APPENDIX 1

Consultation

APPENDIX 1 - A

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSAL

"The project has obvious and immediate benefits for the poultry industry in the use of manure as a fuel source, which will result in the reduction of the stable fly problem. It is vitally important from a local, regional and state perspective for all energy sources to be utilized for community benefit and this innovative project is worthy of full support. On behalf of Council and the community, I commend you on your initiative and wish you every success with the project" (Ray Hooper, CEO, Shire of Chittering. Letter, 09/08/1999) - prior to Blair Fox Generation indicating an intention to develop the power station in the Shire of Chittering.

"I take this opportunity to confirm Council's wholehearted support for this initiative…Council is particularly interested in the project's potential to eradicate the breeding of Stable Flies, a pest which currently has a severe and detrimental impact not only on the quality of life of many Shire of Gingin residents, but also on the beef cattle industry that has been a mainstay of the Shire for well over 100 years" (S.D. Fraser, CEO, Shire of Gingin. Letter, 19/07/1999).

"Thank you for your invitation to support the Poultry Litter Power Project which will also assist in reducing the problems associated with stable flies on horticultural properties in Kwinana" (Frank Edwards, CEO, Town of Kwinana. Letter, 12/08/1999).

"The City of Wanneroo is interested in this project because it has the potential to eradicate the breeding of Stable Flies, a pest which currently impacts on the quality of life within the City" (Kath White, CEO, City of Wanneroo. Letter, 10/08/ 1999).

"The WA Broiler Growers are to be congratulated for their poultry litter power station project initiative. The power station will confer a number of benefits to the WA chicken meat industry in that it will: solve a major fly breeding problem; be capable of disposing of all manure in the event of an exotic disease outbreak; help increase industry bio-security through the controlled disposal of poultry litter; unify the WA industry through the innovative ownership structure of the power station (being in the form of a cooperative); supply renewable energy to the local chicken meat industry which will confer a marketing advantage over imported produce; and raise the profile of the chicken meat industry in a positive light. The WA industry has again set an industry benchmark that will be the envy of all States, and one which has the full support of the Australian Chicken Meat Federation" (Dr Jeff Fairbrother, Executive Director, Australian Chicken Meat Federation. Letter, 15/06/00).

"Our Company is excited that Blair Fox Generation WA is proposing to construct a power station using poultry litter to fire the power station. We are happy to support this project in Western Australia and see it as the first of many poultry litter fired power stations in Australia" (PJ Manning, General Manager, Inghams Enterprises Pty Ltd. Letter, 20/07/1999).

"The Poultry Farmers Association of WA (Inc) wish to add their support for this project. As you may be aware the Association has been investigating all avenues for the disposal of poultry manure and waste management…There are obviously costs associated with any processing and given the ever increasing quantities of poultry litter in WA there is an urgent need for an environmentally acceptable and low cost-effective means of disposal…Accordingly, the Association wish to add their support to this project" (Rob DePrato, President, Poultry Farmers Association of WA Inc. Letter, 09/08/1999).

"I believe this project offers a neat solution to the environmental problems of waste reduction, odour control, fly breeding and reducing greenhouse gas emissions" (Dr Stephen Schuck, Manager, Biomass Taskforce. Letter, 13/07/1999).

"The joint proposal [between the broiler growers of WA and Blair Fox Generation WA] for the generation of electricity from burning poultry litter would be the first application of its kind in Australia and is to be commended. I support this proposal" (Colin J Barnett, Minister for Energy. Letter, 06/08/1999).
"The project warrants strong support for a number of reasons…I thereby support this project" (Monty House, Minister for Primary Industry; Fisheries. Letter, 23/03/1999).
"I believe the power generation project does offer a solution to the fly problem as well as other environmental problems associated with the use of poultry manure, such as odour and groundwater pollution. The other obvious benefits are that the project would be assisting in the government's waste reduction/recycling strategy and utilizing a waste resource to produce renewable energy" (Michael P Jackson, Director Environmental Health Service, Health Department of WA. Letter, 02/08/1999).
"Provided that emissions from the combustion process meet environmental standards, the burning of the litter to generate electricity will provide a solution with multiple benefits…The Office of Energy would approve electricity from such a source under its Green Power Accreditation program" (Dr Mary Dale, Director Energy Innovation, Office of Energy. Letter, 15/06/00).
"Your company is to be congratulated on your initiative and vision in your plans for generating electricity using a waste material such as broiler litter. This will not only solve the problem of getting rid of all the broiler litter used by commercial farms in WA but it will help greatly towards reducing the stable fly problem….This plant will indeed provide WA with a facility with hitherto unheard of capacity to dispose of contaminated litter and it will set a benchmark for the rest of Australia and probably the world" (Dr John Edwards, Manager Animal Industry Protection, Agriculture WA. Letter, 4/7/00).

APPENDIX 1 - B

LOCAL PAPER - REPORT OF INITIAL PUBLIC MEETING

NEWS • SPORT • LIFESTYLE
Advocate
• Bullsbrook • Ellenbrook • The Vines • Swan Valley • Chittering Valley • Muchea • Bindoon • Gingin

Company boss responds to manure power concerns

THE people behind the proposal for a poultry litter-fired power station near Muchea have responded to residents' calls for more information on the project.

Matthew Rosser, Managing Director of Blair Fox Generation WA, the company behind the proposal, contacted the *Advocate* this week to address community concerns and explain the proposal in further detail.

The proposed site is about five kilometres north of Muchea, opposite the Tiwest plant on Brand Highway.

Mr Rosser said concerns raised at the recent public meeting included the impact of the power plant on ground water, noise and odour from the plant and the potential for fly breeding.

Mr Rosser said the "key motivator" for the power station is "to address the issue of stable fly breeding, which has been identified as a major problem in the region and is associated with the current practice of spreading poultry litter on the ground as an agricultural fertiliser."

"All practicable steps will be taken to ensure that flies will not breed in the litter stored at the plant," he said.

Such measures are to include ensuring the stored litter is kept dry by keeping it in an enclosed shed, and making sure the litter is used within seven days of it arriving on-site.

"The poultry litter would need to be kept on-site in a moist state and uncovered for approximately 10 days for flies to complete their development to the adult stage," Mr Rosser said.

He said that if it is necessary to use chipped tree material as a "supplementary fuel" for the power plant, this will have to be stored on the site.

"This will be stored outside on a hard-stand area and covered," he said.

"We have expert advice that fly breeding will not take place in this material."

He said the power station has the support of the Stable Fly Management Committee who were set up to advise the Government on how to eradicate this problem.

•More, page 6

Response to manure power concerns

•From page 1

Another of the "key outcomes" of the power station, according to Mr Rosser, is the "protection of the valuable ground water resource."

"The current practice of spreading poultry litter on farm land results in the potential for unwanted nutrients leaching into the water table, which is a concern worldwide.

"The poultry litter-fired power station addresses this problem in three ways," he said.

"Firstly, it removes the litter from horticultural use and uses it to create renewable energy.

