

Central Bedfordshire Council

EXECUTIVE

6 February 2018

Waste Collection & Street Cleansing- Service Design and Delivery Method

Report of: Cllr Ian Dalgarno, Executive Member for Community Services
(ian.dalgarno@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk)

Responsible Director(s): Marcel Coiffait, Director of Community Services
(marcel.coiffait@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk)

This report relates to a decision that is Key

Purpose of this report

1. To outline the methods available for the kerbside collection of household waste in Central Bedfordshire and seek approval to consult on any potential changes that would impact on residents; to consider the impact of this work on end dates for the current waste collection contracts and seek approval for a short extension and to seek approval for the procurement of recycling treatment and disposal services to align with the end of the collection contract.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Executive is asked to:

1. **authorise a consultation on the following possibilities related to the council's kerbside waste collection scheme:**
 - **The containment of materials- additional boxes and caddies**
 - **The collection of additional recyclable materials- glass and food waste**
 - **The collection of residual (black bin) waste- 3 weekly collections**
 - **The collection of green (garden) waste- charging for the service**
2. **authorise a waiver from procurement procedure rules to allow up to a maximum of 9 months extension to the current Waste Collection & Street Cleansing contracts; and**
3. **grant authority to procure recycling treatment and disposal services for kerbside collected dry recycling and grant delegated authority to award the contract to the Director of Community Services in consultation with the Executive Member for Community Services and Executive Member for Resources.**

Overview and Scrutiny Comments/Recommendations

2. Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee have received a presentation outlining the approach to a review of waste collection services including an explanation of the waste collection options and delivery methods available to the Council.
3. The Committee recommended that a further report be delivered to the Committee prior to a decision being made by the Executive.
4. Subject to approval of the recommendations made in this report a second report, outlining the results of the consultation and making recommendations for the future collection model, will be presented to Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee for feedback prior to being brought back to Executive.

Background

5. The Council's waste collection services are currently delivered by Biffa Municipal Ltd. under two contracts which both expire on 31st March 2019. The current collection contracts were procured over 14 years ago. Although the services have been adapted over time the end of these contracts presents an opportunity to fully review the design of the services and set the way they are delivered in to the future. Depending on the length of time for any new contract, this opportunity will not come around again for a period of at least 7 years. To ensure we are delivering the most efficient, cost effective, customer focussed, environmentally sound and legally compliant services a complete assessment of the options available and the impacts is required.
6. The Council is under pressure to make savings and efficiencies usually identified during the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) process. There is a £300k saving already built in to the current MTFP in 2019/20 related to the retendering of the waste collection contract. The new MTFP includes a further £2.25m saving requirement from Waste Services from 2019/20.
7. The Waste Regulations (England and Wales) 2012 require local authorities to separately collect paper/card, plastic, glass and metals where this is necessary to ensure high volumes and good quality materials and where 'Technically, Environmentally and Economically Practicable' (TEEP). This includes the assessment of the carbon footprint of different collection methodologies. The Council's last assessment concluded that separate collection was necessary but not practicable. This was adopted by Executive on 31st March 2015 and allowed the current co-mingled recycling collection to continue.

The expiry of the collection contracts represents an opportunity to change collection services and as such a new TEEP assessment is required.

8. The Environmental Services team, in partnership with Bedford Borough Council, have accessed consultancy support from environmental consultant Eunomia, funded by the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) under their consistency agenda. The resulting project included investigating all options available to the Council for service design and commenced in April 2017.

Modelling Project

9. A number of methods for collecting the councils household residual (black bin) waste, recycling, green (garden) waste and food waste have been considered in terms of the cost of the service and recycling performance compared to the current, Business as Usual (BAU) service. The modelling includes one off capital costs of containers and infrastructure such as adaptations required at tipping facilities and ongoing revenue costs of vehicles, staff, depots, waste transfer, waste disposal and recycling material sales.
10. A graphic illustration of the collection systems investigated is included in Appendix A (attached) alongside a more detailed description.
11. In all cases green waste and residual waste are collected separately. All costs assume rolling out weekly food waste collections to the south of CBC in order to harmonise the service across the council and the inclusion of glass collection, either separately or within the co-mingled recycling.
12. In all cases many assumptions have been used relating to areas such as material costs, locations of future depots and tipping points, material tonnages, staffing and vehicle requirements. The costs and savings set out within the report are merely indicative and to be used more as a comparison between the various options rather than an absolute cost or saving.

