



THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

Staffordshire's voice for local government



County Buildings, Stafford
DDI (01785) 276147
Please ask for Jonathan Lindop
Email:
jonathan.lindop@staffordshire.gov.uk

Staffordshire Local Government Association - Joint Waste Management Board

Monday, 18 July 2016

2.30 pm

Civic Offices, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffs. ST5 2AG

John Henderson
Honorary Secretary
8 July 2016

A G E N D A

PART ONE

1. **Apologies**
2. **Appointment of Chairman and Vice-Chairman**
3. **Minutes of Meeting held on 12 May 2016**
4. **Strategic Waste Management Action Plan - Performance Report**

Oral report of the Chairman of the Staffordshire Waste Officers' Group
(information to be tabled)

5. **Joint Waste Management Board Sub-Group - Update** (Pages 1 - 4)

Report of the Staffordshire Waste Partnership Officer

6. **Working Groups** (Pages 5 - 12)

Reports of the Staffordshire Waste Partnership Officer

7. **WRAP Project**

Oral report of the Staffordshire Waste Partnership Officer

8. **Staffordshire County Council Financial Update**

Oral report of the County Director for Economy Infrastructure and Skills

9. Dates/Venues of Future Meetings

- November 2016 - To be arranged

10. Exclusion of the Public and Press

The Chairman to move:-

“That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business which involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A (as amended) of the Local Government Act 1972 indicated below”.

PART TWO

11. Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Contract Management Review

(exemption paragraph 3)

Report of the County Director for Economy Infrastructure and Skills

Membership

Patricia Ackroyd
Ann Beech
Mary Bond
Iain Eadie
Frank Finlay

Terry Follows
Arthur Forrester
Joy Goodall
Gill Heath
John Preece

Staffordshire Joint Waste Management Board: 2015/16 National Indicator Out-turns

Local Authority	NI191: Residual household waste collected per household (kg)					NI192: % of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting					NI193: % of municipal waste landfilled				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	To date 2015/16	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	To date 2015/16	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	To date 2015/16
East Staffordshire BC	112.62	111.36	115.24	117.95	457.17	55.62%	54.09%	46.47%	43.15%	49.83%					
Lichfield DC	116.18	114.74	121.90	119.12	471.94	57.54%	55.61%	49.20%	45.73%	52.02%					
Tamworth BC	116.96	110.52	107.29	119.90	454.67	52.21%	51.96%	46.90%	43.51%	48.65%					
Cannock Chase DC	112.35	110.87	114.35	108.28	445.85	55.98%	54.91%	47.95%	46.32%	51.29%					
South Staffordshire Council	116.13	115.18	118.82	121.34	469.28	58.13%	56.29%	49.02%	44.48%	52.49%					
Stafford BC	106.79	106.37	105.21	115.01	433.38	59.05%	57.86%	52.19%	45.68%	53.70%					
Staffordshire Moorlands DC	97.60	94.62	98.17	98.50	388.89	59.90%	61.40%	54.58%	50.87%	56.69%					
Newcastle-under-Lyme BC	108.77	104.11	111.61	110.85	435.34	54.70%	55.50%	47.90%	44.00%	50.53%					
Staffordshire County Council	139.52	139.91	134.14	148.80	562.37	54.60%	52.50%	47.80%	40.80%	48.93%	1.5%	2.0%	2.50%	3.16%	2.29%
Stoke-on-Trent City Council	146.64	140.81	132.48	197.04	616.97	42.10%	43.20%	35.60%	24.00%	36.23%	4.4%	7.5%	4.90%	5.30%	5.53%