"Secondly, the generation process has built-in safeguards to ensure no contact is made with the ground water source.

"The first safeguard is in the transportation procedures.

"The litter is transported in covered trucks directly from the chicken sheds.

"It is then tipped inside a shed with a concrete floor at the power plant.

"At no time during transportation does the litter come into contact with the ground."

Mr Rosser said the second safeguard was due to the method of storing the litter.

"During the seven-day period when litter is stored at the plant prior to utilisation, it resides on a coffered concrete floor undercover of a shed - again not coming into contact with the ground," he said.

The third of the safeguards involves the treatment of waste water.

"Wastes from the operation of the power station that have the potential to leach into the ground water - waste water from staff toilets, the truck washdown bay and boiler blowdown - will be treated on-site using DEP approved treatment processes to cleanse the watse water to a level where it will meet environmental standards," Mr Rosser said.

He used the example of sewage watse from the plant, which will be "treated using an aerobic treatment unit similar to those that are commonly used in the area."

"...the plant is being engineered to ensure noise levels will be 'well below' government guidelines."

Mr Rosser said the plant is being engineered to ensure noise levels will be "well below" the government's guidelines.

"For example, allowable noise levels at the boundary are currently around 60 decibels and it is expected that the noise emissions from the plant will be 45 decibels at the boundary," he said.

He said the plant has also been designed with the intention of reducing odour.

"This is achieved principally by ensuring that no more poultry litter than is currently contained on a large poultry farm is stored on-site, by keeping the stored and litter in a dried state, and by storing it in a shed," Mr Rosser said.

"Furthermore, the site that is proposed has the advantage of being five kilometres north of the Muchea townsite and would require a northerly wind to carry any odour into the town.

"Wind directional analysis undertaken by the Bureau of Meteorology shows that northerly winds occur rarely in the area."

Mr Rosser said Blair Fox Generation WA is looking forward to "the possibility of locating Australia's first poultry-litter fired power station in Muchea."

"The preferred site has much to recommend it: it is located on a major, designated transport route; it provides good access to Western Power's zone substation and AlintaGas connection point; and it has good access to water," he said.

"Additionally, Muchea is well situated in terms of poultry farm locations."

He said the company hoped the information he had provided would help relieve community concerns, and anticipated "continued fruitful discussions as the project develops."

"As a Renewable Energy generator with an agricultural background and ownership, we appreciate the positive impact that such a development can have in increasing confidence and wealth within the region and hope the community will support us in creating clean, green energy from an agricultural waste," Mr Rosser said.

Blair Fox Generation WA is owned by WA Broiler Growers and Blair Fox Pty Ltd.

APPENDIX 1 - C

CONSULTATION SESSION WITH THE SHIRE OF CHITTERING

at the Council Offices on Thursday, July 5, 2001

Those present:

- Chittering Shire Council
  Cr J. Tomlinson (President) Cr S. Shapiro (Deputy President)
  Cr J. Stagbower Cr. A. Douglas
  Cr. B. Hughes Cr. L. Bush
  Apologies: Cr P. Finch
- Shire of Chittering
  Mr R. Hooper (CEO) Mr D. Stewart (Deputy CEO)
  Mr D. Lawn Mr. L. Davidson
  Mr M. Selby Mr M. South
- Mr M. Rosser, Blair Fox Generation Pty Ltd
- Mr D. Pitt, Welker Environmental Consultancy
- Dr P. Dingle and Ms C. Watkins, Dingle and Bird Environmental Consultancy Pty Ltd
- Mr T. Beaumont, Alstom Power
- Dr D. Rosser, Blair Fox Generation Pty Ltd (recorder).

The meeting commenced with opening remarks by Pres. Tomlinson, followed by a brief overview of the Poultry Litter Fired Power Station project by Matthew Rosser.

Q: Will you import fill or excavate on-site?
A: All fill will be imported from a licensed facility.

The next presentation was from David Pitt, on the air emissions.

Q:	Do the figures include odour from Tiwest? Should it be included? Is odour additive; is there a cumlative effect?
A:	The DEP would assume that I should add them and see the cumulative effect.
Q:	What if there were chemical odours?
A:	If we are protecting emissions against health criteria, we protect against odours from chemical emissions by default.
Q:	Will there be no odour?
A:	The odour will disperse over distance. It will not be offensive at the nearest residence.
Q:	Are you saying you will be able to scrub for odours?
A:	Yes. The only odour is that which escapes from the shed. You can scrub for odour. The odour will be drawn from the stockpile into the boiler and combusted.
Comment (Councillor):	Poultry litter smell is not a problem anyway. Neighbours should be concerned about the odours that come out of the stack.
Response (D. Pitt)	I am confident that what comes out of the stack will not smell.
Q:	What do the gases look like and how do we be sure that people, animals, plants are not harmed? What are these gases?

A:	An explanation of sulphur dioxide and its effects on a person. Tells Council that the levels of emission are so low as to preclude any of these effects.
Comment (Councillor)	Local corrosion from Tiwest sulphur dioxide emissions are a problem.
A:	Quite understandable that they would be, but the power station will have nothing like that mass of emission.
Q:	What assumptions do you make about the size of the particles coming out of the stack?
A:	We assume the size of 10 microns in our modeling.
Q:	What will the plume look like?
A:	Clear. On a very cool day, very early in the morning, you will see water vapour from the cooling tower.
Q:	Was the inversion layer we experience here included in your modeling?
A:	Most definitely.
Q:	How confident are you in your study? You have a disclaimer at the beginning of the environmental report.
A:	I am very confident that there will be no adverse environmental impacts from this project. We need to always put a disclaimer on our reports, the insurance company requires it. You also need to consider that the DEP requires us to take a very conservative approach to all our modeling, so we assume that Tiwest is running to 100% of its licensed emission limits and that the power station is also running at 100% of its licensed emission limits at all times. This is very conservative and you have to assume it will not happen.
Q:	Does the modeling include re-starts?
A:	Emission levels assume start-up, which is what the modeling is run on. Start-up is the worst case scenario.
Q:	Can you run on gas alone?
A:	We can't run on gas because we will be regulated to provide renewable electricity. You would have to assume a shut-down if you ran out of fuel.

The next presentation was by Dr Dingle and Ms Watkins, on the Health Risk Assessment (Dioxins). The Health Risk Assessment used a multi- pathway methodology which assumes that a person lives 100% of the time in the area near the power station; and obtains all their food and drink from crops or animals grown in the area around the power station.

Q:	Did you look at the effects on people who eat grains, as we have no dairy cattle here?
A:	The model looks at the whole food chain, grains included, and assumes that the crops were grown near the power station. It assumes people drink milk from cows that graze near the power station.
Q:	How did you ascertain what people eat?
A:	We didn't have to determine what people actually ate. The model assumes that all the food that anyone could possibly want to eat is grown or produced locally in the vicinity of the power station.

This would never happen, so it is definitely looking a worse-case scenario. That is, if everyone's diet was as contaminated as it could be by the power station, what would the health risk then be?

