



South Tyneside Council



**SOUTH TYNE AND WEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT
PARTNERSHIP JOINT EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE AGENDA**

Friday, 14 June 2019 at 1.30 pm in the Whickham Room - Civic Centre

From the Chief Executive, Sheena Ramsey

Item Business

1. **Election of Chair**

2. **Election of Deputy Chairs**

3. **Apologies for Absence**

4. **Minutes** (Pages 3 - 10)

The Joint Executive Committee is asked to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 March 2019 (attached)

5. **Declarations of Interest**

6. **Residual Waste Treatment Contract 2018/19 - Anna Bell, Regional Waste Manager, Suez**

Presentation

7. **Resources and Waste Strategy Consultations - STWWMP Responses**
(Pages 11 - 24)

Report attached

8. **Contracts Update** (Pages 25 - 36)

Report attached

9. **Communications Update**

Presentation

10. **Date and Time of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Joint Executive Committee will be held on Friday 13 September 2019 at 1.30 pm in the Whickham Room, Civic Centre

Contact: Helen Conway Email: helenconway@gateshead.gov.uk, Tel: 433 3993, Date:
Friday, 7 June 2019

GATESHEAD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL
SOUTH TYNE AND WEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT PARTNERSHIP JOINT
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Friday, 15 March 2019

PRESENT: Councillor Linda Green (Gateshead Council) (Chair)
Gateshead Council Councillor Angela Douglas
South Tyneside Council Councillor Mark Walsh
Sunderland Council Councillor Amy Wilson

IN ATTENDANCE:

Gateshead Council Helen Conway, Colin Huntington, Marc Morley
South Tyneside Council Tom Turner
Sunderland Council Colin Curtis
South Tyne & Wear Waste Management Partnership Chris Wilson, Gary Smith,
Fiona Swinburne, Tony Alder
Suez Anna Bell
GAP Waste Peter Moody

APOLOGIES:

Councillor Deborah Waller, Councillor Jim Foreman and Andrew Whittaker

43 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 15 June 2018, 21 September 2018 and 7 December 2018 respectively were agreed as a correct record.

44 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received or declared at the meeting.

45 CHALLENGES AFFECTING RECYCLING IN THE UK - A SUEZ RECYCLING AND RECOVERY UK PERSPECTIVE

Anna Bell from Suez provided the Joint Executive Committee with a presentation on

challenges affecting recycling in the UK.

RESOLVED - that the Joint Executive Committee noted the information presented.

46 GAP GROUP

Peter Moody from GAP Waste provided the Joint Executive Committee with a presentation on the work of the company and its plans for the future.

The Joint Executive Committee were invited on a site visit to the GAP Fridge Reprocessing facility in Gateshead in the near future to see the plant in operation.

RESOLVED - that the Joint Executive Committee noted the information presented.

47 'OUR WASTE, OUR RESOURCES: A STRATEGY FOR ENGLAND'

The Joint Executive Committee received a presentation entitled 'Our Waste, Our Resources: A Strategy for England' which is the first significant waste-related statement from Government since the 2011 Waste Review and the subsequent Waste Prevention Programme for England in 2013.

The strategy forms part of the Government's flagship 25-Year Environment Plan, which also includes other publications such as the Clean Growth Strategy, the Industrial Strategy, and the Litter Strategy.

There are 8 chapters in total – some with more of an impact on local authorities than others and they are summarised as follows:-

- 1) Sustainable Production
- 2) Helping Consumers Take More Considered Action
- 3) Recovering Resources and Managing Waste
- 4) Tackling Waste Crime
- 5) Enough is Enough: Cutting Down on Food Waste
- 6) Global Britain – International Leadership
- 7) Research and Innovation
- 8) Measuring Progress – Data, Monitoring and Evaluation

The Executive Joint Committee were advised that a number of the proposals will have a major impact on the future delivery of local authority waste services, such as:

- The requirements to collect a core set of recycling materials, the seemingly mandatory separate collection of food waste, free garden waste collections
- Actions around HWRCs – which will also impact on the contractors who are delivering the service,
- New policy areas that could have a huge impact on local authorities and the waste sector – the external producer responsibility requirements and the introduction of a deposit return scheme.

The Executive Joint Committee were advised that many actions will require significant new investment through local authorities – in both the collection and disposal infrastructure – and government is committed to ensuring that local authorities are resources to meet the new net costs arising from the proposals, there is no description of how this will be achieved or the source of the funding.

The Partnership will now fully participate in relevant consultation exercises following the publication of the strategy, the first series of which were released in late February and will consider collection consistency, the introduction of a deposit return scheme and reforming the UK packaging producer responsibility system.

- RESOLVED -
- i) That the information be noted
 - ii) That officers circulate the consultation comments to members of the Joint Executive Committee for information
 - iii) That further updates will be provided to the Joint Executive Committee in due course.

48 MRF MARKET ENGAGEMENT EVENT

The Joint Executive Committee were advised of the recent Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) market engagement event that was held at Gateshead International Stadium.

Gateshead and South Tyneside councils' MRF contract for dry recyclables with Palm Recycling Ltd, commenced service on 1 April 2014. A 36-month contract extension to 31 March 2021 was agreed in 2018.

Sunderland City Council's separate MRF contract commenced service with J&B Recycling on 1 April 2015. Similarly, a contract extension period to 31 March 2021 has been agreed with the contractor.

As the maximum contract extension periods for both MRF contracts have been agreed, this means that all three partner authorities will require new MRF arrangements from 1 April 2021.

However, in planning for the procurement of the next MRF contract, the ongoing uncertainty within the waste sector must be considered. This includes the impact of the Chinese recycling import restrictions; the outcome of the negotiations for the UK to leave the EU; and the implications arising from the recent publication of the resources and waste strategy, 'Our Waste, Our Resources: A Strategy for England'.

It was agreed that to further support the development of the next MRF contract specification, it was important for STWWMP to arrange a market engagement event so direct dialogue with potential service providers could be held. This enabled a number of issues to be discussed, such as:

- The viability of the current kerbside recycling collection system and consider

potential alternative options.

- The optimum contract length for the STWWMP MRF contract commencing in April 2021.
- The viability of constructing a dedicated STWWMP MRF or waste transfer station within the partnership area.
- The management of risk and reward in relation to market prices and contamination levels within the next MRF contract structure

The Joint Executive Committee were advised that STWWMP approached the national Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) to enquire if any independent support was available to assist with the development of the next MRF contract specification. WRAP subsequently agreed to fund free-of-charge support, and STWWMP participated in a formal procurement process, which appointed renowned environmental consultants Eunomia Research and Consulting to support STWWMP.