Option 1a. Multi Stream Collection including food and glass

13. This is the separate weekly collection of each recycling material, including glass and food waste, on the same vehicle.

It involves residents presenting their recycling separated out in to a number of boxes/bags and collection crews depositing the material in to different sections of the multi stream vehicle. Green waste and residual waste are collected separately every two weeks.

14. The advantages of this method are that:

- The council can collect food and glass from all households and gain an income for the sale of the materials,
- Sorting facilities and associated costs are not required.

The main disadvantages are:

- Residents have 3 boxes to sort their recycling in to which require a larger footprint for storage and setting out than a single wheeled bin,
- A much greater number of vehicles are required to complete the collections,
- Open boxes can lead to recycling blowing out causing littering.

The key risks are:

- Material sales prices can fluctuate considerably over a short period,
- CBC do not have the expertise or resources to sell materials on the open market and would probably procure a long term agreement with a single supplier reducing savings.
- Each section of the vehicle must be exactly the right size to ensure they fill up at the same rate,
- The current transfer station, owned and managed by Bedford Borough Council, will need to be adapted at their discretion to allow separate tipping of each material,
- Residents may become disengaged with recycling as they have to further sort their materials.

Further detail on the considerations for all the collection options can be found in the table in appendix B.

15. Indicative savings of this method of collection are -£477k per annum but with one-off indicative capital costs of £801k for containers and £670k for infrastructure costs. The potential overall annualised saving on this option is -£224k.

Option 2a. Co-mingled Recycling with separate food

16. This is the system currently adopted in the north of Central Bedfordshire where recycling is presented by residents fortnightly mixed in a wheeled bin. Food waste, presented in an outdoor caddy, is collected weekly in a dedicated vehicle. Green waste and residual waste are collected separately every two weeks.
17. The advantages of this system are that:
- Residents from the north are already using it and there is high participation in the scheme,
 - Separate vehicles are used so there are no issues with sections of the vehicle filling up more quickly than others,
 - No modification of the transfer station is required,
 - It can be easily rolled out to the south of the area without impacting on the way residents present their rest of their materials for collection.

There are no significant disadvantages or risks related to this option.

18. Indicative costs of this method of collection are £25k per annum including the roll out of food waste to the south but with one-off indicative capital costs of £187k for containers. The potential overall annualised cost on this option is £102k.

Option 3a. Co-mingled Recycling with food pods

19. Residents present their waste in the same way as in Option 2 but food waste is deposited by collection crews in to an adapted part of the main residual and recycling collection vehicles known as a 'pod'. In this way residual and recycling are collected fortnightly and food waste is collected weekly. Green waste is collected in a standard vehicle, fortnightly.
20. The advantages of this system are:
- The same as for Option 2.

However, the disadvantage is that:

- For the system to work efficiently food waste must be tipped at the same site as the recycling or residual waste collected on the same vehicle with related tipping and haulage costs.

The risks are that:

- The transfer station will need to be adapted at BBC's discretion to allow separate tipping of food waste and the pod,

- A site close to the residual treatment facility used in the south will need to be found to allow tipping of the food waste,
 - The pod and main section of the vehicle must be exactly the right sizes to ensure they fill up at the same rate.
21. Indicative savings of this method of collection are -£28k per annum but with one-off indicative capital costs of £187k for containers. The potential overall annualised cost on this option is £49k.

Option 4a. Twin Stream (split back) Recycling with separate fibres

22. For this system residents present their paper and cardboard in a box by the side of their wheeled bin containing the rest of the recycling (plastic packaging and metal tins and cans) and they are collected fortnightly. Food waste is collected separately every week. Green waste and residual waste are collected separately every two weeks.
23. The advantage of this method is:
- CBC can gain an income for the sale of paper and card.

However, the disadvantages are that:

- Each section of the vehicle must be exactly the right size to ensure both sides fill up at the same rate,
- Open boxes can lead to paper and card blowing out of the box causing littering.

