

# Options for Recycling & Food Waste Collections

---

Cabinet Task & Finish Group  
25<sup>th</sup> July 2018.



# What are we going to look at?

- What to do with Food Waste Collections?
- The three main recycling collection models operating in the UK – source separate – twin stream – fully comingled
- Advantages / Disadvantages with twin stream & fully comingled
- Legal obligations & TEEP requirements
- Modeling analysis of each model. With and without food waste
- Potential Capital requirements
- Update on EU Circular Economy Package
- Processing and markets
- Net costs of different options including processing with and without food waste
- Questions & Next Steps

# What to do with Food waste Collections? Background

- Introduced in 2010 as part of significant service change, and as mitigation for changing from weekly collection of residual waste, to fortnightly.
- Participation around 50% households taking part
- 2,700 tonnes collected in 2017/18, = 3% of the total recycling rate for the Council
- Treatment costs are very low, and treatment generates energy.
- Great way of identifying how much food we waste as individuals once you see it separated.
- Currently collected along with recycling on the same vehicle and bulked up at Knutton Lane.
- Currently unable to collect from flats which are on a bin system.








# What to do with Food waste Collections? Moving Forward

- Maintaining weekly collections of food waste utilising collection vehicle for residual waste and recycling would require these vehicles to have separate food pods, therefore requiring replacement of two thirds of the RCV fleet.
- Refuse collection vehicles with food pods are rare, and therefore difficult to source on the hire market if required, and therefore could impact on the reliability of the service in bad weather or other major issues.
- The majority of authorities run a separate fleet for the collection of food waste.
- Separate fleet would allow collection from flats, schools and allow the Council to provide commercial collection of food waste.

# Multi-stream with separate food – current service

| Dry Recycling   |                | Residual Waste / Garden Waste   | Food Waste  |
|---|----------------|---|---|
|    | Paper          |    |  |
|    | Card & Glass   |   |   |
|    | Plastic & Cans |   |   |
| Maximum 165 litres weekly   |                | Maximum of 240lts fortnightly   | Food – 23lts weekly   |
| Vehicle – 12t multi compartment   |                | Vehicle – 26t standard RCV  | Vehicle – N/A   |
|  |                |  | Included in dry recycling   |

# Two-stream (fibres separate) with or without separate food

| Dry Recycling   | Residual Waste  | Food Waste  |
|---|---|---|
|  <p>Paper or<br/>Paper &amp;<br/>Card</p>                      |    |    |
|  <p>Glass<br/>Plastic &amp;<br/>Cans<br/><br/>&amp; Card ?</p> |   |   |
| <p>Maximum 175 litres<br/>fortnightly</p>   | <p>Maximum 240lts<br/>fortnightly</p>   | <p>Food – 23lts weekly</p>  |
| <p>Vehicle – 26t Split body RCV</p>   | <p>Vehicle – 26t standard<br/>RCV</p>   | <p>Vehicle – 7.5t RCV</p>   |
|    |  |  |

# Co-mingled with or without separate food

| Dry Recycling  | Residual Waste  | Food Waste  |
|--|---|---|
|  <p data-bbox="725 533 860 772">Paper<br/>Card<br/>Glass<br/>Plastic<br/>Cans</p> |    |    |
| <p data-bbox="488 912 837 1018">Maximum 240lts<br/>fortnightly</p>   | <p data-bbox="965 912 1314 1018">Maximum 240lts<br/>fortnightly</p>                   | <p data-bbox="1442 912 1868 960">Food – 23lts weekly</p>                              |
| <p data-bbox="488 1043 860 1123">Vehicle – 26t standard<br/>RCV</p>  | <p data-bbox="965 1043 1337 1123">Vehicle – 26t standard<br/>RCV</p>                  | <p data-bbox="1442 1043 1756 1075">Vehicle – 7.5t RCV</p>                             |
|   |  |  |