The STWWMP market engagement event was held on 27 February 2019 and 10 companies participated with current MRF contractors also involved.

Representatives from WRAP and Eunomia attended the event as observers and facilitated a short plenary session after the event closed to discuss initial feedback from the face-to-face discussion with service providers.

A full analysis and evaluation exercise following the event will now be undertaken and this will be delivered through a dedicated workshop with the STWWMP Officer Project Board to discuss a full options appraisal exerciser to consider a range of issues that STWWMP must address in developing the next MRF contract specification, including:

- Collection models
- The legislative context and potential impacts on local authority waste management,
- Pricing structure, and
- Current factors affecting the MRF market

This will enable a procurement 'road map' and action plan to be developed, so that STWWMP can develop an appropriate MRF contract specification that provides the best value to the partner authorities and is commercially attractive to service providers within the market.

- RESOLVED -
- i) That the information be noted
 - ii) Agree to receive further updates regarding the development of the next STWWMP MRF contract specification, as appropriate

The Joint Executive Committee received a report on the current position regarding the Residual Waste Treatment Contract and other ancillary waste joint contracts and

activities managed by the South Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership (STWWMP).

The latest contract performance (April 2018-January 2019) and service updates during recent months were reported.

The Joint Executive Committee were advised that STWWMP remains committed to an ongoing programme of community education and engagement, managed by Groundwork North East and Cumbria (GNEC) at the visitor and education centre, the energy-from-waste facility, and through outreach activities held in local schools and community settings.

Between April 2018 and the end of January 2019, over 6,500 local residents, children and young people, and community group members have taken part in waste awareness events, activities, and site visits.

A separate events programme for the dedicated Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) project with local schools and community groups formally closed at the end of January. Final project results are currently being prepared.

The Campground Community Liaison Group met on Tuesday 27 November 2018. The group were informed that the site is operating well and managing contract waste as expected. It was also noted that Sunderland Councillors had undertaken a site visit to both Jack Crawford house and the EfW. A presentation on the delivery of the dedicated Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) project was also provided.

The Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) contracts continue to be monitored closely by the joint partnership team. This includes processing payments, holding regular contract meetings and performance reviews, and Health & Safety site inspections at the various contractor facilities to ensure that recycling performance is maximised.

Table A at Appendix B (attached to the main report) highlights the total amount of materials collected by each authority between April 2018 and January 2019, broken down to demonstrate the paper collected separately in the inner box and the comingled materials collected in the main section of the blue bin. The overall recycling tonnages in each partner authority continue to fluctuate, but paper tonnages collected separately in the inner caddy have fallen again compared to the same period last year.

Table B at Appendix B (attached to the main report) highlights MRF recycling and recovery rates (for comingled materials only) since Quarter 1 2017/18. Recycling performance has generally remained at similar levels in Gateshead and South Tyneside. Sunderland City Council's recycling rate has improved slightly in the latest quarter and they continue to identify actions to help increase their recycling rates and reduce contamination (shown as recovery in the table) rates.

The Joint Executive Committee were also advised that a recycling trial commenced in February on a single collection round in both Gateshead and South Tyneside. This enables around 2,400 households to recycle paper and cardboard materials

together in a separate, additional, wheeled bin. Initial monitoring and sampling of the trial data suggests that residents are actively taking part and the quality of the paper and card picked up on the first collection day was extremely positive. Although the trial is taking place in Gateshead and South Tyneside, the results will benefit all three partner authorities and will be used when evaluating future service delivery models.

Appendix C (attached to the main report) highlights the latest HWRC recycling performance (April – December 2018).

Recycling performance at the sites remains at a similar level to the previous year. However, recycling performance at Cowen Road (Gateshead) and Beach Street (Sunderland) is currently slightly below the annual target, although this may change once the statistics for the full year are received. The performance at Beach Street could still be affected by the introduction of fortnightly collections in 2017.

All HWRC contractors continue to explore whether additional materials disposed at sites can be recycled and further improve recycling performance.

The partner authority HWRC contracts SUEZ and Remondis are set to expire at the end of March 2020. The joint partnership team has begun discussions with partner authorities to consider contract requirements facilitate next joint procurement process which will be delivered later in 2019.

The current contract periods are scheduled to end in March 2019. However, it has been agreed that the contracts for all three partner authorities will be extended for a period of 12 months from 1 April 2019.

Contract management meetings continue to be held with service providers at the various facilities, which also include Health & Safety site inspections. The garden waste kerbside collection service will resume in April 2019 in all three partner authorities.

RESOLVED - that the Joint Executive Committee noted the contents of the report.

50 COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE

A presentation was given to the Joint Executive Committee on International, National and Local Authority waste-related stories that have been in the media.

International Waste News

The Joint Executive Committee were advised that the US National Waste and Recycling Association has written to Donald Trump urging him to raise China's ban on imported recyclables during trade talks with the Chinese government.

The NWRA president said that they believe that there are better ways for the Chinese to achieve their goal of improving their environment than to place what he described as 'unrealistic restrictions' on recycling imports.

The letter also states that, for decades, the US has exported one-third of its recyclables to China in a 'mutually beneficial relationship'.

National Waste News

The Joint Executive Committee were advised that the Association of Directors of Environment, Economy and Transport (ADEPT) has called for a fundamental review of how waste services are managed, saying that it supports the drive to make producers pay.

Launching their policy position on the resources and waste strategy, the association has outlined its support for an extended responsibility scheme. The president of the ADEPT noted that:

- Local authorities have to make tough decisions about where the budget is spent,
- But that in order to provide the waste and recycling services that people expect the current systems need to change,
- And responsibility for managing packaging waste must lie with the producer – which will not only reduce the burden on local authorities but will also provide incentives for long term investment and give markets greater certainty

ADEPT also wants to see greater investment in the UK's own waste processing capacity – particularly given the current uncertainty across the market globally.

The Joint Executive Committee were advised that in response to the publication of the strategy and consultation on a deposit return scheme, the Association of Convenience Stores has said that a manual scheme 'won't work' in convenience stores.

The consultation exercise proposes a network of reverse vending machines and manual return points, which would be hosted by retailers. The ACS has previously argued that manual returns would cause a number of issues for small retailers and are not a practical solution.

The Joint Executive Committee were also advised that following a hugely successful trial in 2018, Highland Spring has now launched a nationwide retailer roll-out of a 100% recycled and recyclable plastic eco bottle.