The risks are that:

- The savings on this option rely heavily on high material prices for paper and card and these can fluctuate considerably over a short period,
 - CBC do not have the expertise or resources to sell materials on the open market and would probably procure a long term agreement with a single supplier reducing savings,
 - The transfer station will need to be adapted at BBC's discretion to allow separate tipping of paper and cardboard,
 - Residents become disengaged with recycling as they have to further sort their materials.
24. Indicative savings of this method of collection are -£824k per annum but with one-off indicative capital costs of £396k for containers and £310k for infrastructure costs. The potential overall annualised saving on this option is -£689k.

Option 5a. Twin Stream (split back) Recycling with separate glass

25. This system is the same as option 4a with fortnightly collection of recycling but glass is collected separately from the box whilst plastic packaging, tins and cans, and paper and card are collected from the wheeled bin. Food waste is collected separately every week. Green waste and residual waste are collected separately on a fortnightly basis. Excepting the separate collection of food waste, this is the current system for around 13,000 households in the south of CBC.

26. This system has the advantage that:

- Glass can be collected separately across the whole of the council area, without impacting on the way residents present the rest of their materials.

However, the disadvantages are that:

- Each section of the vehicle must be exactly the right size to ensure both sides fill up at the same rate and this is more difficult to predict where historic information on the potential volumes of glass does not exist.

The risks are that:

- Material sales prices can fluctuate considerably over a short period,
- CBC do not have the expertise or resources to sell materials on the open market and would probably procure a long term agreement with a single supplier reducing savings.
- The transfer station will need to be adapted at BBC's discretion to allow separate tipping of glass,
- Residents become disengaged with recycling as they have to further sort their materials.

27. Indicative savings of this method of collection are -£65k per annum but with one-off indicative capital costs of £396k for containers and £310k for infrastructure costs. The potential overall annualised cost on this option is £39k.

Option 6a. Three Weekly Residual Collection

28. This method has been modelled using Option 4 as the base methodology (as the one offering the highest savings from the main 5 options) but involves the collection of residual waste on a three weekly basis rather than fortnightly.

29. The advantages are:

- The tonnage of residual waste decreases by up to 20%,
- Recycling rates could reach 57% as residents further sort their recycling.

The disadvantages are:

- Many residents already struggle to contain two weeks of residual waste in a standard issue 240l bin or a larger 360l bin (for larger families or those with nappies/clinical waste),
- Although food waste would be collected weekly from all households some residents will not use this, potentially causing odour and pest issues in their residual bins.

The risks are:

- Only 17 out of 369 district and unitary authorities responsible for waste collection have moved to a 3 weekly collection of residual waste so there is not a great deal of data on the impacts of doing so.

30. Indicative savings of this method of collection are -£1,920k per annum but with one-off indicative capital costs of £396k for containers and £310k for infrastructure costs. The potential overall annualised cost on this option is £1,785k, an additional £1m saving on option 4 alone.

Options 1-5b. Chargeable Green (Garden) Waste Collection

31. Charging for green waste has been modelled across all Options 1a-5a but option 4a has been chosen for the demonstration of savings here so that it is comparable with 3 weekly collection savings above. An annual charge of £40 per household was included in the modelling based on CBC's comparator authorities charging between £20- £57. A £5 per household admin cost for managing the service is included in this. The median participation rate across comparator authorities is 43% and this has also been used in the modelling.

32. The advantages of this service are that:

- All residents signing up to the scheme in the north would receive a wheeled bin for garden waste which is a frequent request from residents,
- Replacement bags, a frequent request with the current system, would no longer be required,
- Multiple subscriptions (bins) could be purchased by householders at lower cost to allow for those with larger gardens,

- Overall arisings of green waste are not forecast to increase due to the extra green waste from bins rather than bags being offset by the lower estimated participation rates,
- CBC can tailor the charge to cover costs or make additional savings (but income will ultimately be based on participation which is unknown),
- Where residents already have a free service, participation rates are usually high when transitioning to a chargeable service,
- 30% of all local authorities responsible for waste collection now charge for garden waste collections so there is good data available on the impacts of introducing it.