# Advantages / Disadvantages – Twin Stream

| Advantages   | Disadvantages  |
|--|--|
| Easier for the householder to use  | Householder will still need to separate paper / card   |
| Provides more consistency with some Staffordshire and other neighbouring authorities collection systems                    | Difficult to integrate separate food waste collection  |
| Maintains the 'high' value high quantity materials separately. This takes some of the volatility risk out of the operation | Contamination levels will increase, which will lead to increased costs if not effectively managed. |
| Increased productivity in collections.   | Glass in the comingled element remains a problem. Difficult from a TEEP issue.                     |
| Easier to recover following bad weather / other incidents  | Twin pack vehicles not as reliable as standard RCV's   |



# Advantages / Disadvantages – Comingled

| Advantages  | Disadvantages  |
|---|--|
| Very easy for the householder to use  | System will generate high levels of contamination, which could lead to increased costs, and will need to be managed effectively.   |
| Requires a standard RCV for collections, therefore more flexibility in the fleet                        | Volatile markets for materials will increase gate fees   |
| Provides more consistency with some Staffordshire and other neighbouring authorities collection systems | Materials likely to be exported following sorting process  |
| Fast collection process similar to collecting residual waste  | Will require rigorous TEEP assessment  |
| Very easy to recover from bad weather / other incidents   | Industry does not like materials from comingled collections. As they will be paying for collections under EPR, they will want more say in how it is collected / processed. |
|   | Difficult to integrate separate food waste collection  |

# Legal Obligations - TEEP

- Currently no statutory recycling targets for English Local Authorities.
- Waste Framework Directive 2012, however obligates LA's to 'separately' collect Glass, Paper, Plastic, and Metal for recycling.
- If collecting materials comingled, it is necessary to carry out a 'TEEP' assessment.
- TEEP = **Technically, Environmentally, Economically & Practical**. In essence LA's collecting and processing comingled materials, need to prove the process produces materials to the same quality to those collected separately.
- TEEP assessments are regulated by the Environment Agency.

# Modelling Analysis - Number of Vehicles Required with & Without Food Waste

Total Vehicles to purchase (rounded up)

|                      | Current Service for Comparison. | Option 1a – Comingled with separate Food | Option 1b – Comingled with Pod for Food Collection | Option 2a – Twin Stream with separate Food | Option 2b – Twin stream with Pod for Food Collection |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Standard RCV         | 12.0                            | 18.0                                     | 6.0  | 12.0                                       | 6.0  |
| RCV + Food Pod       | 0.0                             | 0.0                                      | 12.0   | 0.0  | 6.0  |
| Twin pack            | 0.0                             | 0.0                                      | 0.0  | 9.0  | 0.0  |
| Twin pack + Food Pod | 0.0                             | 0.0                                      | 0.0  | 0.0  | 9.0  |
| Dedicated Food       | 0.0                             | 6.0                                      | 0.0  | 6.0  | 0.0  |
| RRV                  | 15.0                            | 0.0                                      | 0.0  | 0.0  | 0.0  |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>27.0</b>                     | <b>24.0</b>                              | <b>18.0</b>  | <b>27.0</b>                                | <b>21.0</b>  |

\* Vehicle numbers do not include Spare Vehicles

| Commentry         | Current service - No change | Recycling service can be replaced by ~5-6 vehicles (similar type to current Refuse and green) once moving to comingled. | Using pod vehicles requires an extra vehicles for each of the residual and dry recycling services. | The dry recycling service requires ~ 9 twin pack RCV's for the two-stream service. Higher number required as the large compartment is filling up with the plastic/cans/glass and requiring an additional tip (reducing time on collections) | Similar to Option 2a with the dry recycling service requiring ~ 9 one- pass vehicles for the two-stream service and food. Higher number required as the large compartment is filling up with the plastic/cans/glass and requiring an additional tip (reducing time on collections). |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---|---|
|                   |                             | 6 - 7.5t food waste vehicles required   | No dedicated food waste vehicles required<br>6 standard RCV's are for Garden Waste                 | 6 - 7.5t food waste vehicles required   | No dedicated food waste vehicles<br><br>6 standard RCV's are for Garden Waste   |
| Types of vehicles | 2 main types                | 2 main types  | 2 main types   | 3 main types  | 3 main types  |