Q: You have used a methodology for your model that was used in a waste-to-energy plant elsewhere. Shouldn't you use a model that dealt with poultry litter, like you will be combusting?

A: That's not quite the way to look at it. You need to look at where dioxin comes from. Both plants have similar source materials– ie the level of chlorine in the material and the temperature of the plants will be the same. The assumptions of our methodology are scientifically sound.

Q: You have used a New Zealand dietary intake of dioxin as representing the lowest in the world. Are you saying that with the poultry litter fired power station we will be even lower?

A: What we are saying is that the additional intake that would be added to the body burden by the power station is 0.0008 or so of the NZ intake.

Q: Does it worry you that the World Health Organization has reduced the dioxin standard from 10 to 4? How confident can we be in the standards?

A: There is no guarantee. Most standards will come down over time. However, this is a strong model as it assumes all pathways are a source of contaminant. While the standards will always come down, they will come down much less in the future than they have in the past as they previously only assumed a few pathways of intake. The concept of the existing body burden is relatively new and is reflected in current standards.

A question also arose regarding why a resident of the Shire, Ms S. Metcalfe, had been contacted during the Health Risk Assessment. It was explained to the Council that Ms Metcalfe was consulted as a resident of long-term standing who would be able to identify key stakeholder groups for further consultation.

An additional reference, which was not made at the time of the meeting, is that Ms Metcalfe first came to the attention of the project as a member of the Ellenbrook Catchment Group.

A series of other questions arising from the Environmental document were then put to Mr Rosser.

Q: Were you aware that Main Roads WA have raised Brand Hwy 0.9M?

A: Yes, we were aware and that has been taken into consideration in our design.

Q: Have the Water & Rivers' Commission said you can have the water?

A: This question was taken on notice as we needed to confirm the actual arrangement, which is:
We have been granted an exploratory licence to prove the reserves. This work cannot be undertaken until we have site approval.

Q: Do you need on-site security?

A: The plant will be running 24 hours/day so there will be no need to have additional security. It will operate from a fenced site. Additional information not provided at the time: We will support and join the Rural Watch program if one is operating in the area.

Q: How often will trucks be going to the power station?

A:	Trucks will operate between 7am and 7pm, 6 days' per week.
Q:	Is there any reason you can't take the fuel and combust it immediately, rather than stockpile it?
A:	No, we can do that within reason. The stockpile is there for surety of supply to the boilers and assists with consistency of the material, particularly in respect to moisture.
Q:	Will the ponds be isolated, and how deep will they be?
A:	They will be built to the latest DEP specification and sized to take a 1:100 year flood situation. The entire operating site will be raised to the Shire's requirements of 1M minimum and the ponds will be on that built-up area.
Q:	What will happen to the ash? Will it be stockpiled? Where will it be housed?
A:	Only 8 tonnes of ash per year are produced. It will be removed to meet demand and stored in the meantime in a sealed silo on site.
Q:	What is the height of the building?
A:	14 metres.
Q:	What happens to the residue in the scrubbing process?
A:	The scrubber takes out particulate material, which will be the ash fertilizer. In respect to the dioxin, only miniscule quantities are left.
Q:	Do you intend to create a wetland or rejuvenate an existing site on the block?
A:	Definitely rejuvenate; possibly create a new wetland if appropriate (the ponds may have some vegetation on their borders, but we would need to be advised by the botanist regarding this).
Q:	Will the poultry industry keep plastic bags, etc out of the litter? Will you need to filter the litter or will the poultry industry take care of that?
A:	Present biosecurity practices in the industry will protect us from the need to re-filter the litter. We will combust nothing but poultry litter or other Federally-licensed material.
Q:	Where does the carbon credit come from? What is what you are doing not a deficit?
A:	Renewable energy is seen by some people as being just wind or solar, ie sources that renew themselves without human involvement. What, then, is a bio-fuel (or biomass fuel)? Basically, a renewable energy source is one that does not unlock carbon that is stored underground. Fossil fuels take carbon (in the form, for example, of coal, gas or oil) from under the ground and release them in the atmosphere. Poultry litter and other bio-fuels take a source of fuel that is already above ground (with its carbon circulating in the atmosphere) and generate electricity from it. In doing this, they are displacing the need to dig up more carbon from underground to meet society's energy needs.
Comment (Councillor):	You claim that the ash provides all the benefits of poultry litter, except nitrogen. This is wrong. Raw poultry litter also inoculates the soil against disease. And it does not leach through to the water table.
A:	We would have to differ on those opinions.
Q:	How do you plan to deal with spontaneous combustion in the fuel?
A:	That will be part of a fire control strategy for the whole plant.
Q:	Why are you not having sulphur scrubbers?
A:	The sulphur content of the poultry litter is low anyway and the expected

emissions are below the levels required by the DEP.
Additional comment: The baghouse technology allows us to scrub for sulphur if those limits were exceeded, which is not expected. This was one of the benefits of having baghouse technology in the design.

Q: If the litter is already 2 days' old when you get it, won't flies breed in it?

A: No. It will be stored in a closed shed, and used before flies can breed.

Q: You are saying that you will have 100,000 tonnes of poultry litter per year and the industry is growing at 4% per year. Won't you soon need to build another plant?

A: Certainly not in the near future. Any excess will be sent to composting. It is unlikely that the 4% pa growth rate will be sustained for ever in the industry. Some years down the track, though, it may be necessary to have another facility in the metropolitan area but this would probably be south of the river.

APPENDIX 1 - D

ADVERTISEMENT FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION EVENING

Meeting for litter station tomorrow

A REMINDER to Muchea residents that an information evening regarding the proposed Poultry Litter Fired Power Station will be held tomorrow night (July 27).

The meeting will be held at the Muchea Hall from 6pm to 9pm.

A public consultation document is available at the Muchea shop and the Chittering Shire Library.

Operation Sandpit 2.

It ended last Friday with the capture of seven youths in a stolen

Police are grateful for the phone calls from the public throughout last Friday.

PROPOSED POULTRY LITTER FIRED POWER STATION

Environmental Issues – Public Consultation Document

Blair Fox Generation WA has placed copies of the Environmental Issues - Public Consultation Document at the Muchea shop and the Chittering Shire Library. Copies have also been circulated amongst stakeholder groups.

An information evening about the project will be held at the Muchea Hall on Friday July 27, 2001 from 6pm to 9pm.

ADVOCATE CLASSIFIEDS

Your local noticeboard

BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES

Due to family commitments

BUSINESS FOR SALE

FLORIST

PUBLIC NOTICES

GINGIN DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL

Expressions of Interest for Kindergarten & Pre-Primary Students for 2002

PUBLIC NOTICES

Muchea Progress, Recreation and Sporting Association (Inc–29/06/1911)

Annual General Meeting

Monday 9th July 2001, 7.30pm

SITUATIONS VACANT

Real Estate Career

RURAL SALES

We are seeking a team player to join our successful network. Experience preferred but not essential. The desire to earn in excess of $75,000 in the first year is important.

