# AGENDA ITEM 10

## Policy Committee – 17<sup>th</sup> January 2017

### **Waste Collection Arrangements**



Report of Director of Services

Lead Member; Councillor C Lis

Ward(s) affected: All

### 1 Purpose of the Report

To advise Members on the outcome of the assessments required to demonstrate compliance with Waste Regulations and approve the introduction of a co-mingled collection of glass, metals, plastic and paper.

### 2 Recommendations

Members are recommended to:-

2.1 Note the completion of the TEEP assessment and approve the introduction of a comingled collection of glass, metals, plastics and paper with effect from April 2017.

### 3 Background

3.1 Local Authorities are continuing to face pressure to make efficiency savings, having faced a 40% reduction in funding since 2010 with reductions to continue in future year settlements. This coupled with a collapse in the global commodities market for dry re-cyclables means the Council is receiving significantly less in income from the sale of the materials it collects.

Previously the Council offset some of the costs of operating the waste collection service from the sale of recycling material however it now has to pay to send this material for processing with an adverse budget swing of £400,000 per annum. Given the financial climate the Council is in it is not sustainable to continue to operate the existing collection arrangements. If the Council was to combine the collection of glass, metals, plastics and paper, savings can be made in collection costs whilst also improving the service delivered to the residents.

3.2 Policy Committee in July 2016 agreed in principle to introduce co-mingled collections of recyclable materials subject to a 'Technical, Economical,

# AGENDA ITEM 10

Environmental Practical (TEEP) assessment <u>not</u> establishing that the Council should collect recyclable material separately to comply with regulations.

- 3.3 Due to the highly technical requirements and detailed work involved in carrying out a TEEP assessment it was recommended this work proceeds only if the Council made an in principal decision to implement co-mingling and that the outcome of the assessment be reported to a later meeting of Policy Committee. Following the in principal decision to implement co-mingling this work has now been carried out.
- 3.4 The TEEP assessment consists of a number of tests. Section 4 of this report summarises the conclusions of the TEEP assessment. The fully detailed TEEP document is available on request and will be uploaded to the Council's website once the assessment has been accepted by Council.

#### 4 The Assessment

- 4.1 The Waste Framework Directive (WFD) which became law in April 2006 requires local authorities to establish separate collections of recyclable materials where it is 'technically, environmentally and economically practicable' ("TEEP") to do so.
- 4.2 The Council's TEEP assessment has concluded it is <u>not</u> *technically, environmentally and economically practicable* for the Council to collect recyclable materials separately and that consequently the co-mingling of glass, metals, plastics and paper in a single bin is permissive and compliant with regulations.

#### Technical Assessment

- 4.3 In order to consider whether the separate collection of each material is technically practical it is necessary to consider whether separate collections have been developed and proven to function by Local Authorities with similar characteristics elsewhere.
- 4.4 Based on statistics provided by the Waste Resource Action Programme (WRAP) 50% of Local Authorities in England operate a co-mingled service, 29% a separate collection system for one or more material and 34% a separate collection system for one material only. The technical assessment therefore determines it is technically practical to separately collect each material because it is in operation elsewhere.

#### Economic Assessment

- 4.5 Economic practicability should not cause excessive costs. The TEEP assessment compares the costs of the existing collection arrangements, co-mingled and the separate collection to identify whether separate collection leads to excessive costs.
- 4.6 Economic costs are assessed by analysing all necessary financial information, not just the cost of collecting each material. Therefore in addition to considering the costs of vehicles, staff, fuel and containers other elements such as recyclate income, processing costs, premises and support services costs have been taken into account.

Collection System	Annual Cost Figure (£)	Cost v existing service (£)
Existing system	427,585	-
All separate	1, 199,769	+772,184
Co-Mingled	163,536	-264,049

4.7 The total cost for each of the collection scenarios is summarised in table 1 below.

Table 1

- 4.8 The separate collection service is financially the most expensive at £1,19m per annum. Co-mingled is financially the cheapest service at £163k per annum.
- 4.9 The economic assessment determines it is <u>not</u> economically practical to separately collect materials as this would lead to additional annual costs of £772k when compared to existing arrangements and £1.03m compared to co-mingling.

#### Environmental Assessment

- 4.10 Environmental performance is assessed by analysing the carbon emissions and air quality impact for each collection scenario. This includes emissions from transport during collection, emissions from the recycling facilities and haulage to and from the transfer station. Table 2 summarises the carbon emissions and table 3 the Air Quality Damage Cost from the three collection scenarios.
- 4.11 The environmental assessment determines it is <u>not</u> environmentally practicable to separately collect each material and that doing so would worsen the Council's environmental performance. The carbon impact of separate collections shows an increase of 290.5 tonnes of additional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions over the existing service. The air quality impact of separate collections shows an additional air quality damage cost of £1.54m over the existing service.

