

**WASTE MANAGEMENT PARTNERSHIP BOARD  
MINUTES**

**Date of Meeting:** 18 May 2010  
**Location:** DoESS Office, Civic Offices  
**Time:** 2.00pm  
**Attending:** Cllr Mrs M Sartin – Env. Portfolio Holder & Board Chairman (MS)  
 Cllr Mrs D Collins – Leader of Council (DC)  
 John Gilbert - Director, Environment & Street Scene (JG)  
 David Marsh – Waste & Recycling Manager (DM)  
 Paul Madden – Sita UK (PM)  
 Vlad Velikoselskis - Sita UK (V V)  
 Sebastian Rawski – Sita UK (SR)

**Also present:** Kim Durrani – Asst Director, Environment & Street Scene (KD)

		Action
1.	<b>Apologies for Absence</b> – Steve Holgate	
2.	<b>Declarations of Interest</b> - None	
3.	<b>Draft minutes of meeting held on 16 March 2010</b> – Agreed subject to clarification on the £100K available to Sita for staff awards being available only to Sita employees	ALL
4.	<p><b>Matters Arising (not on agenda)</b>            Litter surveys had been undertaken in Epping and Loughton as part of the countywide cleaner, greener network had shown some encouraging results although still problems with littering by schoolchildren. DC suggested that a number of rural areas also had littering problems. DM was looking into the possibility of recommencing some litter picking in litter “hot spots” but this was resource dependant. JG mentioned the availability of resource via the probation service either for groups of probationers or individuals. PM agreed to look into similar schemes with Sita and the criteria required for the use of probationers.</p>	PM
5.	<p><b>Review of current contract performance (operational &amp; financial)</b>            SR took the Board through the latest financial and performance data which showed that the contract was coming into profitability. The performance graphs indicated a steady increase in recycling performance although the overall waste stream was not declining as might have been anticipated. There was a useful reduction in residual waste but dry recyclables remained relatively static. JG thought that unusually, there had not been the expected “knock on” effects when a new service was introduced. There was some discussion around comparisons with Rochford DC, which used an identical system but was performing at a higher level. It was thought that influencing factors might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Rochford’s was an entirely new system providing services which did not previously exist, whereby EFDC’s were changes to existing systems which some residents saw as retrograde;</li> <li>(ii) demographic differences, especially with EFDC’s proximity to London; and</li> <li>(iii) the amount of street cleansing arisings collected</li> </ul> <p>As part of this report VV provided information on accident statistics and days lost to illness/sickness. The numbers were impressively low. There was a discussion around the two serious (one fatal) accidents involving Sita</p>	

	<p>personnel where operatives had been caught by the bin lifting gear and deposited into the collection hopper. The HSE were still investigating but VV had initiated training whereby he actually went out to see the crews in action to ensure that safety requirements were being met. The Board commended him for this approach.</p> <p>There was a discussion on the availability of vehicles and the effects that vehicle downtime had on performance. VV stated that he required high levels of availability to ensure full service, but that he could (just) operate at around 80% availability. JG made reference to the need to commence a programme of vehicle replacement for those RCVs brought over following the SHWM Administration. This should help in keeping vehicle downtime to a minimum.</p>	KD/VV
6.	<p><b>Food &amp; garden waste – capacity issues</b></p> <p>The issue of difficulties with the current service were discussed, primarily those relating to residents demanding a second F/G wheeled bin. DM reiterated the criteria used and stated that around 100 requests had been approved so far. Many hundreds of assessments remained outstanding. PM and VV stated that Sita would have capacity issues should too many additional collections be authorised. JG suggested that a review was required to consider options such as a charged second bin, summer only additional collections etc. JG also made reference to what was currently considered to be the “best” service, that being:</p> <p>weekly dry recyclables  weekly food  fortnightly residual  charged for garden waste</p> <p>DC saw some political difficulties with the reintroduction of a charged service, but agreed that the option should be explored, perhaps as part of future contract renegotiations.</p>	Sita/EFDC
7.	<p><b>Street cleansing review</b></p> <p>Much of this issue had been picked up under item 5 but JG confirmed that street cleansing/scene was a key issue for the Council in 2010/11 and that both Sita and the Council needed to shift resources to give this an appropriate priority. DM confirmed that schedules had been sent to members and local councils etc.</p>	Sita/EFDC
8.	<p><b>Health &amp; Safety</b></p> <p>Covered in item 5 above</p>	
9.	<p><b>Quarter 4 Performance outcomes and 2010/11 targets</b></p> <p>JG reminded the Board that the standard NIs remained KPIs for EFDC. He repeated his concerns that NI 195 was not improving quickly enough and that additional effort was required (see also item 7 above). He stated that now the new waste service had settled, it should be possible to apply additional resources to drive improvement.</p>	Sita/EFDC
10.	<p><b>Visit to MRF</b></p> <p>JG reminded Sita that a visit to the Sita MRF remained outstanding. PM asked for two dates to be provided, say for July.</p>	JG
11.	<p><b>Depot relocation</b></p> <p>JG took the Board through recent decisions regarding decanting from Langston Road to enable its capital value to be realised. He informed the Board of a recent discussion with Steve Holgate regarding a move to North</p>	