Local Authority	% household waste sent for recycling (formerly BVPI 82a)					% household waste sent for composting (formerly part of BVPI 82b)					% household waste sent for anaerobic digestion (formerly part of BVPI 82b)				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	To date 2015/16	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	To date 2015/16	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	To date 2015/16
East Staffordshire BC	19.39%	20.16%	14.66%	18.70%	18.23%	36.13%	33.90%	31.81%	24.46%	31.58%					
Lichfield DC	23.97%	25.60%	27.60%	31.50%	27.17%	33.57%	30.01%	31.50%	14.24%	27.33%					
Tamworth BC	25.68%	29.00%	32.70%	34.44%	30.46%	26.53%	22.96%	14.20%	9.07%	18.19%					
Cannock Chase DC	26.97%	27.99%	30.84%	34.69%	30.12%	29.01%	26.91%	17.11%	11.63%	21.17%					
South Staffordshire Council	21.01%	22.20%	24.98%		22.73%	37.10%	34.06%	24.01%		31.72%					
Stafford BC	21.46%	23.18%	26.46%	28.87%	24.99%	37.59%	34.68%	25.73%	16.81%	28.70%					
Staffordshire Moorlands DC	21.63%	21.31%	21.62%	24.46%	22.26%	38.12%	39.95%	32.85%	26.31%	34.31%					
Newcastle-under-Lyme BC	15.74%	18.27%	18.49%	20.49%	18.25%	33.56%	31.70%	23.05%	16.74%	26.26%	5.36%	5.54%	6.36%	6.77%	6.01%
Staffordshire County Council	21.60%	22.30%	24.80%	25.29%	23.50%	32.80%	30.00%	22.80%	15.21%	25.20%					
Stoke-on-Trent City Council	18.83%	20.67%	21.48%	18.17%	19.79%	23.16%	22.46%	14.10%	5.79%	16.38%					

Notes
Data consistent with WasteDataFlow out-turns. All data is provisional until DEFRA publication (due November 2016)

PROJECT PROGRESS REPORTS

Closed projects

Veolia Four Ashes joint campaign for 2015/16

The 2015/16 campaign is now completed and being used by the County Council as no Collection Authorities wished to uptake the campaign.

CPC training collaborations

The training broker offered no financial savings and therefore the Transport Officers decided not to take forward the options of joint procuring CPC training due to the constrictions of planning, but are open to it in the future and remain considerate of other authorities should ad hoc opportunities arise.

Calendars

The joint creation / delivery of calendars was discussed at SWOG and deemed only suitable for the potential to procure a fulfillment contract via a framework, however this was such a low priority given more pressing work in the arena that the project has halted and will be resurrected at a more suitable time.

On-going projects

Holistic savings for Staffordshire

The last JWMB saw the presentation of the Local Partnerships report – from this 4 work streams were created; a DEFRA contract review of Four Ashes, WRAP project on food waste, working group on chargeable garden collection, and a working group on residual frequency. These are discussed in the new projects sections.

Bulky waste

SWOG discussions are taking place to assess the potential for a county wide bulky waste collection service which focuses more heavily on reuse, to offer consistency and efficiency for residents, with a central point of contact, and a singular pricing structure. Options include outsourcing (piggybacking on the to the reuse aspect of the FCC HWRC contract), creating a third sector based framework, or harmonising methods but remaining collections as per individual authorities.

FCC are not currently able to offer any assistance but are not adverse to the idea in the future. So progression is moving towards the potential of a third sector framework.

Food Partnership

Following the creation last year of the educational resources on food waste reduction, the packs have been delivered by our partners. Following the creation of the Staffordshire Food Partnership,

SWP has become actively involved in the food waste task group and in meeting new partners to deliver the resources on our behalf.

Furthermore, SWP has recently met with the North Staffs Community Food Group, many of whom are keen to use our resource and collaborate on future food waste initiatives.

Guidance on food waste is also being provided to the Stoke on Trent City Council's bid to become a 'sustainable food city'.

All these contacts will prove very useful should the authorities wish to undertake a separate food waste collection service, in helping us to deliver our messages etc.