The disadvantages are that:

- Residents will be charged for something that is currently provided for free,
- The roll out of the scheme is operationally challenging, involving the removal of bins where residents have not joined the scheme and some way for collection crews to identify which bins have been paid for,
- Additional resource will be required to roll out and administer the scheme.

The risks are that:

- Savings are based on several assumptions over where residents of CBC might dispose of their green waste if they don't join the scheme and the likely participation rate.

33. Indicative savings of this method of collection are -£2,685k per annum but with one-off indicative capital costs of £859k for containers and £310k for infrastructure costs. The potential overall annualised saving on this option is -£2.514m, an additional £1.825m saving on option 4 alone.

Glass and Food Waste Collection

34. In all the above options glass collection for the whole of CBC and separate food waste collection for the south of CBC has been added and the indicative costs include assumptions on tonnages and pricing related to this.
35. The advantage of this is that:
- It offers residents additional material streams from the kerbside making recycling waste easier,
 - A recycling rate of 51% could be achieved across all options.

There are no major disadvantages.

The risks are:

- Unless BBC also add glass to their co-mingled material the current transfer station will need to be adapted at their discretion to allow separate tipping of CBC material,
 - New recycling treatment and disposal contracts would be limited to those providers who have the ability to process glass with dry recycling at their facilities,
 - Once added, if glass ever falls out of favour with the Materials Recycling Facility operators it is virtually impossible to communicate the message to all residents and stop them putting glass in to the co-mingled collection. This reduces the quality of the material resulting in higher gate fees for treatment.
36. The costs for including food waste and glass waste collection are not considered separately as they are integral to WRAP's approach for consistent collections. However, the costs are reduced or savings increased across all options by having glass included. The cost of rolling out food waste is covered by other changes to the collection system costs in options 1a and 4a and for all options when including chargeable green waste or 3 weekly residual collection.

Matters for Consideration

Consultation

37. Where the design of the service is changed, the containers (bins, bags and boxes) used by residents to present their waste at the kerbside may also require to be changed. For example, if the design of the service requires recycling to split out in to two streams- collecting paper and card separately from plastic packaging and cans- residents will need to be supplied with a box to present the paper and card separately.
38. Where changes in a service impact on residents it is good practice to conduct a consultation to ascertain their needs, attitudes and priorities and consider their feedback as part of the service design process. We also have a duty to demonstrate assessment of consultation feedback from an equalities perspective.
39. Based on the options modelling and advantages, disadvantages and risks involved it is recommended that a consultation is carried out to include questions around:

- Containment of materials- additional boxes and caddies
 - 3 weekly residual collections
 - Green (garden) waste charging- levels of charge
40. Questions relating to potential charging and opening days at the Council's four Household Waste Recycling Centres may also be included in the consultation so that all possible changes in waste services can be considered at the same time.

Waste Collection & Street Cleansing Contracts

41. An extensive data collection and modelling process has been undertaken to review all the options available to the council rather than automatically tendering a like for like service. This has taken more time than anticipated and so the process for designing, commissioning and delivering an alternative method of operating the service has been delayed.
42. If the council decide to change the collection system in any way a full route optimisation will need to be conducted to ensure that collections rounds are configured in the most efficient way. This will also add additional time in to the project plan.
43. The waste industry would normally allow around 18 months for the design, procurement and mobilisation of a waste collection service due to the complexity of the service, to allow adequate time for bidders to submit clarifications and final tender documents and also to allow a long enough mobilisation period to enable purchasing of vehicles and finalise collection round routing, container delivery, communications etc.
44. This pressure on timescales is exacerbated by the current long lead times for the purchase of waste collection vehicles which now stand at around 10 months from placing the order to delivery due to high national demand. This would mean the council would need to award a contract (if that is the desired commissioning route) in May 2018 to allow time for vehicles to be ordered and delivered in time for contract start in April 2019 which is not deliverable.
45. Based on the requirement to properly consult on aspects of potential service change and to allow time for a fully considered decision making process and full EU tender process it is recommended that the current waste collection and street cleansing contracts are extended for 6 months.