For a confidential interview phone John on 9296 7788.

APPENDIX 1 - E

LETTER TO RATEPAYERS

BLAIR FOX GENERATION

Friday, July 20, 2001

G & D EDWARDS
14 ASHTON COURT
CARINE 6020

Dear Resident,

Public Meeting - Muchea Hall - July 27th, 6pm to 9pm

Blair Fox Generation WA proposes to construct a poultry litter power station on land opposite the Tiwest facility on the Brand Highway. Before submitting our application to the Environmental Protection Authority and the Chittering Shire we are undertaking a consultation process.

We would like to offer you the opportunity to meet with us on Friday, July 27 at 6pm at the Muchea town hall. We will have with us a group of experts who will be available to discuss the project with you.

If you require further information regarding the project, prior to the meeting, copies of the our Environmental Review Document are located at the Chittering Library and Muchea shop.

Yours sincerely

MANAGING DIRECTOR
BLAIR FOX GENERATION

Blair Fox Generation WA Pty Ltd, Suite 4, 164 Beaufort St, Perth Western Australia 6000
Tel +61 8 92288846 Fax +61 8 92270488 Email: blairfox@cygnus.uwa.edu.au

POULTRY LITTER FIRED POWER STATION

Where is the proposed site for the power station?

On the Brand Hwy, directly opposite Tiwest.

What is the fuel?

A mixture of bird droppings and bedding material (eg sawdust).

Will it smell?

No odour will be noticeable at the nearest residence.

Why won't it smell?

Three reasons: 1. The fuel will be kept in a closed storage area and air will be drawn off from there and fed into the boiler. 2. The fuel will be kept dry. 3. The plant will be sited to minimise neighbours being downwind of prevailing winds.

Will flies breed in the poultry litter?

No. The litter will be dry, which discourages breeding. It will also be used before the breeding can occur (ie. within 7 days).

Will it be dusty?

To protect from dust and flies, the litter will arrive in covered trucks and tipped into the closed storage shed.

Will the groundwater be harmed?

No. No water will leave the site. The site will be built up to Shire guidelines (approx. 1 metre).

Will the plant or trucks be noisy?

The plant is well within noise standards and will not vibrate. Trucks will not run before 7am or after 7pm, nor on Sunday.

Power Station Facts

- **Will employ 15 full time workers √**
- **Will employ 125 workers during construction √**
- **Commitment to employ / buy local √**
- **"Clean and Green" √**
- **Renewable Energy √**
- **Displaces 81,000 tonnes CO_2 per year √**
- **Won't pollute groundwater √**
- **No run-off will leave site √**
- **Won't breed flies √**
- **Solution to stable fly problem √**
- **No offensive odour at any residence √**

How Can I Learn More?

Did you see our ad in the Advocate? We are holding a Public Information Session at the Muchea Hall on Friday, July 27, 6-9pm.

Come along and meet a panel of experts to discuss your concerns about groundwater, air emissions, vegetation, pollutants, odour.

A Document for Public Review has been prepared. It can be borrowed from the Shire Library or the Muchea Shop.

We first went to the Muchea Community in February 2000. We didn't have a lot we could tell you then, but we wanted to find out which issues we had to address to satisfy your concerns about the power station.

The group's main areas of concern were pollution of the air and groundwater, and odour. Our commitment is to build a plant that you can take pride in...that generates clean, green electricity for our State.

Will there be any adverse health effects on me or my family from dioxins?

No. Even in the worst case scenario, which is used for environmental assessment purposes, the power station would add only extremely minute levels of dioxin to humans, crops, water and animals in the vicinity.

Even so, we will put sophisticated dioxin scrubbers on the plant, just to be even more sure.

Who will regulate the power station to protect our community?

Unlike many industries, Renewable Energy Power Stations have two levels of licensing and regulations to meet – State (EPA) and Federal (Australian Greenhouse Office).

How are you going to ensure no run-off gets into the groundwater?

The whole site will be raised to Shire specifications (approx 1 metre), including the evaporation ponds. We will create or rejuvenate a wetland area for filtering. Stored chemicals will be bunded. All roads on site will be sealed and water from truck washdown bay will be diverted to evaporation ponds, which will be double lined to latest DEP standard and cleaned by licensed contractor.

How will the power station work and what can I expect to see, hear and smell?

Poultry litter fuel will be transported in covered trucks to the power station between 7am and 7pm Monday to Saturday. The plant will operate continuously, 24 hours/day, 7 days/week. The truck will back into a closed storage shed and add its load to a stockpile (max. 7 days' supply). External surfaces of the trucks will be washed for biosecurity reasons. Extractors placed above the stockpile will draw odourous air out of the shed and into the boiler, where it will aid combustion. The fuel will be fed into a boiler, where it is combusted to raise steam which will drive a steam turbine and generate renewable electricity.

No odour will come from the stack. You will not see a plume except on very cold mornings, when a thin wisp from the cooling tower will be visible. When the native vegetation that we will plant is grown, the plant will be screened except for the stack (40m high). Noise from the plant will not generally disturb the nearest residence, but unusual events will be scheduled for weekdays.

Why pick this site?

1. Close to electricity zone substation. 2. On major transport route. 3. Available water. 4. Gas pipeline.

APPENDIX 1 - F

COMMUNITY INFORMATION EVENING

MUCHEA HALL, JULY 27, 2001. 6 – 9PM

Those who signed the attendance register were:

NAME	NAME (Please Print)
M. GRUBISHA	JULIA DERENCH
M. FEWSTER	JACKIE CONNOLLY
R. JONES	GLENYS YOZZI
DAVID LAWN	SUE CURRIE
F. FEWSTER	MAXINE KING
MATHEW SELBY	VERONICA ROBINSON
L. L. DILETTI	LAURIE BUSH
B.V. HERRERA	PAUL VARNEY
P.E. HERRERA	BOB CALVER
STEVE PAVLINOVICH	NIGEL RUFFLE?
RON PAVLINOVICH	JAN RUFFLE?
DARRYL HART	ROBERT DAVIS
STEVE HART	GREG CHADWICK
IAN HALL	WAYNE BROCK
PAUL MARTIN	MARGARET BROCK
CAREY MARTIN	TRUDY WATSON
Indecipherable	STEVE VALLANCE
L. DEW	TANYA WARES
HELEN SCOTT	KIM FEWSTER
WALLY CIUPRYK	
PIERS GOODMAN	
LEE BELL	
RENATO BRUNO	
SHANE ROBINSON	
SHIRLEY GILLIES	

NAME	NAME (Please Print)
DON BINKS	
GAVIN RUTHERFORD	
BOB ROGERS	
ANNE INGHAM	
GARRY McGLEW	
DAVE GUY	
TANIA GUY	
JAN STAGBOUER	
LANCE STAGBOUER	

The proponents had in attendance the following consultants:

- Dr Peter Dingle (Health Risk Assessment – Dioxins)
- Dr Eleanor Bennett (Botanical Survey)
- Mr David Pitt (Air Quality, Odour)
- Mr Kevin Haselgrove (Hydrogeological Survey)

Blair Fox Generation was represented by Mr Matthew Rosser and Dr Debra Rosser.