SBC contract procurement

SBC are hiring Kay Cocks at the day consultancy rate for specialist technical assistance to the procurement of their collection and processing contract, acting as a critical friend. So far, Kay is spending up to 1 day a week on this project, attending board meetings, writing minutes, drafting the specification and aiding in the creation of the procurement documentation. This work level is expected to continue throughout the year, with peaks and troughs during the procurement process.

MRF contract issues

Unfortunately, the issues with the Biffa MRF contract are yet to be resolved, despite many official letters back and forth from both parties. The councils involved remain hopeful of a swift solution as discussions progress. This matter has not been aided by recent management changes at Biffa.

New projects

Veolia Four Ashes joint campaign for 2016/17

Work is now underway for the next year's campaign, however this will be directly managed by the contract staff at the County Council to ensure a more useable end result for all councils. The focus upon this campaign is a process diagram design to show what happens to out waste streams, as an educational resource.

Bartec user group

SWOG agreed that a specialist user group for all Bartec using councils would be beneficial. The meeting of the user group offered many discussions on best practice, lessons learnt, and opportunities to share resources / training. One major outcome is the potential to secure a full contract for the authorities, however initial investigation suggests there may be issues with official contracts in procurement regulation.

Fly-tipping procedures

Transport Officers have requested a specific meeting with FCC and the county council to full understand the issues with fly tipping and ensure county wide consistency. This meeting is opened up to any street cleansing colleagues.

Garden waste working group

A working group focusing on chargeable garden waste collections met on 10th June at Newcastle's depot , attended by representatives from the County Council, Newcastle Borough Council, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, and Lichfield and Tamworth Joint Waste Service. The group had a lengthy discussion about barriers, opportunities, efficiency, and benchmarking. The group will table a report at JWMB.

Residual frequency working group

The working group on reductions in residual collection frequency / capacity met on 15th June at the Four Ashes incinerator, attended by representatives from the County Council, Stoke on Trent City Council, East Staffordshire Borough Council, Newcastle Borough Council, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, Lichfield and Tamworth Joint Waste Service, and South Staffordshire District Council. The group had lengthy discussion on collaboration, holistic savings, knock on affects to other contracts, restrictions, and needed information. As such, the group determined the WRAP work will feed into this project. The group will table a report at JWMB.

WRAP collaboration

Work with WRAP to become a Local Authority case study for their consistency project, receiving free support for modelling (as recommended in the LP report and the proposal at JWMB) has commenced. We are one of only 6 projects being undertaken with WRAP, estimated to receive up to £60,000 worth of free consultancy.

WRAP have agreed to our proposal in a meeting on 7th June and are drafting a full scoping document, whilst collating the required data and information from councils. It is expected that, following a confirmation discussion with the project manager next week, the final report will be available for October / November.

DEFRA review

DEFRA / WIDP are currently undertaking a free review of the Four Ashes contract (as recommended in the Local Partnerships report). Jim Busby, our lead from DEFRA, is working with the County Council to review the contract. By the time JWMB occurs, the 2 day interview period should be completed and general feedback given straight away (no report date yet advised). Chris Jones at the County Council will update at JWMB.

Annual reporting

The collation of the annual financial data is being requested, prior to inclusion in the Autumn update annual report.

Potential future projects

Wheeled bin framework

From discussion during SBC contract procurement meetings, the idea of having a SWP single provider framework for wheeled bins has developed and will be discussed by SWOG to assess the projects potential to offer both avoided costs (as ongoing staff time and regular procurement works) and savings (a better unit price) as well as the potential to include a rebate for external use of the SWP framework.

Additional

External advice

A number of authorities outside Staffordshire have requested advice on how to become a partnership like us, after hearing of our success at collaboration without enforcing a standard system. As such, Kay Cocks has been advising authorities on how to adopt our model of working.