During the trial, shoppers expressed a desire for more eco bottles, and following the national launch, Highland Spring said that more 100% recycled and recyclable bottles will follow later in the year, including a kids Eco Bottle which has been designed to help young people understand more about healthy hydration and responsible recycling.

The results of the trial showed that shoppers responded well to the new eco bottle, with no negative reaction to the appearance of the recycled plastic material, and environmental awareness emerged as one of the key factors in people choosing to purchase the bottle.

The Joint Executive Committee were reminded that Walkers recently launched the UK's first nationwide crisp packet recycling scheme and in January 2019, Marks and Spencer went one step further with the news that they are launching a new plastics initiative to enable customers to bring back non-recyclable plastic packaging.

Unlike the Walkers scheme, which only targets crisp packets, this scheme includes a range of plastic packaging in addition to crisp packets, including black plastic food trays and sauce sachets. M&S has pledged to give the plastic collected a 'new life' by recycling it into store fittings, furniture and playground equipment for schools.

The scheme was initially launched in eight M&S stores in the South of England, but the scheme will be rolled out to stores nationally by the end of this year.

M&S has said that as a business, the company is committed to reducing the amount of plastic we use and have already started phasing-out non-recyclable packaging from their products.

RESOLVED – That the Joint Executive Committee noted the contents of the report.

51 PROGRAMME OF FUTURE MEETINGS 2019-2020

The Joint Executive Committee received the Programme of Future Meetings for 2019-2020.

RESOLVED - that the information be noted

52 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Joint Executive Committee were advised that this would be Tony Alder's last meeting, as he is retiring from the Council and the South Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership Joint Committee with effect from the end of March 2019.

The Joint Executive Committee wished to place upon record their thanks to Tony for his work and wished him every success in the future.

53 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will take place on Friday 14 June 2019 at 1.30 pm in the Whickham Room, Civic Centre.



South Tyneside Council



REPORT TO THE SOUTH TYNE AND WEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT PARTNERSHIP JOINT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

14 JUNE 2019

REPORT OF: Colin Huntington, Project Director, South Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership

SUBJECT: Resources & Waste Strategy Consultations – STWWMP Responses

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To advise the Joint Executive Committee of the submission of responses by South Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership (STWWMP) to the recent resources and waste strategy consultation exercises.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 In March 2019, the Joint Executive Committee received a presentation highlighting the publication of the new national resources and waste strategy, 'Our Waste, Our Resources: A Strategy for England'. The strategy contains proposals that set the long-term waste policy framework and aims to encourage England to move away from the traditional linear economy (take, make, use, throw away) and begin to recognise and maximise the value of resource usage by minimising waste and its impact on the environment.

2.2 Following its publication, the Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) issued three consultation exercises, which sought views from a wide range of organisations (such as local authorities; waste management companies; retailers; manufacturers; product designers; trade organisations; charities and social enterprises; academic and research organisations; and individual responses from members of the public etc.) on many of the proposals outlined within the strategy. The consultation exercises considered:

- Consistency in household and business recycling collections in England;
- Introducing a Deposit Return Scheme in England, Wales and Northern Ireland; and
- Reforming the UK packaging producer responsibility system.

2.3 The consultations were released simultaneously with a strict 12-week period for each response to be submitted.

3. STWWMP RESPONSES

- 3.1 STWWMP coordinated a joint response to each consultation exercise on behalf of the three partner authorities.
- 3.2 To inform the process, feedback was sought from a wide range of key stakeholders including: the Joint Executive Committee; members of the Officer Project Board; key service providers; STWWMP Lead Authority professional support, e.g. financial services and communications representatives; and elected members and executive officers from each partner authority.
- 3.3 In general terms, the aspirations of the strategy are aligned to the strategic principles of STWWMP, i.e. prevent waste from occurring by encouraging residents to consider how to minimise the waste that they produce and improve recycling rates by providing residents with services that are simple-to-use and easy-to-access.
- 3.4 However, the two key issues behind the delivery of many of the proposals within the strategy (and especially those highlighted within the collection consistency consultation) essentially relate to further clarification regarding the source and value of government funding to meet the service costs of the strategy's proposals, and ensuring that local flexibility in service delivery can also be accounted for.
- 3.5 STWWMP has reflected these issues strongly in its responses to the consultations.
- 3.6 The key STWWMP responses to local authority-related issues within each consultation are highlighted in Appendices A-C.

4. NEXT STEPS

- 4.1 All three consultation exercises closed at at 11.59pm on Monday 13 May 2019. STWWMP must now wait for government to publish the outcome of the consultation exercises and clarify their impact on the strategy's original proposals.
- 4.2 However, some of the consultations indicated that further consultation on their outcome will be required (e.g. the development of statutory guidance on waste-related minimum service standards for local authorities) and this is expected to take place in late 2019.

5. RECOMMENDATION

- 5.1 The Joint Executive Committee is requested to note the contents of this report.

Contact:

Chris Wilson, Contract Manager (Policy), STWWMP Tel: 433 7478

Consistency in household and business recycling collections in England

Proposal	STWWMP response	Comments
All local authorities should be required to collect a core set of dry recyclable materials from all households	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% of local authorities (including STWWMP) already collect the proposed materials. • Further consideration needs to be given to implementation in flats and houses in multiple occupancy, especially around waste storage. • Contamination will still be a key issue and this cannot always be attributed to 'confusion', i.e. inclusion of hazardous/offensive wastes. • STWWMP request funding from government to undertake a waste compositional analysis exercise to identify and then target recycling disposed with the residual waste stream.
Core material set will be glass bottles and containers, paper and card, plastic bottles, plastic pots tubs and trays, and steel and aluminium tins and cans	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP already collect such materials at the kerbside. • STWWMP suggest food and drinks cartons (e.g. Tetrapaks) are also included, and, potentially, tin foil. • STWWMP advise that plastic bags, black plastic materials, and textiles are not considered at the current time. • Clear labelling on core materials will be a key issue (links to EPR consultation) along with the availability of sustainable end markets.
All local authorities should be required to collect a weekly separate food waste collection from all households	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP acknowledges the rationale behind proposal and the likely impact in increasing recycling rates. • STWWMP achieve food waste landfill diversion (since April 2015) through processing of residual waste at the partnership's energy-from-waste facility.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited anaerobic digestion (AD) facilities (i.e. the alternative processing treatment) are available within the North East, which would impact on STWWMP securing contracts at a market premium. • STWWMP considers the costs to introduce separate food waste collections (including additional internal and external containers, specialist collection vehicles, staff and collection crews, fuel costs, contract procurement exercises etc.) as excessive and are not offset by the environmental benefits of processing food waste by AD, or the carbon footprint of an extended vehicle fleet, or by the financial impact on contractual EfW minimum tonnage requirements. • Source/ detail of potential government funding not identified in consultation – but if government mandate separate food waste collections, STWWMP is clear that all costs would need to be fully funded (both transitional and operational).
Households generating garden waste should be provided with access to a free kerbside collection service	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP achieve garden waste landfill diversion (since April 2015) through processing of residual waste at the partnership’s energy-from-waste facility or through kerbside garden waste collection services through open windrow composting. • Garden waste services are seasonal and resources are utilised elsewhere, (such as winter maintenance) and the potential impact on other services is not acknowledged in the consultation. • STWWMP consider that free garden waste collections will remove a valuable income stream from the delivery of a discretionary service, which is used to support the delivery of other frontline services. • Source/ detail of potential