The information evening began with consultants stationed at tables with their respective reports, able to answer individual queries or address particular issues raised by members of the community.

In response to requests, a Public Meeting format was arranged so that everyone could hear the answers to questions raised.

Notes from this meeting were taken by Dr Debra Rosser and provide a summary of the main questions raised and responses given by the proponents and consultants.

The key issue raised was acknowledged by the meeting to be outside the scope of the proponents to address: *"If we let this plant go ahead, how will you stop the domino effect of more industry in Muchea?"*

1. General Comment From the Floor:

The poultry power project is in essence okay. But the site is wrong. You are on

1. The Ellenbrook
2. A gazetted flood plain

3. You can fight with Tiwest over whose emissions emanate from
4. If it goes there, it makes a mockery of the government setting up the Ellenbrook Catchment Group.

2. General Comment From the Floor:

Many people's land will be downgraded because of the Kwinana-type scenario; only industry will consider locating in the area.

3. Question From The Floor:

When you're cleaning out the [evaporation] ponds, where will it go?

Response: Via a licensed contractor to a licensed disposal site. Only small quantities of material will come from the ponds (a couple of truck loads per year – dependent on the mineral content of the ground water).

4. Question From The Floor:

Have any other sites been looked at or is this the only one?

Response: This site is most suitable because of proximity to the electricity zone substation and land access to it; the gas offtake; the availability of water; the major transport route.

5. Question From The Floor:

Have you got access to the gas? We don't.

Answer from Shire President Tomlinson: The connection is not suitable for a domestic gas offtake.

6. Question From The Floor:

How big are the ponds and how will they be emptied? Will they be concrete or plastic lined?

How many ponds? Will there be any monitoring bores near the ponds?

Response from Mr Pitt: There will be two ponds, for alternate use, double-lined to DEP standards with plastic and sized for a 1:100 year flood situation. The ponds will comply completely with DEP requirements, both in construction and management.

More information was sought and this has been taken from the Public Consultation Document and reproduced below.

"The liquid and solid waste management systems are designed to prevent any contaminated material from entering the wider environment.

All potentially contaminating effluent streams will be directed to the evaporation ponds. Each evaporative pond will have dimensions of 100m x 50m and bund walls not less than 2m high. The required evaporative area was estimated by Process

Developments based by rationing data from the Tiwest site where they use a pond with an area of 40,000m^2 to evaporate rainwater from 96,000m^2 of paved area.
The ponds will be fully sealed using two layers of 1mm thick Nylex Millennium Flexible Polypropelene with an intermediate layer of Geonet.
The Geonet between the dual liners will be drained to catchment sumps outside the bund walls. This will allow any seepage through the upper liner (eg due to a tear) to be detected and repairs made thus ensuring that any escape of effluent from the ponds is prevented.

The proponent is committed to the ongoing investigation of further measures to re-use and recycle plant wastes. This process will be incorporated into the Environmental Management Plan."

"Evaporation ponds will be lined according to DEP guidelines and sludge removed regularly by a licensed contractor."

"Stormwater from areas subject to contamination, waste water from truck washdowns, RO plant retentate, boiler blowdown water and other process effluents will be discharged to two evaporation ponds with a minor amount being used for the trickle irrigation of areas landscaped with native vegetation.

The estimated volume of water required to be evaporated is 13,000m^3/pa from stormwater falling on the 240m x 80m area covered by the power station plant and yard areas plus approximately 12,000m^3/pa of retentate and washwater.
Each evaporative pond will have dimensions of 100m x 50m and bund walls not less than 2m high. The required evaporative area was estimated by Process Developments based by rationing data from the Tiwest site where they use a pond with an area of 40,000m^2 to evaporate rainwater from 96,000m^2 of paved area.
The ponds will be fully sealed using two layers of 1mm thick Nylex Millennium Flexible Polypropelene with an intermediate layer of Geonet.

7. Question From The Floor and Comment 3:

Where will the water come from? Our water is dropping all the time in our bores and if you take our groundwater we will be worse off.

Response from Mr Haselgrove: This operation will not affect Muchea's available groundwater. You are too far away.

8. Question From The Floor:

If there's an adverse effect and they cut your allowance, where are you going to draw water from?

Response from Mr Haselgrove: This is a common occurrence and is often only temporary. The additional amount needs to be found elsewhere during that time.

9. Question From The Floor:

Who are you selling the power to?

Response: This is confidential information, but we can tell you that the State Government only allows us to sell to people who are using a minimum of $5,000 in electricity now. We can't sell to

smaller customers. The chicken growers and poultry processors mostly fit that profile. However, by 2005 the Government assures us that we will be able to sell to the domestic market.

10. Question From The Floor:

Are you selling at a cheaper price?

Response: Most definitely. We have to.

11. Question 13:

Why can't you take it a further 10Km north?

Response: Reiterates the earlier response regarding site suitability.

12. Question 14:

Will the trucks be running all day every day?

Response: Generally Monday to Saturday, but some Sunday runs might occur in daylight hours.

13. Question From The Floor:

If the trucking companies go on strike, will flies breed in the litter?

Response: Alternative transport arrangements will be made so that the fuel supply to the plant is not impeded. The stockpile within the plant will be handled as usual in that scenario.

14. Question From The Floor:

What is the Shire's position on this?

Response from Shire President Tomlinson: Neither for nor against. If you have a legitimate question, we will support you in getting an answer.

15. Question 17, Comment 4:

It's the best concept ever, but we all shifted to Muchea for a rural life – not Kwinana. What else is going to come? The Chittering Shire is a rural shire.

The proponents did not respond to this comment.

16. Question From The Floor:

And is the plant going to get bigger?

Response: No.

17. Question From The Floor and Comment 5:

Dioxins are persistent organic pollutants that bio-accumulate. Mrs Fewster then listed the adverse health effects of dioxins. What are the estimated 12 month amounts of dioxins from the power station?

Response from Dr Dingle: Worst case scenario for the annual exposure for someone living on the perimeter of the site and obtaining all their food from the land etc can be compared to a very light exposure to passive smoking for a brief (minutes) period of time.

18. Question From The Floor:

Do you know what Tiwest's dioxins are because I don't want any more problems than what we've got now? We have been experiencing spontaneous abortion in our stock, miscarriage and other misfortunes. Could these be related to the presence of Tiwest?

Response: We do not have the ability to comment on Tiwest and can only answer for ourselves. [At this point it became obvious that a member of the audience, Mr Ron Jones, had been taping the meeting without the knowledge or permission of the proponents or, apparently, of the majority of the community members present. There followed a longish presentation on Tiwest from Mr Jones until he was eventually asked to resume his seat].

19. Question From The Floor:

What does the paragraph in the [Public Consultation Document] mean about noise as opposed to unusual noise?