Working group; Chargeable garden waste collections Report for Joint Waste Management Board; July 2016

Background

It was decided at the last meeting of the Joint Waste Management Board, in May, that, following discussion on council priorities and areas for consideration, there was some interest by several councils in pursuing an investigation into the potential of charging for the collection of garden waste, as a method of generating income to the council to alleviate financial pressures. After the meeting of the Board, the Partnership Manager set up a meeting for councils to opt into according to their own priorities (4 of the 10 councils in SWP opted to take part in the working group).

Group meeting

The working group focusing on chargeable garden waste collections met on Friday 10th June. The group was attended by Officers from the following councils; Staffordshire County Council, Lichfield and Tamworth Joint Waste Service, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, and Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council.

The aim of the meeting was to openly discuss the potential for moving from a free charge waste collection service to charging for the same service, and whether there would be any benefits from introducing the charge together as a group of councils rather than as individual councils.

All options open to us with garden waste are;

- Continue to offer a free service
- Stop the service (and potentially sell the customer base?)
- Outsource this non-statutory service
- Run a chargeable collection service as a trade waste service
- Charge for the collection service, to cover the cost of collection (and retain recycling credits to cover disposal costs)
- Charge for the collection service, to cover the cost of collection and processing (therefore ceasing recycling credits).

It is estimated that around 44% of local authorities now charge for collection of garden waste. Colleagues around the table noted that the recent examples of other local authorities in England / Scotland who have undertaken a chargeable garden waste collection service offer a variety of lessons learnt from their processes. The importance of benchmarking was noted, especially considering the move from free to charging services.

It was agreed that any common principles noted in the benchmarking would be applied to SWP. A strong emphasis was placed upon undertaking any service alteration, such as charging, as a group to ensure consistency, such as consistent pricing across council services, and partnership communications, with the possibility of a central admin point, acting as a conduit / potential trade waste service. It was considered that undertaking this alteration to service together (be that in clusters or as a full partnership) would offer a 'safety in numbers' approach in public engagement when expecting a backlash from residents.

Working group; Chargeable garden waste collections Report for Joint Waste Management Board; July 2016

Key issues to be noted

At present, there are some inconsistencies between the garden waste collection services that are currently offered by SWP councils;

- All bar SMDC separately collect garden waste (SMDC = with food)
- Some councils charge for second bins, of which some offer an annual fee, but some offer a one off payment, all different prices
- Winter service stoppages vary between councils.

The group agreed that a standard methodology should be drafted, based on the key principles of the benchmarking and the considering the following issues of importance;

- Collection of garden waste decoupled from residual
- Leave all current bins out (rather than collect all in when removing the free service)
- Residents opt in to the service
- Consistent price
- Charges introduced at the end of the summer, as entering a quieter period
- Common bin size (with a variation in price for smaller bins?)

The group agreed that the charge to residents will be determined by collection costs and processing costs / recycling credit figures, and that the feasibility of any option depends on key dates such as contract end dates for processing / collection.

Plan of action

The group are currently undertaking the following tasks to progress this project forward;

- Benchmarking previously undertaken will require an update in order to present the best representation of the current market.
- Case studies will be created of nearest neighbour councils to establish in depth knowledge of key lessons.
- Knowledge sharing and seeking best practice information through professional organisations of LARAC, APSE, NAWDO and WRAP.
- Organise a meeting with Biffa to discuss the potential of what is involved with outsourcing garden collection services, as per their Garden Waste Club, as another potential option for discussion.
- Collate a database of all garden waste collection service information, both operationally and financially, including tonnage information over recent years.
- Use this information to;
 - Assess the potential impact of tonnage variation on disposal contracts – HWRCs and incineration,
 - Model scenarios to test service alteration viability,
 - Develop a standard collection service methodology (e.g. bin size, price, service sign up, payment mechanism, advertisement, etc).

The group agreed that the work by WRAP to model the potential for the Partnership to undertake separate food waste collections, along with the work by DEFRA to assess the

Working group; Chargeable garden waste collections Report for Joint Waste Management Board; July 2016

disposal contract with Veolia for the Four Ashes incinerator, form an integral part of any modelling to assess the implications of introducing a charge to garden waste collections.