		<p>government funding not identified in consultation – but if government mandate free garden waste collections, STWWMP is clear that all costs would need to be fully funded (both transitional and operational).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP highlights that government will need to amend the waste regulations if a free garden waste kerbside collection service is mandated.
<p>Separate collection of materials where this is feasible and to improve quality, including minimum service standards</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP acknowledges EU revised Waste Framework Directive separate collection requirements and highlights the partnership's 'TEEP Position Statement' in response. • STWWMP notes that kerbside-sort collections generally require weekly collections due to limited container capacities. • STWWMP highlights the current separate fibre recycling trial taking place in Gateshead and South Tyneside. • STWWMP agrees with the Local Authority Recycling Advisory Committee (LARAC) that one mandated collection system is not appropriate, as various local circumstances must be allowed to be considered.
<p>Standardised waste container colours for the core set of recycling materials, plus with residual, food, and garden wastes</p>	<p>Agree in part</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All STWWMP recycling bins are the same colour, which enables joint communications activities to be delivered. The colour of other bins is an individual decision for the partner authorities. • Replacing existing household kerbside bins nationally would be a significant financial and logistical exercise. • Standardising bin colours for each waste stream nationally could have unintended consequences and confuse some residents, e.g. if the national colour is already the colour

		<p>of an existing bin for a different waste stream etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source/ detail of potential government funding not identified in consultation – but if government mandate standardised container colours, STWWMP is clear that all costs would need to be fully funded (both transitional and operational).
Statutory guidance on minimum service standards to which local authorities will be required to have regard	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP notes that the detail of the proposed service standards will be considered in a further consultation exercise. • STWWMP strives to deliver household waste services that are fit-for-purpose with clearly defined standards that residents can expect from the range of waste-related services provided.
Develop a set of non-binding performance indicators for local authorities to use to monitor waste management and recycling and to highlight where services can be improved to delivery higher recycling and minimise waste	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst STWWMP welcomes the ability to benchmark performance, reassurance is sought that the submission of <u>non-binding</u> data should not be an onerous task and suggest that this can already be met by the existing WasteDataFlow database abilities and functionality.
Support and enable greater collaboration and partnership working between authorities	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STWWMP model is an example of how collaboration and partnership working between local authorities can improve waste management and recycling levels.
Increase recycling from businesses and other organisations that produce municipal waste	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP already provides tailored trade waste services to meet the needs of local businesses in disposing their waste. • STWWMP is not in favour of a separate food waste collection service within the partnership area, including businesses. • STWWMP also seeks clarification regarding the consultation's definition of municipal waste.

Introducing a Deposit Return Scheme in England, Wales and Northern Ireland

Proposal	STWWMP response	Comments
Basic principles of a DRS	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP acknowledges that introduction of a DRS could reduce street littering of recyclable materials that are consumed on-the-go, but that a DRS <u>should not</u> compete with existing recycling services, which have proven to be highly-successful. • A fundamental principle for STWWMP is to encourage its residents to become responsible recyclers and utilise the current kerbside service, which is easy-to-use, easy-to-understand, well-established, and popular with residents. • STWWMP considers that the introduction of a DRS as an alternative waste disposal/recycling route could create confusion for residents and result in inconsistencies in service delivery across STWWMP. • STWWMP seeks further clarification regarding the overlap between the DRS proposals and the separate consultation on recycling collection consistency, which includes proposals to introduce a core set of kerbside recycling materials, which will also be in-scope of a DRS. • STWWMP considers that the introduction of a DRS would remove valuable materials from kerbside collections and, therefore, make the remaining materials disposed at the kerbside less attractive to the market when procuring future MRF contracts. • STWWMP is keen to see more detail regarding the overlap between the DRS proposals and

		<p>the separate consultation on EPR requirements, i.e. how will producers support local authorities in the disposal of drinks containers that are in-scope of a DRS but are disposed by residents at the kerbside.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instead of the significant costs associated with introducing a DRS, STWWMP would rather see investment from government to fund more communications, for example, to further promote household kerbside recycling, for example.
Materials in-scope	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst STWWMP does not currently support the introduction of a DRS, if such a scheme is implemented PET bottles, aluminium/steel cans, and glass bottles could be included as they are already widely recyclable. • HDPE bottles <u>should not</u> be included, as milk should be considered as an everyday item and not subject to a deposit, and their disposal should be considered under the separate consultation on EPR requirements.
Drinks in-scope	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst STWWMP does not currently support the introduction of a DRS, if such a scheme is implemented, water, soft drinks, juices, alcoholic drinks, and milk-containing drinks could be included. • Milk <u>should not</u> be included (see above), and STWWMP seeks further clarification regarding the everyday use of plant-based drinks. • Disposable (e.g. coffee) cups should not be included in a DRS and their disposal should be considered under the separate consultation on EPR requirements.