Response: Promise for more clarification from the document, but essentially it meant that any unusual events would be confined to weekdays in case they were likely to cause an unusual disturbance.

The following is from the Public Consultation Document:

> *"The major noise sources from the power station are from vehicle movements, conveyors and running machinery in the litter shed, and fans and pumps associated with the boiler and turbine.*
> *The proponent has □inimized□ the need to □inimize noise impacts. The general location was selected on the basis of having a 1 km buffer distance from any residence. A significant factor in the decision to site the facility at the southern-eastern end of the block was to □inimize the separation from nearby residences. The boiler and turbine, which are considered to be the noisiest items of equipment, are housed in a concrete building designed for noise attenuation.*
> *The nearest residences to the proposal site (ie. those shown in Table 11 above), are all within about 200 metres of the Brand Hwy and would therefore be subject to some traffic noise. The estimated daily traffic along this section of the highway is about 2,000 vehicles per day. This is below the 6,000 vehicles per day level that is required for the assigned noise levels at any residence to be modified on the basis of existing traffic noise...*

[T]he nearest resident to the proposal site, does however, lie within 450 metres of Tiwest's industrial zoned property and is therefore subject to +0.6 dB(A) adjustment to its assigned noise levels. The other nearby residences are more than 450 m away from the Tiwest site and are therefore not

subject to any such adjustments. The determining criteria are, therefore, that "night-time" (ie. between 10pm and 7am) noise emissions from the proposed power station:

- *should not cause a level of 35.6 dB(A) to be exceeded at the nearest residence, located 1.35 km away; and should not cause a level of 35 dB(A) to be exceeded at any other residence.*

The power station will be engineered to achieve these criterion under normal operating conditions. As an added safeguard, the plant will also be engineered to achieve a level of 45 dB(A) at the site boundary.
Noise impacts from traffic directly associated with the proposal will be □inimized by having deliveries of poultry litter and other feedstock materials to the facility limited to 7am to 7pm Mondays to Saturdays.
Infrequent activities that may cause high noise emissions, such as boiler blowdowns, will also be restricted to 7am to 7pm Mondays to Saturdays.

Additional measures to mitigate against noise impacts will include planting trees around the perimeter of the facility."

20. Question 23:

Would you employ local people?

Response: We see renewable energy as being particularly significant a factor in stimulating regional economies, and employing local people – particularly local youth – is part of that shift. Blair Fox Generation is committed to an 'employ local / buy local' approach.

21. Question 24:

What is flyash? Is it hazardous to the workers?

Response: Flyash is a very fine ash from the baghouse (pollution control gear on the boiler – scrubbed out of the exhaust gas stream). This is contained in a sealed environment and people are not exposed to it.

22. Question From The Floor:

Have Blair Fox Generation got any more of these power stations?

Response: No.

23. Question From The Floor:

Have you followed up on any problems that other plants have had, or met with any community groups over there in Europe?

Response: No, we have not met with any community groups in Europe. Plants tend to keep their problems to themselves, but we have tried to ensure we have a well-designed plant that will not cause any problems.

24. Question From The Floor:

Will your plant be less stringent than the regulations in Europe?

Response: Well, there are no dioxin scrubbers on plants in Europe and we've got them here, and it's not because we've got more dioxins it's because we're more strictly regulated.

25. Question From The Floor:

Will you be having sulphur scrubbers?

Response: No.

26. Question From The Floor:

Will you tell us why?

Response: Because there are low levels of sulphur in the fuel and emissions are below the EPA criterion (below 40% of criterion).

27. Question From The Floor:

What chemicals are going to be on site?

Response: There will be no PCB's or anything of that nature. This question was taken on notice to provide more detail and the following is drawn from the Public Consultation Document:

"Any chemicals [will] be stored onsite in sealed drums to DEP standards and bunded where appropriate in order to ensure containment in the event of a spillage from the general stormwater drainage system."

Cleaning chemicals will be held on site and also caustic soda.

28. Question From The Floor:

Are there any cooling systems on-site?

Response: There will be no 'coolants' as such. The cooling tower will use water. The following is drawn from the Public Consultation Document.

"Cooling tower blowdown water will be treated in a reverse osmosis (RO) plant to recover water for use. The blowdown water flow-rate from the evaporative condenser or cooling tower will be approximately $12m^3/h$. The plant will comprise a microfiltration unit, a reverse osmosis (RO) plant and an RO permeate concentration plant. The plant will process 12 m^3/h blowdown fluid to produce 11 m^3/h of reuse water and 1 m^3/h (8,000 m^3/y) of concentrated RO permeate with impurity concentrations that are approximately 36 times the impurity concentrations in the bore water. The RO plant will also use 12 m^3/day (4,000 m^3/y) of water for cleaning. Some of this water will be a 0.5% w/w caustic soda solution and some of the water may be a 0.7% w/w nitric acid solution. Retained stormwater, RO plant retentate, boiler blowdown water and other process effluents will be discharged to evaporation ponds".

29. Question From The Floor:

In building up to 1M high, if something does happen with chemicals etc and it does get into the Ellenbrook, then if it gets bad who is going to provide our drinking water?

Response from Mr Haselgrove: The source for drinking water flows the other way. There is no risk of contamination of drinking water from the plant. I will address this more fully at the Ellenbrook Integrated Catchment Group meeting.

30. Question From the Floor

Where is the manure coming from?

Response: All meat chickens.

31. Question From The Floor:

A scrubbing system infers a collection and retention. What happens to the residue?

Response: The ash is sold as a fertilizer.

32. Question From The Floor:

Who gets the benefits? What are the benefits to the local community?

Response:

- Eligible local business will be able to purchase low cost electricity from the project.
- Tourism – we believe Fibrowatt in the UK have more than 1,000 visitors per year. We are keen to work with the Muchea Progress Association to ensure that the community benefits from the tourism.
- Jobs
- Rateable land
- Hosting Renewable Energy and the potential to welcome only "Green" industry to your area.

Response from Shire President Tomlinson: The presence of Tiwest has not decreased land values, but has a positive effect on them.

33. Question From The Floor:

How much visible smoke will be seen from the stack?

Response: There will be no smoke, only steam that will be visible on cold mornings.

34. Question From The Floor:

In comparison with Pinjar, how much dearer will your power be?

Response: We don't know what the cost to produce Pinjar's power is, but they are a peaking plant (ie fire up when needed) whereas we are base-load (ie run all the time) so we would be considerably cheaper.

35. Question From The Floor:

What does the displacement of CO_2 mean?

Response: For every unit of renewable energy that you put into the supply, you avoid (or displace) the need to provide that energy from fossil fuel. In terms of CO_2, this means that you create energy from sources that are currently circulating in the atmosphere and don't dig any more up from under the ground (like coal and gas, which add additional CO_2 to the atmosphere as soon as they are released from their underground habitats).

36. Question From The Floor:

Is the sand-pad on a 65 contour?

Response: This will require more clarification.