Speaking with WRAP, they are happy to extend the remit of their support to include the modelling of chargeable garden waste collection services as a separate aspect to any operations and as a standalone addition should councils wish to take on such alterations. This modelling will not affect the other modelling to be done by WRAP and is in addition to all other works for us – thus extending the level of support we are receiving free of charge. This also means such modelling is not required to be undertaken by us, resulting in internal cost avoidance as well.

The reports from WRAP and DEFRA are expected to be tabled at the Autumn JWMB meeting, meaning this working group can continue the work thereafter. Additionally, SWP progress on this project will be updated in a report at Autumn JWMB.

Case study – Durham Councils

Prior to 2009, Durham County had a two tier system of a disposal authority and 7 collection authorities. In 2009 they moved to a single tier and became a unitary authority. When in the two tier system, the majority of councils previously had a free garden waste collection service (5 WCAs, with 1 WCA offering no service and 1 WCA charging £15 per year). Upon moving to a unitary authority, the collection service was standardised to a free service.

In 2015, the garden waste collection service introduced a charge of £20 per year (totalling 16 collections per year), or £50 for a 3 year sign up. This charge was benchmarked to other local authorities in the North East of England and is slightly lower than the average (£23). Durham Council offered a cheaper price because it reflects the policies of affordability as there are some areas of deprivation. However this service is heavily subsidised by £1million per year (charge would be £40 to break even). In 2016, there was no price increase (however other neighbouring authorities increased their prices – new average of £25). The charge is subject to annual review and is expected to increase in 2017, although this has yet to be agreed. A £5 increase in price aligns Durham Council with its neighbours and would generate a further £250,000 whilst they expect to maintain the current customer base.

Of the 235,000 households in the authority, the free service was delivered to 155,000 households. When the charge was introduced, the service was offered to an extra 35,000 households, totalling 190,000 households. Initial uptake was 65,000 households in 2015 (of which 18,000 households signed up for 3 years), which increased to 68,000 households in 2016. Operationally, the service pinch point is 70,000 households, where an additional truck would be required. The scheme is therefore currently used to its full capacity now.

Tonnage collected annually during the free service totalled 26,000 tonnes. Upon introduction of the chargeable service, tonnage dropped by 10,000 tonnes for the first year, with only 1,500 tonnes increasing at the HWRCs, no major impact on residual tonnages, and no tonnage alteration to fly tipping amounts. The perception and recognition of fly tipping increased, but the tonnage collected from fly tipping remained steady and was mainly commercial waste. This means 8,500 tonnes was 'lost' from the collection service – it is expected some of this is due to home composting / bonfires, and reduction of gardening practices. It is expected that the current service is used more efficiently as residents wish to

Working group; Chargeable garden waste collections Report for Joint Waste Management Board; July 2016

ensure value for money by filling the bin. It is also expected that there will be cases where several households have collaborated to share one bin.

Financial savings have been achieved by the streamlining of operations (reduction in trucks / staff etc), route optimisation and standardised service provision. Financial savings from disposal compares the cost of farm composting gate fees (3 sites on a framework agreement) at £24 per tonne with direct deliver, to the cost of the residual gate fee of £100 per tonne. Additional costs included the development of an in-house bespoke IT system to allow service sign up on line etc, which took time to create and is still a work in progress.

When weighing up the operational costs against the generated income, despite the service currently being subsidised (the aim is to reduce this year on year until it is a financially independent service), the council believes the charging of garden waste collection has been worth the time, effort and savings created operationally and by diverting from residual waste. A customer satisfaction survey in September 2016 is planned to assess the impact on residents' approval.

Durham Council has kindly offered SWP the use of example letters to residents, with terms and conditions, information for householders, FAQs etc.