Recycling treatment and disposal services

46. The initial term of the current contract for the treatment and disposal of kerbside collected recycling ends on 30th September 2018. Although extensions are available on the contract the value of recyclates has declined significantly over the last 2-3 years and the favourable rates the contract originally offered are no longer tenable.
- It is therefore sensible to approach the market to ensure we secure the best possible rate for CBC's kerbside collected recycling.
47. Some of the collection options would involve changes to the composition of the recycling materials collected, for example, adding glass in to the co-mingled collection or separating out the paper and card in the two stream option. The contract term will ensure end dates can align with the end dates of the current collection contracts, allowing a new contract be let that reflects the requirements of any new collection system.
48. The market for recycling is extremely volatile and material sales values fluctuate widely over a short period of time. Therefore it is proposed to structure the contract as a 1 year with 2 single year extensions to make it more attractive to the market. To this end the procurement will also follow our previous approach and be run jointly with Bedford Borough Council (but in two separate lots with separate contracts) so that the combined tonnage of waste is larger and offers a greater opportunity for potential providers.
49. Based on the points above it is recommended that a procurement is delivered for the treatment and disposal of kerbside collected recycling up to the end of the current collection contracts and a second procurement is delivered, if necessary, to enable disposal of different compositions of recycling thereafter.

Reasons for Decision/s

50. Approving the recommendations in this report will:
- Allow a consultation on waste collection options to be delivered
 - Enable the continuation of waste collection and recycling treatment and disposal services.

Council Priorities

51. The review of waste collection services supports three of the Council's key priorities –
- Provide Value for Money- Maintaining a range of recycling services whilst providing cost savings and efficiencies
 - Enhance Central Bedfordshire- Keeping the number and movement of waste vehicles down to a minimum and reducing emissions.

- Quality Universal Services- Continuing to provide excellent recycling and waste collection service to Central Bedfordshire residents.

Legal Implications- Collection Options

52. Recycling: Under the revised Waste Framework Directive from 2008, member states must achieve 50% recycling rate (including composting and re-use) by 2020. Individual local authorities do not currently have specific recycling targets. The EU's Circular Economy Package, containing proposed recycling targets for member states of between 60 and 70% by 2030 will likely be adopted by the UK before it exits the EU.
53. Garden waste: The collection of garden waste is non-statutory. Under the Controlled Waste Regulations 2012, local authorities are permitted to charge for collection of garden waste, and a third of local authorities currently do so.
54. Food waste: The collection of food is non-statutory. Government published a Food Waste Recycling Action Plan in July 2016 to help increase the quality and quantity of food waste collected for recycling and are planning further work in 2018 to encourage a higher capture rate from households. The Circular Economy Package includes measures to achieve the UN's Sustainable Development Goal of halving per capita global food waste at the retail and consumer level.
55. Three-weekly collections: There is no legislation that requires local authorities to collect any waste at a specific frequency.
56. Separate collection: The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2012 require all local authorities to collect paper, glass, plastics and metals separately from each other unless it can be demonstrated that it is not necessary to produce high quality recyclate or it is not technically, environmentally or economically practicable to do so. The modelling has shown that all of the options, including BAU, comply with the regulations.
57. Receptacles: Local authorities are at liberty to specify the type and number of receptacles used by householders to present waste for collection under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Legal Implications- Collection Contract Extension

58. The Public Contracts Regulations 2015 apply to this contract, as the value of the contract exceeds the EU procurement threshold. The Council's Procurement Procedure Rules similarly apply.