Proposed material flows	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP notes that the material flow shows all the material being returned to the return point/retailer, which is then forwarded via collection systems to the counting centre etc. However, material placed in the local authority kerbside collection system is not shown. • STWWMP notes that the consultation states that government are considering a funding formula whereby local authorities could be paid the deposit amount on drinks containers by the DMO without having to physically return them via a designated return point and seeks further clarification from government regarding how this formula will be modelled (as no further details are provided).
Overlap with the packaging producer responsibility system	Not enough information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP notes that the consultation states that one option to avoid a 'double-charge' would be for producers obligated under a DRS to not also be obligated under a reformed packaging producer responsibility system for the same packaging items. • However, STWWMP agrees with LARAC that EPR reforms mean that producers must cover the full costs incurred for the collection of the material that they put on the market - whether this is from the kerbside or DRS – and that producers are not being double charged within a DRS (as they are simply paying the operating costs of two different collection systems).
Unredeemed deposits to be used to part-fund the costs of the DRS system	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP considers that the DRS should function on redeemed deposits only and it would be appropriate for the funds from unredeemed deposits to be directed towards local authorities to cover the costs of collecting in-scope materials through, e.g.

		kerbside services.
In line with the principle of full net cost recovery, the government proposes that producers would cover the set-up costs of the DMO	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP agrees with LARAC that DRS is a form of EPR and so it is appropriate that producers should fund the set-up costs of the DMO.
Should producers of drinks within a DRS be responsible for DRS operational costs	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with full cost recovery principles, STWWMP considers that producers should be responsible for meeting DRS operational costs, including communications campaigns and litter clearance.
Obligated to host a return point	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP acknowledges that any DRS system needs to have a comprehensive collection infrastructure in place to operate successfully, utilising locations that are easily accessible and do not encourage residents to use their own transport to deliver materials to collection facilities etc. • STWWMP agrees that retailers who sell drinks should be the primary hosts of return points, which should be supported by other easy-to-access locations of high footfall, however, it would not be appropriate to mandate locations. • STWWMP acknowledges the potential of hosting return points alongside existing recycling services (such as the bring site network) but highlights that such sites are likely to need some modification and these costs need to be fully met by the producers, i.e. at no cost to the local authority, either initially or on an ongoing basis for any operational costs. • The DMO will need to ensure that appropriate provisions are in place to service rural areas/communities.

Optimum deposit level to incentivise return of drinks containers	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP does not feel that it is appropriate to comment on what value an optimum deposit level should be.
DRS models – ‘all-in’ or ‘on-the-go’	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst STWWMP does not currently support the introduction of a DRS, STWWMP considers that if such a scheme is implemented, it should focus on recyclable items that are currently regularly disposed within the residual waste stream and therefore offer a genuine potential to increase recycling rates – therefore an ‘on-the-go’ DRS for items could target materials that are not normally returned home to be recycle in household kerbside collection systems. • STWWMP notes that its household recycling kerbside collection services already collect larger drinks containers and, therefore, their inclusion in a DRS is more likely to result in the transferral of material from one recycling stream to another.

Reforming the UK packaging producer responsibility system

Proposal	STWWMP response	Comments
Principles proposed for packaging EPR	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP agrees with the majority of principles proposed for packaging EPR but notes that the requirement on local authorities to collect a consistent set of materials should only be applied where viable end markets exist. • As a fundamental concept of EPR, STWWMP notes that full net costs should be provided by producers.
EPR packaging outcomes	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP agrees with the outcomes that an EPR packaging system should be designed to deliver but is concerned that some outcomes may not be delivered due to the lack of detail available.
Should items not currently legally considered as packaging should be in scope of the new packaging EPR system	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the polluter pays principle and true producer responsibility is to be installed, then the scope of packaging should be as wide as is reasonably possible.
Definition of full net cost recovery	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP supports the definition adopted and welcomes the fact that it includes disposal and littering of packaging and not just materials presented as recycling. Netting off revenue from the sale of materials is appropriate. • STWWMP supports the proposal that producers should also fund national and local communication campaigns for recycling and littering, as outlined in the consultation. • STWWMP supports the inclusion of costs related to data recording and considers it appropriate that this includes local authority costs in relation to the use of WasteDataFlow.

<p>Payments to local authorities for collecting and managing household packaging waste should be based on the provision of collection services that meet any minimum standard requirements</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP agrees with LARAC that local authorities should receive payments for the provision of services related to packaging as this is a fundamental part of producer responsibility and moving to a situation where producers bear the full life costs of their products. • Payments for collecting and managing household waste should not be related to minimum service standards - if payments are only made if a local authority only operates a certain system, then this is against the polluter pays principle and a local authority should not have payments withheld if there are genuine reasons why they cannot meet a specific service standard.
<p>All of the costs to local authorities of managing packaging waste have been considered</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP agrees with LARAC that the payment systems do not reflect the packaging that must be collected and treated from littering, and there is also no mention of collection costs of packaging in the residual waste stream, which must also be addressed.
<p>Should producer fees be used to support local service related communications delivered by local authorities</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP considers that local communication exercises are key to the proper use of recycling services and need to be fully supported if increased recycling is to be realised and high recycling targets are to be met. • National campaigns are also important and help to support local messages and vice versa. For example, where possible, STWWMP utilises the materials and resources provided by WRAP through the Recycle Now programme. • STWWMP agrees with LARAC and is not aware of a legitimate reason where producers should be exempt from contributing to the cost of communications activities.

<p>Do you agree it should be mandatory for producers to label their packaging as Recyclable/Not Recyclable</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP is clear that labelling needs to be clear/unambiguous and supports the mandated use of labelling indicating if packaging is recyclable or not (alongside the removal of other 'recycling labels' as these are often misleading and meaningless from a consumer recycling advice point of view, e.g. 'check locally').
<p>Governance Model 2 – single not-for-profit management organisation</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STWWMP agrees with LARAC that the creation of a central body allows for strategic oversight that could be beneficial to developing end markets, collection, better packaging design and higher recycling. Local authorities would, therefore, only be dealing with one organisation so there are no procurement or contracting issues. • Model 2 makes clear that payments to local authorities would be made in accordance with an 'agreed funding formulae' which will underpin the required investment from local authorities and provide confidence that services can be implemented for longevity and ensure value-for-money contracts. • STWWMP is aware that LARAC members are strong in their desire to see local government involved in the governance of the single body and it not just be a purely producer managed organisation.



South Tyneside Council



REPORT TO THE SOUTH TYNE AND WEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT PARTNERSHIP JOINT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

14 JUNE 2019

REPORT OF: Colin Huntington, Project Director, South Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership

SUBJECT: Contracts Update

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To advise the Joint Executive Committee of the latest position regarding the Residual Waste Treatment Contract and other ancillary waste joint contracts and activities managed by the South Tyne and Wear Waste Management Partnership (STWWMP).

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The Residual Waste Treatment Contract (RWTC) was awarded to a consortium led by SITA UK (through SITA South Tyne and Wear Ltd) on 20 April 2011. The contract comprises the energy-from-waste facility (EfW) at Teesside, fed by waste from three Waste Transfer Stations (WTS) situated for use by each of the partner authorities. The contract commenced service on 22 April 2014.