Report prepared on behalf of the working group by;
Kay Cocks, Partnership Manager, Staffordshire Waste Partnership

Working group; Residual Waste Collection Frequency Report for Joint Waste Management Board; July 2016

Background

It was decided at the last meeting of the Joint Waste Management Board, in May, that, following discussion on council priorities and areas for consideration, there was interest by many councils in pursuing an investigation into the potential of reducing the frequency of residual waste collections as a method of increasing efficiencies in waste collection and disposal. After the meeting of the Board, the Partnership Manager set up a meeting for councils to opt into according to their own priorities (8 of the 10 councils in SWP opted to take part in the working group).

Group meeting

The working group focusing on residual waste collection frequency met on Wednesday 15th June. The group was attended by Officers from the following councils; Staffordshire County Council, East Staffordshire Borough Council, Lichfield and Tamworth Joint Waste Service, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council, South Staffordshire District Council, and Stoke on Trent City Council, with apologies from Newcastle under Lyme Borough Council, who wanted to attend but were unavailable on the day.

The aim of the meeting was to openly discuss the potential for authorities to reduce the frequency of the residual waste collection services. The intention of reducing the collection frequency is to actively discourage people from using this waste stream, instead encouraging the use of the recycling services (i.e. any materials that are recyclable which are currently being thrown away in the residual bin would instead be recycled in the correct bin). Ideally, this would reduce the amount of residual waste being produced and therefore collected, as well as increasing the amount of recycling, thus improving recycling rates. For example, in South Staffordshire, if all residents recycled all possible materials in the blue bin, then the District Council's recycling rate would be approximately 70%. This indicates the potential performance improvements available and highlights the capacity that is available in the residual bin if residents correctly use the recycling services currently available. In theory, the service alteration would reduce collection costs (as operations reduce the number of truck and crews required to carry out the service) and disposal costs (as there is less tonnage), although this is not always the case and savings cannot always be realised, depending on the level of the cost starting point and financial implications of contractual issues.

Colleagues around the table noted that the recent examples of other local authorities in England / Scotland who have undertaken a reduction in service frequency offer a variety of lessons learnt from their processes – these include;

- The need for a weekly separate food waste collection service, to ensure all biodegradable food waste is collected within a suitable time frame, as it is unfeasible to leave food waste uncollected for 3 or 4 weeks. Research from WRAP and other local authorities shows that a separate food waste collection service can be more conducive to high yields compared to a combined food and garden waste service.
- A reduction of service to a collection every 3 weeks have proven the starting point for most authorities undertaking the alteration, however this has led to issues with calendar reading as round scheduling with odd numbers offers a variety of

Working group; Residual Waste Collection Frequency Report for Joint Waste Management Board; July 2016

inconsistencies for residents. Many councils who undertook 3 weekly residual collections are now moving towards 4 weekly collections due to the simpler approach even numbers offer for communication and consistency (indeed some councils are reducing collection frequency by going straight to 4 weekly collections to avoid the two step process seen with the initial uptake of councils).

- Nappies remains a concern for officers as no specific information on how to tackle biological waste has come from the lessons of councils reducing residual collection frequency. The concern is that nappies will be disposed of into other bins that are collected more frequently.
- Case studies commonly show the need for additional support when undertaking this service alteration, which in many councils has been additional staff for communication / contact centre and door-to-door enforcement / bin checking duties, to ensure a smooth transition and to limit public concerns and therefore any knock on affects to the service has a whole, such as contamination.
- As contamination in the recycling waste streams is a big concern, there is potential here to investigate the option to utilise the enforcement powers of section 46 notices, which have not yet been decriminalised.
- Most council case studies also moved recycling collection frequency to weekly, to further encourage recycling – this would cancel out any collection costs savings as operationally no alteration is taking place (the trucks are still being used, they are simply collecting recycling rather than residual).
- Case studies all indicated disposal savings however all councils which have altered their services currently have very high disposal rates (e.g. £308 per tonne), therefore offering huge savings – it should be noted that SWP has the lowest disposal rate in the country (c.£65 per tonne) and therefore huge savings are unlikely to occur, as those were obtained when new contracts came into force for incineration and landfill was no longer the chosen disposal method (very expensive).