CARBON EMISSIONS				
	Total Annual km	Fuel (litres)	CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent tonnages	
Existing Service	153,552	107,343	289.82	
Co- mingled	93,378	65,296	176.30	
Separate	426,984	298,427	580.32	

Table 2

AIR QUALITY DAMAGE COSTS			
	NOX (£)	PM10 (£)	Total (£)
Existing Service	130,007	732,893	853,900

# AGENDA ITEM 10

Co-mingled	79,066	445,634	524,700
Separate	361,432	2,037,377	2,398,809

Table 3

#### 5 Conclusion

- 5.1 Application of the TEEP tests identifies that whilst it is technically practical to collect recyclable materials separately it is <u>not</u> economically or environmentally practical.
- 5.2 The regulations require that separate collection must be practical in each assessment. If separate collection is not practical in any of these assessments then separate collections are not required. On the basis that separate collection has failed two of the three practicability tests it is not practical to collect waste separately.
- 5.3 The TEEP assessment gives the Council the option of co-mingling the collection of recyclable materials and it is proposed the Council moves to a fully co-mingled collection of glass, metals, plastic and paper given this is the most economic system and is compliant with regulations.

#### 6 Consultation

- 6.1 A public consultation exercise was carried out during the period October December 2016 to seek residents views on introducing co-mingled collections.
- 6.2 There were 255 responses with the majority of those responding (89%) having no objections to the introduction of a co-mingled collection service. Of those that did object it was on grounds of increased contamination and insufficient capacity in the blue bin to hold the co-mingled material. The Council will communicate the importance of recycling correctly during the lead up to implementation to address increased contamination concerns whilst the collection of blue bins will take place fortnightly as opposed to monthly current to address capacity issues.

#### 7 Contractual Arrangements

- 7.1 To implement a co-mingled service there is a need to establish alternative disposal arrangements. Currently the Council is under contract with Yorwaste for the disposal of recyclables separately and although the contract provides for variation by written agreement of the parties a change to co-mingled collection would constitute a change in contract arrangements and not within the scope of the original procurement. A new contract is therefore required.
- 7.2 As reported to Members of Policy Committee in July 2016 the Council can sign up to the Yorwaste 'Teckal' Collaboration Agreement, agree terms with and award a new contract to Yorwaste using a 'Teckal' exemption. Yorwaste would

then procure the service to deliver the disposal of the co-mingled material.

- 7.3 A 'Teckal' exemption enables the Council to let a contract without needing to follow EU procurement rules. The benefits of a 'Teckal' agreement are that it allows the Council to start co-mingling in April 2017, the process is compliant with procurement rules and is cost effective.
- 7.4 Details of the contractual arrangements will be reported to Members as soon as they are finalised.

#### 8 Next Steps

8.1 Table 5 below sets out the timetable for the introduction of co-mingled collections.

OUTLINE TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF CO-MINGLED SERVICE			
Action	Timescale		
In principle decision on Co-Mingling	Council 2 <sup>nd</sup> August 2016		
Introduction of Co-Mingled Collection Service approved by Policy Committee / Council	January 2017 / February 2017		
Consultation with the workforce on the operational arrangements	January – February 2017		
Communication to resident on changes	February and March 2017		
Co-mingling collections commence	April 2017		

Table 5

8.2 A comprehensive communication plan is being developed to ensure all residents are fully informed of the Council's revised recycling arrangements, the reasons for the changes, outcomes expected and the importance of recycling. Communication methods will include leaflets to all households, public notices in key strategic locations, press releases, social media, bin stickers, website etc.

#### 9 Financial Implications

- 9.1 There are no additional capital costs required to implement the co-mingled option as existing vehicles and wheeled bins can be utilised.
- 9.2 It is projected revenue savings of £111,000 per annum will be generated by adopting a co-mingled service.
- 9.3 A supplementary revenue estimate of £15,000 was approved to undertake the TEEP assessment and communicate the waste collection changes effectively to residents.

#### 10 Legal Implications

- 10.1 The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2012 transpose the Waste Framework Directive into UK law and the Council must demonstrate compliance.
- 10.2 Regulation 13 of the revised Waste Framework Directive November 2008 requires All Waste Collection Authorities to collect glass, metals, plastic and paper separately where it is technically, environmentally and economically practicable to do so. As the assessment concludes separate collections are not technically, environmentally and economically practicable, the Council can demonstrate compliance.

If the TEEP assessment was successfully challenged, the Council will be required to cease operating a co-mingled service and either revert to the previous collection arrangements or adopt a suitable alternative.

#### 11 Equality Impact Assessment

The Council's Equality Impact Assessment Procedure has been followed and an Equality Impact Assessment completed. Initial screening of the procedure identified that the proposed policy, strategy, procedure or function does not have the potential to cause negative impact or discriminate against different groups in the community.

#### 12 Contribution to Corporate Priorities

The collection of household waste and recyclates links to the Council priority for 'Resilient Communities' by creating greener communities through reducing waste.

#### 13 Background Papers

Waste Regulation Compliance Assessment Report. In addition the TEEP ASSESSMENT and associated appendices are available in the relevant agenda folder in the New Service Area on the Council's network should you wish to access them

#### 14 Author of the Report

Paul Ellis, Director of Services, pellis@cravendc.gov.uk, 01756 706413