deemed most appropriate.</p> <p>Ian Hocking explained the enhancements detailed in the table of development differences were over and above what the NCC requires and had been developed in conjunction with the Department of Fire and Emergency (DFES).</p>	
2.5 (m)	<p>Tipping Floor water run off – Barbara Dundas asked what might happen in the event there was a fire involving batteries or waste oil and requested to know where this water run-off would go.</p> <p>Sang Chi confirmed this water run-off would be channelled to a below the ground on-site water treatment tank.</p>	
2.5 (n)	<p>Water run-off implications – When considering the prospect of a further on-site fire, Barbara Dundas cited a WesTrac report that she believed</p>	

Item	Description	Action
2.5 (o)	<p>had mentioned the use of a million litres of water per hour for ten hours to control a fire. With this example in mind, Barbara Dundas asked what would happen to the Cleanaway run-off in a similar scenario.</p> <p>Ian Hocking explained the new plant design has taken into consideration a method of internal collection of water run-off on-site. The drainage system also has isolation valves installed as part of an upgrade in the new plant. There is also an additional second pit on-site which would allow tankers to pump water out of the external area.</p> <p>Approach to water removal from site – Barbara Dundas raised concern that the turnaround time for tankers to go to Henderson was two hours. Furthermore, Gregory Peterson noted there was potentially the need for the table of development differences to include information on the previous turnaround time to carry water away from the site. Further clarification on this point was sought from CRG Members within a revised table.</p>	<p>ACTION Lenda Oshalem to address tanker turnaround time within the table of development differences future communications shared with CRG and community.</p>
2.5 (p)	<p>Approach to large amounts of water – Barbara Dundas suggested that the table of development differences appeared to address day-to-day issues rather than a worst-case scenario of a large fire. Barbara Dundas expressed concern that there was not a fall-back position for large amounts of water.</p> <p>John Mulholland suggested a number of elements that now contributed to the enhanced approach to larger amounts of water:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The infrastructure of the new plant will be completely different in terms of the segregation of the waste stream. In the previous building the plant flowed from the starting point to the finished goods. There was no concrete walls in the previous building which allowed the fire to spread throughout the building. The new plant provides clear segregation between the plant and the finished goods. 2. There are multiple segregation walls between the high fuel stack areas and within these areas there is a sprinkler system that is designed to specifically target these areas, resulting in a significant fire risk reduction. 3. In the event of a fire, there is now the added capacity of water storage on the new site and a renewed internal infrastructure that can carry any subsequent water waste stream. 	

Item	Description	Action
2.5 (q)	<p>4. Noting DFES had signed off on the new plant design as being sufficient to not allow a fire to spread.</p> <p>Ian Hocking reiterated the importance of the fire wall and provided the example of the previous fire wall protecting the original office that survived the fire and suggested the additional fire walls in the new plant are expected to offer the same degree of protection.</p> <p>External water capture – Barbara Dundas enquired about what happens after there is a fire in a bunker. Barbara believed that after the last fire there were piles outside that smouldered and she was keen to know if this may result in water in the outside quarantine area and in this event, where would that water go.</p> <p>Ian Hocking explained there was a switch on the external pavement that would activate the on-site storm water system that would stop any water escaping the boundary of the site. Ian Hocking confirmed there are systems in place for external and internal water capture.</p>	
2.5 (r)	<p>Facility design – Gregory Peterson enquired if there was a table that outlined the differences specifically in the design of the facility, such as the segregation of bunkers and liquid storage capacity.</p> <p>John Mulholland confirmed table of development differences currently outlined these points.</p> <p>Lenda Oshalem explained that the table of development differences could be shared with an explanation on the variations in the design between the previous and new plant. This was welcomed by CRG Members.</p>	<p>ACTION Lenda Oshalem will develop the technical explanation to complement the Table of Development Differences which can be published on the Cleanaway and City of Swan websites. (It was confirmed CRG Members will be able to share this summary via a link on the Cleanaway website).</p>
2.5 (s)	<p>Future protocol improvements – Robert Watson asked if some of the previous protocols that were in place between Cleanaway and external agencies might be improved in the future. Robert Watson also asked if there had been any change to the process of notification of health facilities.</p> <p>Ian Hocking confirmed there had been a change in the protocol alarm system and that it was now directly linked to DFES and not linked through a secondary monitoring party.</p>	

