

The Future

Which Way Next?

The Options

Co-mingled collection - Kerbside sort collection





Revised Waste Framework Directive*

Article 11

By 2015 Member States must:

- Promote Re-Use
- Collect at least paper (& cardboard), metal, plastics and glass

By 2020 Member States must:

Recycle a minimum of 50% by weight



^{*}To be implemented 12th December 2010

The Best Performers:

- Staffordshire Moorlands DC: 61.58% Co-mingled 3 bin system
- Cotswold DC: 60.83% Kerbside sort, box and bag, fortnightly
- East Lindsey DC: 59.45% Co-mingled 3 bin system
- South Hams DC: 57.90% Two Stream Co-mingled, 2 bins/2 Sacks
- South Shropshire DC: 57.45% Kerbside sort, box, fortnightly
- Teignbridge DC: 57.37% Kerbside sort, 2, boxes fortnightly
- Huntingdonshire DC: 57.16% Co-mingled 3 bin system
- Waveney DC: 55.91% Co-mingled 3 bin system
- North Kesteven DC: 55.96% Co-mingled 3 bin system
- Uttlesford DC: 53.73% Co-mingled 3 bin system
- SEFTON CURRENTLY ~ 40% (~18% dry recyclate)
- Wirral has higher dry recycling ~23% with 3 bin AWC system

The Pros and Cons

Co-mingled

- 1. Easy for residents
- 2. Less labour intensive
- 3. Easier to service HMO's
- 4. Less litter
- 5. No bulking station
- 6. One end user Veolia 20 yr
- 7. Bring in-house: uniformity in services, respond to change
- 8. Contamination
- 9. Separate food waste collection
- 10. Plastic bottles and cardboard

Kerbside Sort

- 1. Multiple collection containers
- 2. Labour intensive
- 3. Harder to service HMO's
- 4. More litter issues
- 5. Large bulking/transfer station
- 6. Multiple end users markets?
- 7. Remain contracted out: possible service conflict
- 8. High quality material
- 9. One pass with food possible
- 10. Plastic bottles **or** cardboard??



- 1. 3rd Wheelie Bin instead of box
- 2. Sack area methodology box
- 3. Separate weekly food waste collection
- Public Consultation? AWC feedback
- In/out sourced
- 6. Procurement process
- 7. TUPE transfer of staff
- 8. Implementation roll out
- 9. Communicate change
- 10. Education MRF input specification
- 11. Cost





- 1. Add plastics and/or cardboard
- 2. Material specification & commodity value, but subject to market price fluctuation
- 3. Additional box or bags
- 4. Keep weekly/alternate weeks
- 5. Weekly food waste liners
- 6. Re-tender process
- 7. Implementation
- 8. Communicate change
- 9. Service performance
- 10. Education
- 11. Cost of enhancement?





 Kerbside Sort: Remain as part of Contract

 Co-mingled: Managed in-house with enduser partners



Environmental Impact

- Co-mingled should bring ~5% recycling rate rise as cardboard, plastic bottles added and collection volume increased
- Kerbside recycling gain less sure difficulty in adding both cardboard and plastic in easy collection service - relying more on active sorting by residents for different materials each week
- Higher fuel use for commingled collection fleet but offset by recycling / landfill avoidance gain
- A 5% increase in recycling would save ~£0.5m per year on the Waste Disposal Levy

Environmental Permitting

Co-mingled:

 MRF Responsibility of MWDA – MRF performance influenced by quality of input from us and other Merseyside users

Kerbside Sort:

 Our responsibility: Managing Contractors, end user issues

Key Timescales

Co-mingled

Cabinet Member (January 2010)

Consultation (January)

Overview & Scrutiny (February)

Cabinet Member (February)

Cabinet (March)

Round Planning (April/May)

Implementation Planning (May/June)

Vehicle Procurement (May/June)

Overview & Scrutiny (June)

Container Procurement (June)

Cabinet Member (August)

Cabinet (September)

Serve Notice to Contractor (?)

Staffing/TUPE issues (to March 2011)

Kerbside Sort

Cabinet Member (January 2010)

Specification (January)

Overview & Scrutiny (February)

Cabinet Member (February)

Cabinet (March)

Procurement/Tendering (March)

Tender Evaluation (May/July)

Overview & Scrutiny (July)

Cabinet Member (August)

Cabinet (September)

Serve Notice/Award Contract (Oct)

Staffing/TUPE issues (to March 2011)