2.2 In March 2015, SITA UK's parent company announced a global rebrand, indicating that all its subsidiary companies would change their names to SUEZ. In December 2015, STWWMP received formal notification that SITA South Tyne and Wear Ltd had also changed its name and would now be known as South Tyne and Wear Energy Recovery Ltd (STWER).

2.3 Gateshead and South Tyneside councils' 48-month Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) contract for dry recyclables commenced service with Palm Recycling Ltd on 1 April 2014. A contract extension period was agreed in 2018, which is scheduled to end on 31 March 2021.

2.4 Sunderland City Council awarded a separate MRF contract to J&B Recycling, which commenced service on 1 April 2015 for a period of 36 months. A contract extension period was agreed in 2018, which is also scheduled to end on 31 March 2021.

- 2.5 Gateshead and Sunderland councils jointly procured separate contracts with SUEZ for the management of Household Waste and Recycling Centres (HWRC). Both incentive-based contracts were two years and seven months in length and commenced service at the beginning of September 2014. 36-month contract extension periods were agreed from 1 April 2017.
- 2.6 From 1 December 2017, South Tyneside Council entered into a 30-month HWRC management with Remondis JBT.
- 2.7 The end dates for all three HWRC management contracts are co-terminus. This will enable a joint approach between all three partner authorities to be considered for a new contract commencing on 1 April 2020.
- 2.8 A joint procurement exercise awarded three separate green waste composting contracts for each partner authority. Although contracts were awarded to three different providers, the timing of the contract lengths has been structured to enable a joint partnership contract to be considered at the end of the current arrangements. The current contract providers are:
- Gateshead: A.Willey for 36 months from 01 April 2016
 - South Tyneside: SUEZ for 36 months from 01 April 2016
 - Sunderland: JBT (now delivered by Remondis following take-over of JBT) for 31 months from 01 September 2016
- 2.9 Following the expiry of the above contracts, all three partner authorities agreed to a 12-month extension from 01 April 2019.
- 2.10 The joint partnership team continues to undertake several waste management functions on behalf of the partner authorities, including reviewing and verifying monthly contract reports, which detail materials processed and service issues. Once approved, invoices are processed and, where appropriate, apportioned between partner authorities within contractual timescales.
- 2.11 This is enabling, amongst other things, a proactive and timely approach to management of the RWTC which is operated under strict timescales. Similar benefits are also afforded to the procurement and management of other ancillary contracts, such as MRF, HWRC, and green waste composting.

3. **RESIDUAL WASTE TREATMENT CONTRACT (RWTC)**

2018/19 Service Update

- 3.1 The year-end performance information for the 2018/19 contract year can be found at Appendix A. RWTC contractual recycling and recovery targets were once again exceeded.
- 3.2 During the latter stages of the contract year, no notable service issues or loss of availability were encountered. No environmental breaches were experienced and no further compliance classification scheme (CCS) scores applied. All incinerator bottom ash samples returned compliant results.

2018/19 Annual Maintenance Shutdown

- 3.3 During February and March 2019, the annual maintenance shutdown took place. The shutdown was managed safely, and delivered as planned, with standard repairs carried out. No significant or unexpected issues were identified, and all assets were found to be within anticipated wear rates and in accordance with maintenance lifecycle schedules.
- 3.4 Subsequently, Line 5 was able to be brought back into service 24 hours ahead of schedule.

2019/20 Service Update

- 3.5 Line 4 lost one hour of availability on 01 April 2019 as a consequence of a plant trip initiated by a high bag filter differential pressure. Following investigations, the pulse jet air cleaning pressure was increased, which rectified the issue. There were no further unplanned losses of availability on either Line 4 or Line 5 in April.
- 3.6 However, on 03 April, a functional failure associated with the high voltage electrical switchgear resulted in 67.5 hours of lost turbine availability. Following an initial investigation, the fault was identified as a failed switching relay in the high voltage panel, which was replaced. The equipment supplier, TGM Kanis, attended site and conducted an internal inspection of the turbine, which confirmed that no fault had occurred within the turbine itself.
- 3.7 No environmental breaches were reported in April and all incinerator bottom ash samples returned compliant results.

Line 6 - Update

- 3.8 As highlighted previously, following the approval of planning permission for SUEZ to construct a sixth EfW line on the site at Haverton Hill, Hitachi Zosen Inova (HZI) were selected as preferred bidder. SUEZ and HZI continue to develop the design and finalise technology selection, performance requirements, and layouts to prepare for the start of pre-engineering and identification of enabling works.
- 3.9 However, an alternative location for the construction of Line 6 has now been identified within the Haverton Hill footprint, but not within the boundary of Lines 1-5. This would reduce the needed for shared site facilities such as access roads and weighbridges. An amendment to the existing planning permission will need to be submitted by SUEZ and a pre-application discussion has been held with Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council, but no revised plan has been formally submitted yet.
- 3.10 Construction is still expected to commence later in 2019 and the new facility operational by 2022. STWWMP will ensure that interface with the contractor will continue throughout the process.

Refinancing

- 3.11 Following previous positive discussions with STWER regarding refinancing the project, STWER has submitted an alternative proposal to a full refinancing exercise which could replace the Debt Service Reserve Account (DSRA) with a contingent Debt Service Reserve Facility (DSRF), whilst leaving the rest of the financial structure in place. STWWMP continues to work closely with financial

and legal advisors (Local Partnerships and Pinsent Mason) to investigate if the proposal is acceptable to the partnership.

Joint Insurance Cost Review (JICR)

- 3.12 Discussions with representatives from the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), STWER, and Willis Towers Watson insurers involving the joint insurance cost reports associated with the RWTC are ongoing.

Waste Transfer Stations (WTS)

- 3.13 All three of the WTS have continued to remain available, with all sites accepting STWWMP contract waste without significant issues. Recycling activities are ongoing at each site, which includes the segregation of materials, such as street sweepings, wood, and scrap metals.
- 3.14 Routine maintenance of buildings, plant, and control systems continues to be delivered as planned and no significant issues have been identified.
- 3.15 During the contract year 2018/19, the Environment Agency raised no WTS issues and no CCS scores were applied. All sites remain in Compliance Band A.