Key issues to be noted

The group noted a key observation of the current residual waste collection services operating within the Partnership; Authorities have a variety of bin sizes, as some authorities have chosen to replace the standard 240l bins with smaller sizes (140l or 180l) to reduce capacity. Should authorities choose to reduce the frequency of the collection service for residual waste, it is unlikely that these smaller bin sizes would be sufficient, and therefore pose a problem.

When discussing the potential alterations to service, the following knock on affects were noted;

- Overfilling of the residual bin and side waste,
- Additional tonnage taken to HWRCs and any knock on affect to the contract (i.e. Maximum tonnage limits being breached resulting in cost changes etc),
- Increase in fly tipping and any knock on affect to street cleansing services,
- Increase in recycling and garden waste tonnages – either correctly or wrongly, i.e. elevation in contamination and rejected loads, affects to the minimum / maximum

Working group; Residual Waste Collection Frequency Report for Joint Waste Management Board; July 2016

thresholds as agreed in the contracts, with a knock on affect to costs of disposal and basket of goods value (financial return),

- Changes in recycling rates, and any knock on changes in recycling credits payments,
- Reduction in residual tonnage collected at the kerbside and any knock on affects this will have on the disposal contracts regarding minimum / maximum tonnage thresholds, percentage shares with external partners, and therefore prices.
- Impact on those councils that have contracted out their service as such service alterations constitutes a major contract variation and will require extensive negotiation, depending on the scope and procurement legislation restrictions.
- The efficiencies of round routes will be affected, requiring round modifications, with any significant changes requiring substantial route planning, engagement and communication - many councils have recently re-routed vehicles in recognition of changes to principal disposal points (i.e. Four Ashes incinerator).

From these discussions, it is clear that a reduction in the frequency of the collection of residual waste is not a simple method to cultivate holistic savings whilst increasing the recycling rate, as the validity of such service alteration will depend heavily on the financial viability of knock on affects to other services / contracts resulting in potential financial losses and whether such losses can be recuperated by savings in operational reduction.

Plan of action

The group agreed that the work by WRAP to model the potential for the Partnership to undertake separate food waste collections, along with the work by DEFRA to assess the disposal contract with Veolia for the Four Ashes incinerator, form an integral part of any modelling to assess the viability and cost of reducing residual waste collection frequency. As such, the results of both these pieces of work will be required before a full scoping of residual collection frequency can be done sufficiently. The reports from WRAP and DEFRA are expected to be tabled at the October JWMB meeting, meaning this working group can continue the work thereafter.

Conversations with WRAP also note the potential for basic modelling of a reduction in residual waste collection frequency will be undertaken as part of their work. This will act as a starting point for the councils to undertake more detailed assessment thereafter.

However it is also noted that in the meantime, alongside the WRAP and DEFRA work, Staffordshire County Council and Stoke on Trent City Council, as the disposal authorities, will work on assessing the limitations of the contracts to allow for any reduction in tonnage as a result of the reduction in collection frequency. The County Council are already underway to develop a model to showcase how any alterations in tonnage being received at the Four Ashes incinerator would affect the contract in terms of percentage shares with the external partners and therefore costs to us. The City Council are undertaking works as part of the procurement of the Hanford incinerator and working with the County Council to develop a more symbiotic relationship for waste flow between the two plants, to offset any alterations in tonnage and ensure maximum benefit to the Staffordshire tax payer.

Report prepared on behalf of the working group by;

Kay Cocks, Partnership Manager, Staffordshire Waste Partnership

Not for publication by virtue of paragraph(s) 3
of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972

Document is Restricted