# Cost Analysis – Capital Requirements

- Procurement of Wheelie bins + distribution = £ 913,000
- Procurement of Vehicles between £960,000. and £3,810,000.
- Alterations to Knutton Lane Transfer Station to deal with different material mix. = £500,000
- Note, these costs have not been built into the model operating costs

# EU Circular Economy (CEP)

- UK has confirmed its intention to adopt CEP.
- Targets for recycling of Municipal Waste
  - 55% by 2025
  - 60% by 2030
  - 70% by 2035
- Focus on Extended Producer responsibility (EPR) for full cost coverage of collection for packaging materials paid by producers back to LA's, includes household and commercial collections of obligated packaging materials, namely –
  - Card
  - Glass
  - Plastic
  - Metal

# Processes and Markets for Materials

- Which ever option for recycling collections a transfer station will have to be operated by the Council, prior to sending to a Material Recovery Facility (MRF)
- Need to remember markets for recycled materials are global.
- Restrictions on inputs to China has had a major impact on the global market. Prices for commodities have dropped which has led to MRF gate fees increasing.
- Quality not quantity has become the focus for all types of collection

# Net costs for processing twin stream materials with and without separate food

| Cost  | Twin Stream with Food Separate                                  | Twin Stream with Food Pod                                       | Twin Stream without Food                      | Comparison with current service |
|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Operating NBC TFS   | £365,000  | £365,000  | £345,000                                      | £405,134                        |
| Gate Fee for MRF including Transport & rebate for sale of materials | £29,623 (Food)<br>£279,000(MRF no fibre)<br>£516,000(MRF +Card) | £29,623 (Food)<br>£279,000(MRF no fibre)<br>£516,000(MRF +Card) | £279,000(MRF no fibre)<br>£516,000(MRF +Card) | £29,623 (Food)                  |
| <b>Income</b>   |   |   |   |                                 |
| Paper   | £164,680  | £164,680  | £164,680                                      | £164,680                        |
| Paper & Card  | £189,000  | £189,000  | £189,000                                      | N/A                             |
| Other Income  | N/A   | N/A   | N/A   | £301,000                        |
| Recycling Credits   | £580,162  | £580,162  | £475,711 (No Food)                            | £580,162 (current rate)         |
| <b>Collection Costs</b>   | £1,800,000  | £1,300,000  | £1,170,000                                    | £1,806,441                      |
| <b>Net Cost – Paper separate</b>                                    | <b>£1,965,781</b>   | <b>£1,465,781</b>   | <b>£1,390,609</b>                             | <b>£1,195,356</b>               |
| <b>Net Cost – P&amp;C separate</b>                                  | <b>£1,704,461</b>   | <b>£1,204,461</b>   | <b>£1,129,289</b>                             | <b>N/A</b>                      |

# Net costs for processing comingled materials with and without separate food

| Cost  | Comingled with Food Separate    | Comingled Stream with Food Pod  | Comingled Stream without Food | Comparison with current service |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Operating NBC TFS   | £365,000                        | £365,000                        | £345,000                      | £405,134                        |
| Gate Fee for MRF including Transport & rebate for sale of materials | £624,000(MRF)<br>£29,623 (Food) | £624,000(MRF)<br>£29,623 (Food) | £624,000(MRF)                 | £29,623(Food)                   |
| <b>Income</b>   |                                 |                                 |                               |                                 |
| Paper   | N/A                             | N/A                             | N/A                           | £164,680                        |
| Other Income  | N/A                             | N/A                             | N/A                           | £301,000                        |
| Recycling Credits   | £580,162                        | £580,162                        | £475,711<br>(no food)         | £580,162<br>(current rate)      |
| <b>Collection Costs</b>   | £1,512,146                      | £882,146                        | £882,146                      | £1,806,441                      |
| <b>Net Cost</b>   | <b>£1,950,607</b>               | <b>£1,320,607</b>               | <b>£1,308,039</b>             | <b>£1,195,356</b>               |



# Other things to consider

- Modelling is VERY high level, and subject to further refinement
- Impact on Garage Workshop
- Impact on recycling credit income
- The need to effectively deal with contamination which will feature in comingled collections

# Next Steps

- Questions
- Preferred option to be presented to Cabinet in September 2018.
- What else? - for discussion

# Thank You

