

**FOREST HEATH DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**ST EDMUNDSBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**WEST SUFFOLK WASTE AND STREET SCENE SERVICES JOINT COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of a meeting held on Friday 27 January 2012 at 10.00 am**  
**in the Conference Chamber West (F1R09), West Suffolk House, Western Way,**  
**Bury St Edmunds**

PRESENT:                Forest Heath District Council  
                              Councillor Simmons  
                              Councillor Stewart (Substitute for Councillor Roman)

St Edmundsbury Borough Council  
                              Councillor Ray  
                              Councillor Stevens (Chairman)

IN ATTENDANCE:    M Christie, Environment and Waste Service Manager (FHDC)  
                              P Clifford, Fleet and Technical Manager (SEBC)  
                              D Linguard, Operations Manager (FHDC)  
                              K Marley, Head of Environmental Services (FHDC)  
                              N McCurdy, Strategic Director (Services) (FHDC)  
                              S Pell, Corporate Director for Economy and Environment (SEBC)  
                              C Silverwood, Operations Manager (SEBC)  
                              M Walsh, Head of Waste and Street Scene Services (SEBC)  
                              P Weller, Legal Executive (FHDC)  
                              S Lincoln, Committee Services Manager (SEBC)

**26. Substitutes**

The Joint Committee was advised of the following substitution:-

Councillor Stewart substituting for Councillor Roman.

**27. Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Roman.

**28. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 October 2011 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**29. Declarations of Interests**

Members' declarations of interests are recorded under the item to which the declaration relates.

**30. Procurement of Waste Transfer and Recycling Services**

The Joint Committee considered Report C312 (previously circulated) which provided an update on the procurement process being adopted, roles and responsibilities, and the timing programme that was needed to deliver the procurement of waste transfer and recycling services.

The local authorities in Suffolk had been working together through a joint officer project team to assess future waste infrastructure needs. Suffolk County Council had a need to consider waste transfer requirements for transporting residual waste from

where it arose to the Energy from Waste Facility from December 2014. There was also a need to consider the sorting and marketing of mixed dry recyclate when the current Suffolk Recycling Consortium contract arrangements for the Material Recovery Facility (MRF) at Gt Blakenham expired in March 2014. Future arrangements for processing organic waste in Suffolk was outside of the scope of this procurement exercise as current contracts across the county expired at different times.

The procurement was a complex one involving eight different councils in the process of procuring the waste infrastructure in two lots, namely:-

- (a) the transfer stations and haulage needed for the Energy from Waste Facility; and
- (b) recycling infrastructure and haulage services, to replace the current MRF contract.

The project used an European Union (EU) compliant procurement process called Competitive Dialogue (CD). Under this process prospective contractors were invited to provide their increasingly detailed proposals to an input/output specification. This process allowed a dialogue with suppliers to negotiate and develop optimised solutions. A reduced number of prospective contractors remained involved with the process as discussions in later stages become more detailed.

The CD process had a number of stages which were listed in the report.

It had been agreed that Suffolk County Council would act as the Contracting Authority for this procurement, and would be leading the process. The Lead Negotiator would work closely with a representative from of the Waste Collection Authorities (WCA), and this Lead Negotiator was the Borough Council's Head of Waste Street Scene Services.

Throughout the procurement, until recommending award of the contract towards the end of the process, would be delegated to Suffolk County Council in conjunction with the Directors of all of the other local authorities within Suffolk. These Directors would consult with their relevant Portfolio Holder or Member Champion before confirming their agreement that the process could move forward to the next stage. The key stages where decisions were required were listed in the report.

The cost of these contracts must be met through the collective Suffolk waste budgets. The exact cost of the proposed new transfer and recycling infrastructure would not be known with certainty until bids were returned.

The Joint Committee recognised that the geographical location of waste transfers stations would be important to waste collection authorities in West Suffolk, and would need to be carefully assessed when tenders were received. There was a risk that collection vehicles would have to travel further, which could result in more fuel, vehicle assets and labour costs. The apportionment of costs and benefits would need to be carefully agreed in order that no authority was advantaged at the expense of another. The Joint Committee also recognised that it was also important to understand the wider funding mechanism between the Waste Disposal Authority and the Waste Collection Authorities beyond the expiry of the current Memorandum of Understanding in 2013. It was understood that discussions to explore the options were already underway.

RESOLVED:-

That a further report be presented to the Joint Committee regarding arrangements for sharing costs and benefits resulting from this procurement.