Targeted Recruitment and Training (TR&T)

- 3.16 The RWTC affords provision for SUEZ to help to improve local prosperity across the partnership area by promoting vacant posts within their facilities. The Economic Development Service at Gateshead Council continues to receive information on local vacancies, which are then cascaded to partner authorities for circulation to their client base. Local vacancies are also highlighted at the Jack Crawford House and Campground Community Liaison Groups to enable opportunities to be circulated across community contacts.
- 3.17 In total, 77% of staff employed at the three WTS and within the contracts support team based at Campground are residents of Gateshead, South Tyneside, or Sunderland. 9% of staff employed at the energy-from-waste facility are residents of the partnership area.
- 3.18 Following an initial meeting with STWWMP, SUEZ is currently working with Gateshead Council Learning Skills team to develop appropriate apprenticeship frameworks for the appointment of a waste resource operative apprentice and business administration apprentice. Both roles will support the delivery of the RWTC.

Community Education and Engagement

- 3.19 STWWMP remains committed to an ongoing programme of community education and engagement, managed by Groundwork North East & Cumbria (GNEC) at the visitor and education centre, the energy-from-waste facility, and through outreach activities held in local schools and community settings.
- 3.20 During the contract year 2018/19, 7,700 local residents, children and young people, and community group members took part in waste awareness events, activities, and site visits. Recently, this has included:

- Waste awareness assembly for 178 pupils at Lingey House Primary School, Gateshead.
- Year 8&9 waste awareness assembly for 248 pupils at Mortimer College, South Tyneside.
- Litter picking with 33 Year 6 pupils from Birtley East Primary School, Gateshead, in both the school grounds and nearby park.
- Regular waste awareness and recycling sessions with the Action Team at St. Mary's RC Primary School, Sunderland.
- Waste awareness session for 198 Year 9 pupils at Hebburn Comprehensive School, South Tyneside.
- 1st Houghton Beavers, Sunderland, who participated in a waste awareness and recycled paper making session at the visitor and education centre, Campground.

3.21 During April 2019, activities included:

- 32 Year 4 pupils from St. Joseph's RC Primary School in Sunderland who visited the partnership's energy-from-waste facility.
- Whole school Reduce, Reuse and Recycling assemblies with 214 pupils at Usworth Colliery Primary School and 189 pupils at Blackfell Primary School, both Sunderland.
- Recycling presentation delivered to 98 Year 9 pupils at Joseph Swan Academy, Gateshead.

3.22 A separate events programme was developed and delivered to local schools and community groups for the dedicated Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) project, which closed at the end of January.

3.23 Across the partnership area, the WEEE project delivered:

- 79 school assemblies/activities engaging with 8,863 pupils/staff.
- 60 school/community amnesty events, collecting over 2,500 kg of WEEE.
- 135 community roadshows/events, engaging with 5,142 residents.
- Direct engagement with 4,319 members of the community through 'door knocking' activities.
- The placement of 114 battery recycling containers in local schools, community centres, and libraries, collected 35,035 kg of used batteries. The containers remain in place even through the project has now finished.

3.24 Project activities focused on encouraging the community to apply 'the 3Rs' to unwanted WEEE, with reduce and reuse promoted as priorities. Whilst this approach stimulated WEEE awareness and drove materials further up the waste hierarchy, it also increased opportunities for low income residents to access reused, recycled, and repurposed electrical items through family networks and third-party organisations.

Community Liaison Groups

3.25 The Campground Community Liaison Group met on 7 May 2019.

- 3.26 The group were informed that the site is operating well, that the WTS is generally empty of waste at the end of each working day, with 15 loads of waste leaving site Monday-Friday.
- 3.27 The group heard about the separation of materials for recycling and received a video of the mattress recycling process, which highlighted how the metal and floc materials are separated on site.
- 3.28 The Environment Agency (EA) were unable to attend the meeting but reported that no issues or concerns had been noted.
- 3.29 The next meeting was scheduled for 6pm, Tuesday 24 September 2019.
- 3.30 The Jack Crawford House Community Liaison Group met on Thursday 14 March 2019.
- 3.31 The group received an update on site operations, noting that the site was operating well and is managing contract waste in line with expectations. No significant accidents or incidents had occurred during the period since the last meeting.
- 3.32 The EA undertook a site inspection November 2018 and recorded a positive inspection result, identifying that the site is in compliance with its permit and no further issues were raised. The group also noted that STWWMP undertake regular site inspections.
- 3.33 The next meeting is scheduled to take place at 6pm on Thursday 11 July 2019.

4. MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY (MRF) CONTRACTS

- 4.1 The MRF contracts continue to be monitored closely by the joint partnership team. This includes processing payments, holding regular contract meetings and performance reviews, and Health & Safety site inspections at the various contractor facilities to ensure that recycling performance is maximised.
- 4.2 Table A(i) at Appendix B highlights the 2018/19 year-end performance for the materials collected by each partner authority in the kerbside 'blue bin' recycling service. The results are broken down to demonstrate the paper collected separately in the inner box and the comingled materials collected in the main section of the blue bin. The overall recycling tonnages in each partner authority continue to fluctuate, but paper tonnages collected separately in the inner caddy have fallen again compared to the same period last year.
- 4.3 Table A(ii) shows the same data for 2019/20 (for the month of April only).
- 4.4 Appendix B also contains Table B, which highlights MRF recycling and recovery rates (for comingled materials only) since Quarter 1 2017/18. Recycling performance has generally remained at similar levels in Gateshead and South Tyneside. Sunderland City Council's recycling rate has continued to improve over the last several quarters and they continue to identify actions to help increase their recycling rates and reduce contamination (shown as recovery in the table) rates.

- 4.5 A recycling trial commenced in February on a single collection round in both Gateshead and South Tyneside. This enables around 2,400 households to recycle paper and cardboard materials together in a separate, additional, wheeled bin.
- 4.6 Initial monitoring and sampling of the trial data suggests that residents are actively taking part and the quality of both the paper/card and the other comingled materials has improved. Further detailed evaluation of the trial will take place over the coming months, supported by the Waste Resources Action Programme (WRAP). Residents will also be asked for their views on what they think of the trial collection system.
- 4.7 Although the trial is taking place in Gateshead and South Tyneside, the results will benefit all three partner authorities and will be used when evaluating future service delivery models.