Subsequent to the meeting, the Shire has advised that it is below the 65 contour but as we are not planning any intensive sub-division or septic tanks, and are a non-discharge site, this should not be a problem that cannot be dealt with in the site design.

37. Question From The Floor:

How will the trucks get to the plant?

Response: Via the Brand Hwy. They currently deliver to a range of market gardens and this will no longer be the case when they deliver to a single location, the power station.

38. Question From The Floor:

Are there going to be more trucks than now?

Response: No, less, because of the earlier reason given – that the transport will be more efficient because they are dropping off at one location.

39. Question From The Floor:

Haven't you got an alternative site? Don't you think you should have?

Response: Reiteration of the benefits of this site and the many millions of dollars of state infrastructure available to it at the proposed site.

40. Question From The Floor:

If your plant gets veto-ed, could someone else build a power station here?

Response: Well, it's an attractive site for a power station.

41. Question From The Floor:

Why haven't you looked at Pinjar?

Response: My sense is that it would not provide an appropriate connection for us, but we will check it out and get back to you.

Subsequently, we have found that it is uneconomical to enter the electricity grid at Pinjar because of the 132kV step-up voltage there. The cost of the step-up transformer and protection equipment (ie the equipment that protects the integrity of supply to Western Power's gas turbine) would be such that the plant could not possibly afford to be built – it would not be financed and thus would be another blow as renewable energy sought to compete with fossil fuels. Again, we must reiterate the suitability of the Muchea site and the opportunity it offers to build a renewable energy power station that will be a benchmark for green, clean industry in your community. And that benchmark, once set, will protect you from any lesser standard.

42. Question From The Floor:

The fact that there is a gas offtake at the site, is that a key factor for you?

Response: That is certainly an important issue for us, among others.

43. Question From The Floor:

There are performance standards that you have to meet. In the absence of other plants like this, who has established these standards and determined them to be acceptable?

Response from Mr Pitt: While this plant will be a first, the technology it uses is well known to the DEP and they have sufficient knowledge of existing standards to make a recommendation to the EPA.

44. Question From The Floor:

Do you own the land?

Response: No we have it under a lease agreement.

The time was drawing to a close by this stage, so the proponents put a question to the audience: "What else is there that we can do to satisfy you?" From some quarters, the answer was, "go elsewhere". However, the concluding comment from the floor was as follows: "The plant should either be accepted or denied on its merits, not on whether it will be the forerunner of more industry."
The meeting then closed and people stayed and talked with the proponents and each other about the relative merits of distinguishing this plant, as an example of 'green industry' from other industry proposals or facilities.

APPENDIX 1 - G

NEWSPAPER REPORT OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

NEWS • SPORT • LIFESTYL
Advoca
• Bullsbrook • Ellenbrook • The Vines • Swan Valley
• Lancelin • Ledge Point
• Chittering Valley • Muchea • Bin
• Seabird • Guilderton
THURSDAY AUGUST 2 2001 VOL 7 NO 38 PHONE 9571 2769 FACSIMILE 9571 2762 EMAIL advocate@iinet.net.au

Fox in town for chicken meeting

AN INFORMATION evening at the Muchea Hall last Friday regarding a proposed poultry litter power station in Muchea changed direction during the night.

Muchea residents were not happy with the format of the evening, organised by the company behind the proposal, Blair Fox eneration.

Chittering Shire president and Muchea resident, Judy Tomlinson said residents were not happy with the format where questions were answered one-on-one.

"People assumed they would be given a presentation and our questions answered," Ms Tomlinson said.

"A lot of people were very unhappy about the situation."

Once the format was changed though, residents got down to asking questions regarding the power station, which is to be situated about 5kms north of Muchea on the Brand Highway, directly opposite Tiwest.

The station is being built as a source of renewable energy and as a solution to the stable fly problem, which breeds in chicken manure.

The fuel will be a mixture of bird dropping and bedding material such as sawdust.

An information sheet released by Blair Fox Generation stated there will be no odour noticeable at the nearest residence because the fuel will be kept in a closed storage area and air will be drawn off from there and fed into the boiler. The fuel will be kept dry and the plant will be sited to minimise neighbours being downwind of prevailing winds.

In regards to noise pollution concerns, the plant is well within noise standards and will not vibrate. Trucks will not run before 7am, after 7pm or on Sunday.

To protect from dust and flies, the litter will arrive in covered trucks and tipped into the closed storage shed.

The litter will be dry to discourage breeding. It will also be used before the breeding can occur (within seven days).

Bob Calver is the nearest resident to the proposed station and was at the information evening.

He said he read the report and couldn't see any negative effects.

"Unless there is something still to be determined, I see no reason why it shouldn't go ahead," he said.

Ms Tomlinson said she thought the meeting went quite well.

"I spoke to a few people at the end of the meeting and the general consensus was they are not happy about it but they are not against the proposal," she said.

Blair Fox Generation Managing Director, Matthew Rosser said from this evening all comments received will be answered and then forwarded to the EPA, Council and stakeholders such as the Muchea Progress Association.

Asking the questions; Muchea resident Bob Calver discusses the power station with Blair Fox Generation's managing director Matthew Rosser

PM with t

Keeping a firm grip: Prime I Shire of Chittering president and Pearce M

REPRESENTATIVES fr the Shires of Sw Chittering and Gin helped the Prime Minis John Howard, celebrate 62nd birthday last week.

A function was held for Howard at the Belv Homestead Function Cen in Middle Swan.

Mr Howard was invite the electorate by Pearce I Judi Moylan.

Mrs Moylan said she v able to speak to the Pri Minister on a number issues affecting the reg including the drought, rc funding, health and touris

"I presented a detailed l of issues and discussed th

APPENDIX 1 - H

MEETING WITH ELLENBROOK INTEGRATED CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT GROUP

SWAN SHIRE OFFICE, AUGUST 27, 2001. 9.30AM – 12.30PM

Those in attendance:

NAME	NAME (Please Print)
Sue Metcalf (Chittering LCDC)	Simona Willis (West Bullsbrook Ratepayers)
Ben Prowse (Tiwest)	Kylie Banfield (AgWA)
Adrian Tomlinson (Swan River Trust)	Bill James (community) 9571 8125
Steve Bellusi (Waters and Rivers)	Damian Crilly (Ellen Brook Catchment Group coordinator
Boyd Wykes (Defence Estate)	Laurie Bush(Shire of Chittering)

The proponents had in attendance the following consultants:

- Caroline Watkins (Health Risk Assessment – Dioxins)
- Mr Kevin Haselgrove (Hydrogeological Survey)

Blair Fox Generation was represented by Mr Matthew Rosser.

Key Points

- The meeting was advertised in the Advocate Newspaper on August 9 2001.
- The group will provide a written response to the meeting
- Damian Crilly will provided a written response that we will be able to include in our DEP report. This should be available by second week in September.
- Bill James did not raise any direct opposition at the meeting but I had a phone conversation with him on the 29th of August and he raised the following:
  - Bill is opposed to the project because the dioxin levels – I asked if he had read the report and he said no. I sent him a copy of the dioxin report on 29.08.01 and asked for his feedback.