Item	Description	Action
2.6	<p>Lenda Oshalem recalled that protocols had been previously discussed at the last meeting. Lenda Oshalem noted that Cleanaway had explained that protocols are drafted with all relevant agencies once the plant is near construction completion.</p> <p>City of Swan planning department feedback – Lenda Oshalem noted that Vera Waldby was going to inquire with the City of Swan Planning Department regarding process for Guildford Association getting notification about City of Swan agenda items.</p> <p>Barbara Dundas suggested she had been hoping to obtain a copy of the DFES and the Department of Health reports on the fire, but they had not yet been received.</p> <p>It was agreed for Lenda Oshalem to close off the action item regarding City of Swan planning department feedback and for Barbara Dundas to communicate directly with Vera Waldby on the matter.</p>	
2.7	<p>Notification process – Lenda Oshalem confirmed that she had received information regarding the DWER process for notifying residents on contaminated sites. Lenda Oshalem noted this information is publicly available on the DWER website.</p>	<p>ACTION Lenda Oshalem will distribute the information provided by DWER on the notification process to the CRG via email.</p>
3	<p>DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION UPDATE</p> <p>3.1 Current application status – Ian Hocking outlined:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Licence Amendment was issued on Tuesday 18 August 2020. 2. The Development Application was formally issued on Tuesday 25 August 2020. 3. The Forward Works Permit for construction was issued on Friday 28 August 2020 for the structural and civil works. 4. The remainder of the building permit application is presently with the City of Swan for other works outside the Forward Works Permit. <p>3.2 Demolition permit – Barbara Dundas asked if there had been a demolition permit obtained prior to demolition commencing.</p>	

Item	Description	Action
3.3	<p>Ian Hocking confirmed a planning approval to commence demolition was issued by the City of Swan on Friday 10 January 2020.</p> <p>Lenda Oshalem confirmed an update was sent via City of Swan channels on Tuesday 31 March 2020. It detailed pre-demolition works were to be carried out on Wednesday 01 April 2020 and that demolition works would occur from Monday 06 April 2020 onwards.</p> <p>Steelworks – Barbara Dundas asked for confirmation that building works with steel had commenced at the new plant.</p> <p>Ian Hocking confirmed that in line with the Forward Works Permit, steelworks had commenced on site.</p>	
4	<p>QUESTIONS FROM CRG MEMBERS</p> <p>4.1 Burnt solid waste – Barbara Dundas asked if all the burnt solid waste from the Cleanaway fire in Guildford went to Dardanup.</p> <p>John Mulholland confirmed there was approximately 1,500 to 2,000 tonnes of burnt and damaged waste which was predominantly from the finished goods floor. This entire amount of waste went to the Dardanup facility. John Mulholland confirmed there was no correlation with the fire that occurred in Dardanup a couple of months later.</p> <p>4.2 Contaminant waste test – Barbara Dundas asked whether the fire debris and waste was tested for contaminants to ascertain the appropriate classification and destination for landfill.</p> <p>John Mulholland confirmed the waste had not been tested as it contained all known products that were inert, and Class 1 and the Dardanup landfill is a Class 3 facility.</p> <p>4.3 Loading pallets method – Barbara Dundas asked about the method used to load waste and expressed concern that loading with a bobcat may cause sparks.</p> <p>John Mulholland confirmed there were no bobcats on site and that forklifts were used to clean the floors of rubbish, in line with industry practice in WA and across the country. This practice is not deemed by Cleanaway to be correlated to the cause of the fire; however, it was</p>	

Item	Description	Action
4.4	<p>determined as a potential risk and has been outlawed across the country.</p> <p>Ian Hocking confirmed that despite the DFES investigation the root cause of the fire had not yet been identified.</p> <p>Movement of bales – Barbara Dundas asked how bales were moved and lifted at the plant.</p> <p>John Mulholland confirmed bales are moved and lifted with a forklift attachment.</p>	
4.5	<p>Asbestos presence – Barbara Dundas asked if asbestos had ever been part of the on-site waste stream.</p> <p>John Mulholland confirmed asbestos has never been part of the waste stream and outlined there is no asbestos in the building as asbestos had been outlawed as a building product before the previous plant was constructed. John Mulholland confirmed asbestos is not within the plants waste remit.</p>	
4.6	<p>Waste stream inclusions – Barbara Dundas asked if fibre glass is likely to become part of the waste stream at Cleanaway South Guildford.</p> <p>John Mulholland confirmed fibre glass was not a recyclable commodity and would not be part of the waste stream.</p>	
4.7	<p>Fibre glass particles – Barbara Dundas suggested the plant roof blowing off within the previous fire, resulted in fibre glass particles and large pieces of burnt fibre glass travelling towards Bassendean and Eden Hill. Barbara Dundas asked for clarification on what area DFES asked Cleanaway to clean up.</p> <p>John Mulholland explained that the DWER Pollution Response Unit (PRU) asked Cleanaway to clean up an area around the site manually. John Mulholland explained that around 60 employees who were no longer working on the line were able to contribute to this process and collect any debris they could visually see, both small and large. John Mulholland explained this was undertaken predominantly north of the plant site around the Kingsley Drive and Riverside Drive areas and all open green spaces - in line with DWER requirements.</p>	