5. **HOUSEHOLD WASTE AND RECYCLING CENTRE CONTRACTS**

- 5.1 Table A(i) at Appendix C highlights the 2018/19 year-end HWRC recycling performance, excluding inert materials, such as rubble.
- 5.2 Table A(ii) shows the latest recycling performance for 2019/20 (for the month of April only).
- 5.3 During 2018/19, recycling performance at Campground, Cowen Road, and Beach Street did not achieve the annual target. This could be attributed to the increased level of residual waste received at two of the sites, as the level of recycling has generally remained the same at each site. Contract provisions mean that the contractor will now pay a financial penalty to the partner authorities for not achieving the targets.
- 5.4 Analysis undertaken by SUEZ of the waste disposed within the HWRC residual waste containers indicated that very little recyclable materials were included within that waste stream.
- 5.5 All HWRC contractors continue to explore whether additional materials disposed at sites can be recycled and further improve recycling performance. This includes the introduction of new processes to recycle mattresses and recliner chairs disposed at Campground, Cowen Road and Beach Street. Recently, SUEZ has also sourced a recycling outlet for hard plastic materials.
- 5.6 The partner authority HWRC contracts with SUEZ and Remondis are set to expire at the end of March 2020. The joint partnership team continues to discuss with partner authorities the options for the next joint procurement process which will be delivered later in 2019.

6. **GREEN WASTE COMPOSTING CONTRACTS**

- 6.1 The garden waste kerbside collection service resumed in all three partner authorities in April 2019. Contract management meetings continue to be held

with service providers at the various facilities, which also include Health & Safety site inspections.

7. **RECOMMENDATION**

7.1 The Joint Executive Committee is requested to note the contents of this report.

Contacts:

Chris Wilson, Contract Manager (Policy), STWWMP Tel: 433 7478

Fiona Swinburne, Contract Manager (PFI), STWWMP Tel: 433 7428

Gary Smith, Contract Manager (Recycling), STWWMP Tel: 433 7480

RESIDUAL WASTE TREATMENT CONTRACT

2018/19 year-end performance

Total contract waste	193,345.99 tonnes
Contract waste delivered to WTS: - Campground - Middlefields - Jack Crawford House	Gateshead 60,310.67 tonnes Sunderland 18,955.03 tonnes South Tyneside 50,139.60 tonnes Sunderland 63,949.60 tonnes
Total contract waste delivered to EfW	188,200.40 tonnes
Line 4 availability Line 5 availability Overall EfW availability	95.4% 93.2% 94.3%
Average turbine availability	93.8%
Electricity generated Electricity exported Electricity imported	193,148 MWh 170,810 MWh 16,119 MWh
Recycling performance	Target 2.1% Performance 2.9%
Recovery performance	Target 95.5% Performance 97.1%
Unprocessed landfill diversion rate	100%
Health and safety: - RIDDOR - Injuries and accidents - Near misses - Property damage - Fires	1 5 93 40 0

2019/20 latest performance: April 2019 only

Total contract waste	15,960.22 tonnes
Contract waste delivered to WTS: - Campground - Middlefields - Jack Crawford House	Gateshead 5,092.16 tonnes Sunderland 1,354.14 tonnes South Tyneside 4,209.98 tonnes Sunderland 5,303.94 tonnes
Total contract waste delivered to EfW	15,852.80 tonnes
Line 4 availability Line 5 availability Overall EfW availability	99.9% 100% 99.9%
Average turbine availability	90.6%
Electricity generated Electricity exported Electricity imported	15,383 MWh 14,255 MWh 1,675 MWh
Recycling performance	Target 2.1% Performance 1.7%
Recovery performance	Target 95.5% Performance 98.3%
Unprocessed landfill diversion rate	100%
Health and safety: - RIDDOR - Injuries and accidents - Near misses - Property damage - Fires	0 1 6 5 0

MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY CONTRACTS

Table A(i): 2018/19 year-end blue bin tonnage data

	Gateshead	South Tyneside	Sunderland
Comingled tonnage	13,080	9,481	19,054
Paper tonnage	2,206	1,471	2,026
Total tonnage	15,286	10,952	21,080
<i>Comparison to 2017/18 - comingled</i>	<i>2.5% increase</i>	<i>0.4% decrease</i>	<i>5.1% increase</i>
<i>Comparison to 2017/18 - paper</i>	<i>13.2% decrease</i>	<i>13.5% decrease</i>	<i>6.9% decrease</i>
<i>Comparison to 2017/18 - all materials</i>	<i>0.1% decrease</i>	<i>2.4% decrease</i>	<i>3.8% increase</i>

Table A(ii): 2019/20 latest blue bin tonnage data: April 2019 only

	Gateshead	South Tyneside	Sunderland
Comingled tonnage	1,055	761	1,540
Paper tonnage	175	117	146
Total tonnage	1,230	878	1,686
<i>Comparison to April 2018 - comingled</i>	<i>1.0% increase</i>	<i>0.4% decrease</i>	<i>5.6% increase</i>
<i>Comparison to April 2018 - paper</i>	<i>2.8% decrease</i>	<i>5.9% decrease</i>	<i>2.2% increase</i>
<i>Comparison to April 2018 - all materials</i>	<i>0.4% increase</i>	<i>1.2% decrease</i>	<i>5.3% increase</i>

Table B MRF recycling and recovery performance

Period	Gateshead		South Tyneside		Sunderland	
	Recycling	Recovery	Recycling	Recovery	Recycling	Recovery
Q1 2017/18	89.8%	10.2%	84.9%	15.1%	73.4%	26.6%
Q2 2017/18	88.1%	11.9%	84.2%	15.8%	75.6%	24.4%
Q3 2017/18	88.6%	11.4%	85.7%	14.3%	76.4%	23.6%
Q4 2017/18	88.0%	12.0%	82.3%	17.7%	75.3%	24.7%
Q1 2018/19	88.3%	11.7%	84.6%	15.4%	75.5%	24.5%
Q2 2018/19	86.7%	13.3%	83.1%	16.9%	76.4%	23.6%
Q3 2018/19	87.0%	13.0%	82.9%	17.1%	77.6%	22.4%
Q4 2018/19	87.8%	12.2%	84.3%	15.7%	79.4%	20.6%

HOUSEHOLD WASTE AND RECYCLING CENTRE CONTRACTS

Table A(i): 2018/19 year-end recycling performance (excluding inert materials, such as rubble):

HWRC	Annual Target	2018/19
Campground	63.4%	62.8%
Cowen Road	63.1%	62.3%
Beach Street	61.6%	58.2%
Middlefields (Recycling Village)	N/A	57.7%

Table A(ii): 2019/20 latest recycling performance (excluding inert materials, such as rubble):

HWRC	Annual Target	April 2019
Campground	63.4%	64.2%
Cowen Road	63.1%	63.2%
Beach Street	61.6%	58.2%
Middlefields (Recycling Village)	N/A	61.9%