### **31. Vehicle Procurement Programme**

The Joint Committee received an oral update from the Fleet and Technical Manager.

The Fleet and Technical Manager reminded the Joint Committee that it had been agreed that 16 vehicles be purchased, of which three would be road sweepers and 13 refuse vehicles. Of the 13 refuse vehicles one would be a new trade waste vehicle. The three road sweepers had been the subject of tender, and had been ordered as had the new trade waste vehicle. However, the 12 refuse vehicles had been subject to tender in the autumn 2011 but the final procurement had been put on hold due to the pending decision regarding organic waste. However, the 12 refuse vehicles had again been the subject of tender, and the Fleet and Technical Manager informed the Joint Committee of the results of this re-tendering. The tendering process had indicated that the cost of these refuse vehicles would increase at the end of February 2012.

The Joint Committee was reminded of the cost of maintaining the current vehicles and these appeared to be escalating.

In response to a question the Joint Committee was informed that all vehicles/plant were disposed of by auction, and the income credited to the renewals fund.

Prior to the meeting the Joint Committee had inspected a new 7.5 ton box lorry with the new West Suffolk livery and logo. A discussion was held on whether there should be publicity surrounding the new vehicle but it was concluded that it would be better to wait until other refuse vehicles had been received, in April 2012.

### **32. Date of Next Meeting**

The Joint Committee confirmed that it would next meet on Friday 23 March 2012 at 10.00 am.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **EXEMPT INFORMATION – EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC TERMS OF FORMAL RESOLUTION**

That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Act.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **33. Options for Diverting Organic Waste**

The Joint Committee considered Exempt Report C313 (previously circulated) which outlined the results of research into the relative merits of six different options for the collection and treatment of food waste that was currently collected in the black bin and sent for disposal in landfill.

The options involved different vehicle and staffing configurations, and estimates relating to the amount of food waste that could be collected, based upon assumptions relating to household behaviour and proposed changes to current waste collection policies.

A number of work streams were undertaken including:-

- (a) a compositional analysis of the contents of the brown bin;
- (b) a review of the services provided at a number of similar Councils to determine household participation levels, recycling performance and the relative merits associated with different approaches to managing garden waste; and
- (c) modelling of the changes in cost and performance associated with each option.

The report outlined the range of assumptions to determine the most effective method of collecting food waste in the future and the risks attached to each option. The risks also referred to a number of unknown future impacts that could change the relative cost and performance of each option, such as:-

- (a) the future level of Recycling Performance Payment and the Inter Authority Agreement; guaranteeing the ongoing commitment of partners;
- (b) gate fees associated with organics treatment and the location of future facilities;
- (c) the availability of facilities for both the transfer and processing of waste, at locations convenient to both authorities;
- (d) the availability of capital funding to support changes to vehicle specifications and numbers;
- (e) the ongoing economic climate, affordability and the acceptance of policy changes; and
- (f) the reduction or increase in the quantity of waste generated and captured.

Whilst there were gaps and uncertainties in the research examined to date, based on the assumptions used in the modelling the current waste management approach appeared to be the most effective in terms of cost, although it is the least performing option in terms of the recycling rate achieved. An increase in performance was however, achievable using the other collection and treatment options, although there was a direct association between increasing recycling performance and increasing cost.

RESOLVED:- That

- (1) the work undertaken in terms of the modelling of the various food waste collection options and the potential costs and risks be noted;
- (2) options be kept under review when more information and costs are available;
- (3) no change be made to the current policy on the collection of garden waste;
- (4) introduction of a trial(s) to test the different collection options if proved necessary and practical in the future when more details are known;
- (5) the procurement of the twelve replacement Refuse Collection Vehicles as previously reported be approved; and

- (6) subject to further changes to the financial and performance profile in the short term, the inclusion of meat waste in the brown bins be deferred.

#### **34. Any Other Business**

The Joint Committee was informed that East Cambridgeshire District Council had approached the West Suffolk Partnership with a general enquiry as to whether it would be willing to undertake the operation of its waste collection services as the current contract was coming to an end.

The Joint Committee was broadly supportive of the West Suffolk Partnership undertaking work on behalf of East Cambridgeshire District Council, and wished to be kept informed of progress on this issue.

In response to a question, the Joint Committee was informed that the 'work' related to street cleansing in addition to waste collection.

The meeting concluded at 11.46 pm.

**CHAIRMAN**