Item	Description	Action
4.8	<p>John Mulholland expressed that whilst DWER provided guidance on the area to cover in the clean-up, Cleanaway went above and beyond in their efforts to clear any debris from the fire in the local area.</p> <p>John Mulholland confirmed that fibre glass had a known composition that was not deemed to be hazardous or harmful to human beings.</p> <p>Pollution impact – Barbara Dundas asked if it might have been possible for some toxic fumes from the fire to be carried in the air throughout the local area.</p> <p>John Mulholland explained he did not have the chemical expertise to adequately respond to this enquiry and suggested it may be better for Barbara Dundas to seek expert opinion on the matter.</p>	
4.9	<p>Water tanks – Barbara Dundas asked whether people were advised to empty water tanks because of the risk of large and fine fibre glass fibres as a result of the fire.</p> <p>John Mulholland advised that the DWER Pollution Response Unit (PRU) may be better positioned to respond to this query.</p> <p>Les Egerton added that the PRU had a map on its website that indicated all the places a clean-up operation was completed after the fire that may be able to provide more information on where clean-up efforts were carried out.</p>	
4.10	<p>Estimation of non-recyclable waste – Gregory Peterson asked how much material comes through the plant per week that is not recyclable or that should not be in the recycling stream.</p> <p>John Mulholland estimated they recover 80-95% of all products in the waste stream, the remaining waste was deemed to have no further use or recyclable capacity.</p> <p>John Mulholland confirmed the amount of materials that are not recyclable and should not be in the waste stream is not measured or weighed by Cleanaway.</p> <p>John Mulholland explained that Cleanaway had previously provided an educational program on products that could not be recycled. Part of this education program had included a viewing room in the plant that showed a variety of different products that could not be included in</p>	

Item	Description	Action
<p>4.11</p> <p>4.12</p>	<p>the waste stream. These products would then be segregated and disposed of appropriately.</p> <p>NSW waste plant query – Barbara Dundas mentioned that in NSW she believed there is an incinerator planned for waste that could not be recycled. Barbara Dundas asked about a joint venture she believed Cleanaway had with a recycling plant to be set up in Albury-Wodonga and sought clarification on whether this plant would take anything other than cool drink bottles.</p> <p>John Mulholland mentioned this proposed plant was for specific plastic rather than products that cannot be recycled.</p> <p>Waste destination – Barbara Dundas asked what would happen to the plastic waste that is not send to China, Indonesia or Malaysia.</p> <p>John Mulholland suggested that waste is currently distributed globally and explained that further information on the future phased plans for the distribution of waste can be found online. John Mulholland explained that the Australian Government are currently encouraging industry to come up with internal solutions for waste processing.</p> <p>Given this query was out with the scope of the CRG Terms of Reference it was agreed that further discussion on the matter could be addressed at a separate time.</p>	
<p>5</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p>	<p>OTHER BUSINESS</p> <p>Cleanaway responses to questions – Lenda Oshalem raised the intention of the Cleanaway representatives to respond to all questions as fully as they could. Lenda Oshalem noted that the Cleanaway personnel are sometimes able to provide a personal view and rather than a company position to assist with providing responses to CRG Members’ questions.</p> <p>Additions to the table of development differences – Gregory Peterson raised the importance for the table of development differences to provide some further detail and explanation.</p> <p>Lenda Oshalem confirmed her intention to provide additional information and narrative to the current table of development differences.</p>	<p>ACTION Following distribution of information regarding development differences, Lenda Oshalem will seek feedback on any perceived gaps in information from CRG.</p>

Item	Description	Action
5.3	Barbara Dundas raised health concerns about emissions from waste such as smouldering plastic taken out of the bunker and put in the quarantine area.	ACTION Cleanaway to provide information on how potential emissions could be managed.
6 6.1	PROPOSED FUTURE MEETING DATES Date of next meeting – Shona Gallacher confirmed the next meeting date is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4pm-5pm on Thursday 5 November 2020 	ACTION Shona Gallacher will distribute Meeting Minutes from Thursday 3 September 2020 for comment.