- Bill said that Judi Tomlinson had told him that she was under the impression that the Ellenbrook Catchment Group had given the project its approval. I said that no stakeholder group had given approval. Bill asked if I would talk to Cr Tomlinson about this issue – I have called her on 29th and 30th and left messages on her machine.
    - I spoke with Judi Tomlinson on 31.08.01 and said that no stakeholder group had given their support for the project at this stage and that we will be receiving correspondence in the next couple of weeks regarding the project from the Ellenbrook Catchment Group.
- Bill said that the only way he would permit to the project is if the DEP does the monitoring of emissions from the power station. I said that they the DEP/EPA don't undertake monitoring and that we have to use independent consultants. He said this is not good enough and that we should change it. I agreed that it would be better if the EPA did the monitoring but that it was outside our influence. He then asked whether I would call Cr Tomlinson and ask her about the issue.

APPENDIX 1 - I

MUCHEA PROGRESS RECREATION & SPORTING ASSOCIATION MEETING

MUCHEA HALL, AUGUST 13, 2001. 7.30 - 9PM

Those in attendance:

NAME	NAME
Nigel Ruffle	Jan Ruffle
Natalie Vallance	Glenn Andrews
Kim Masill	Judi Tomlinson

Blair Fox Generation was represented by Mr Matthew Rosser.

Key Points

- The meeting was advertised in the Advocate Newspaper on August 9 2001.
- The meeting was held to provided more detail to questions that had not been fully answered at the Information Evening of July 27 2001.
- Glenn Andrews indicated that a possible benefit arising from the power station might be sponsorship of local endeavours such as the provision of lighting towers to enable football; to be played at night. Matthew Rosser thought that would be a very appropriate indication of good corporate citizenship, especially as the power stations core business was the production of electricity and that the matter would be investigated.

The questions answered were:

Noise:

What does the paragraph in the [Public Consultation Document] mean about noise as opposed to unusual noise?

Response: Promise for more clarification from the document, but essentially it meant that any unusual events would be confined to weekdays in case they were likely to cause an unusual disturbance.

The following is from the Public Consultation Document:

"The major noise sources from the power station are from vehicle movements, conveyors and running machinery in the litter shed, and fans and pumps associated with the boiler and turbine.

The proponent has minimized the need to minimize noise impacts. The general location was selected on the basis of having a 1 km buffer distance from any residence. A significant factor in the decision to site the facility at the southern-eastern end of the block was to minimize the separation from nearby residences. The boiler and turbine, which are considered to be the noisiest items of equipment, are housed in a concrete building designed for noise attenuation. The nearest residences to the proposal site (ie. those shown in Table 11 above), are all within about 200 metres of the Brand Hwy and would therefore be subject to some traffic noise. The estimated daily traffic along this section of the highway is about 2,000 vehicles per day. This is below the 6,000 vehicles per day level that is required for the assigned noise levels at any residence to be modified on the basis of existing traffic noise...

[T]he nearest resident to the proposal site, does however, lie within 450 metres of Tiwest's industrial zoned property and is therefore subject to +0.6 dB(A) adjustment to its assigned noise levels. The other nearby residences are more than 450 m away from the Tiwest site and are therefore not subject to any such adjustments. The determining criteria are, therefore, that "night-time" (ie. between 10pm and 7am) noise emissions from the proposed power station:

should not cause a level of 35.6 dB(A) to be exceeded at the nearest residence, located 1.35 km away; and should not cause a level of 35 dB(A) to be exceeded at any other residence.

The power station will be engineered to achieve these criterion under normal operating conditions. As an added safeguard, the plant will also be engineered to achieve a level of 45 dB(A) at the site boundary.

Noise impacts from traffic directly associated with the proposal will be minimized by having deliveries of poultry litter and other feedstock materials to the facility limited to 7am to 7pm Mondays to Saturdays.

Infrequent activities that may cause high noise emissions, such as boiler blowdowns, will also be restricted to 7am to 7pm Mondays to Saturdays.

Additional measures to mitigate against noise impacts will include planting trees around the perimeter of the facility."

45. 65m Contour:

Is the sand-pad on a 65 contour?

Response: This will require more clarification.

Subsequent to the meeting, the Shire has advised that it is below the 65 contour but as we are not planning any intensive sub-division or septic tanks, and are a non-discharge site, this should not be a problem that cannot be dealt with in the site design.

46. Pinjar Site:

Why haven't you looked at Pinjar?

Response: My sense is that it would not provide an appropriate connection for us, but we will check it out and get back to you.

Subsequently, we have found that it is uneconomical to enter the electricity grid at Pinjar because of the 132kV step-up voltage there. The cost of the step-up transformer and protection equipment (ie the equipment that protects the integrity of supply to Western Power's gas turbine) would be such that the plant could not possibly afford to be built – it would not be financed and thus would be another blow as renewable energy sought to compete with fossil fuels. Again, we must reiterate the suitability of the Muchea site and the opportunity it offers to build a renewable energy power station that will be a benchmark for green, clean industry in your community. And that benchmark, once set, will protect you from any lesser standard.

APPENDIX 1 - J

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO MUCHEA PROGRESS ASSOCIATION

Thursday, August 16, 2001
Mr. Glen Andrews
President
Muchea Progress, Recreation and Sporting Association
PO Muchea
WA 6501

Dear Glenn
With respect to the question raised regarding the storage of hazardous chemicals on site I have the following response:
There will be no PCB's or anything of that nature. The following is drawn from the Public Consultation Document:
"Any chemicals [will] be stored onsite in sealed drums to DEP standards and bunded where appropriate in order to ensure containment in the event of a spillage from the general stormwater drainage system."
Cleaning chemicals will be held on site and also caustic soda.
Also there will be no 'coolants' as such stored at the site. The cooling tower will use water. The following is drawn from the Public Consultation Document.
"Cooling tower blowdown water will be treated in a reverse osmosis (RO) plant to recover water for use. The blowdown water flow-rate from the evaporative condenser or cooling tower will be approximately 12m^3/h. The plant will comprise a microfiltration unit, a reverse osmosis (RO) plant and an RO permeate concentration plant. The plant will process 12 m³/h blowdown fluid to produce 11 m³/h of reuse water and 1 m³/h (8,000 m³/y) of concentrated RO permeate with impurity concentrations that are approximately 36 times the impurity concentrations in the bore water. The RO plant will also use 12 m³/day (4,000 m³/y) of water for cleaning. Some of this water will be a 0.5% w/w caustic soda solution and some of the water may be a 0.7% w/w nitric acid solution. Retained stormwater, RO plant retentate, boiler blowdown water and other process effluents will be discharged to evaporation ponds".
I have also review the pricing on the provision of the lighting towers and believe that it is not cost prohibitive. Should you wish to put a request in writing to our board I am confident that it will receive a good hearing.

Kind regards,

FOR BLAIR FOX GENERATION

Matthew Rosser

Managing Director