59. The waste collection contract for the south of Central Bedfordshire has a six year extension and allows for a short term 6 month extension.
60. The contract covering the north of Central Bedfordshire does not expressly provide for the term to be extended, and, although low, there is a risk of legal challenge to the proposal to extend the contract for 6 months. Also, the contract has previously been extended by 2.5 years to enable alignment of the end date with the south contract and a single procurement thereafter, which slightly increases the risk.
61. However, the proposed extension is for a short period only and the opportunity to tender for a contract covering the whole of CBC will be presented to the market prior to the extension commencing. This will prove the intention of the council to procure the service and suppliers are unlikely to challenge where the opportunity to tender already exists.
62. The Executive is also asked to observe the Council's Contract Procedure Rules (CPRs). For contracts valued up to the EU Procurement threshold the Council has provision to waive the CPRs on certain grounds including: "The contract is an extension to an existing contract and a change of supplier would cause disproportionate technical difficulties, disproportionate economies of scale or significant disruption to Council services."
63. However, for contracts valued over the EU Procurement threshold, as in this case, the CPRs prohibit any variation from the standard EU Procurement procedures. Accordingly, if Members are minded to agree to extend this contract they also need to agree to suspend the CPRs in this regard to allow for a direct award rather than to conduct a competitive process.
64. This report is proposing an extension of 6 months on the basis of a balance of the risk of potential legal challenge with the identified issues and risks.

Legal Implications- Recycling Contract Procurement

65. Recycling disposal: Central Bedfordshire is a Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) under Sections 51 and 55 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and is under a duty to dispose of household waste collected within its administrative area. Undertaking the procurement for recycling treatment and disposal will allow CBC to contract for the services to meet these duties.

Financial and Risk Implications

66. The costs and savings of each option are set out in the relevant section of this report, however, summary tables of the overall annual revenue costs, one-off capital costs the combined revenue and annualised capital over 10 years at zero percent interest is are set out below:
67. Table 1. Annual Revenue Costs- annual costs/savings against baseline (BAU) for vehicles, staff, depots, waste transfer, waste disposal and recycling material sales.

Option	Annual Revenue Cost/Saving (,000)
Option 1a- Multi-Stream	-£477
Option 2a- Co-mingled Recycling, Separate Food Waste Vehicle	£25
Option 3a- Co-mingled Recycling, Food Waste in pod on recycling and residual vehicles	-£28
Option 4a- Two Stream with Fibres collected separately	-£824
Option 5a- Two Stream with Glass collected Separately	-£65
Option 6a- 3 weekly Residual (on option 4)	-£1,920
Chargeable Green Waste (on option 4)	-£2,685

68. Table 2. One-Off Capital Costs- for new containers and changes to infrastructure.

Option	Capital Cost* (,000)
Option 1a- Multi-Stream	£1,471
Option 2a- Co-mingled Recycling, Separate Food Waste Vehicle	£187
Option 3a- Co-mingled Recycling, Food Waste in pod on recycling and residual vehicles	£187
Option 4a- Two Stream with Fibres collected separately	£706
Option 5a- Two Stream with Glass collected Separately	£396
Option 6a- 3 weekly Residual (on option 4)	£706
Chargeable Green Waste (on option 4)	£1,169

*these costs exclude purchase of collection fleet

69. Table 3. Total Revenue and Capital Costs (capital costs annualised over 10 years, includes container replacement from loss/ breakage)

Option	Annual Cost/Saving** (,000)
Option 1a- Multi-Stream	-£224
Option 2a- Co-mingled Recycling, Separate Food Waste Vehicle	£102
Option 3a- Co-mingled Recycling, Food Waste in pod on recycling and residual vehicles	£49
Option 4a- Two Stream with Fibres collected separately	-£689
Option 5a- Two Stream with Glass collected Separately	£39
Option 6a- 3 weekly (option 4)	-£1,785

Chargeable Green (on option 4)	-£2,514
**these costs include revenue and annualised capital over 10 years without interest	

70. The figures are indicative and to be used as a comparison between the various options rather than taken as an absolute cost or saving. Also, these costs do not take in to consideration the £300k saving already in the current MTFP in 2019/20 for retendering the collection service. For MTFP purposes any additional savings would need to be shown as net of this £300k.
71. The figures show there are opportunities to make significant savings, or roll out services at a very low cost but these should be considered alongside the related advantages, disadvantages and risks to the council set out in the report and in the table in Appendix B.

Equalities Implications

72. Central Bedfordshire Council has a statutory duty to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and foster good relations in respect of nine protected characteristics; age disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
73. The recommendations contained in this report include consultation on the changes that may impact on residents. It is good practice to conduct a consultation to ascertain their needs, attitudes and priorities and consider their feedback as part of the service design process. We also have a duty to demonstrate assessment of consultation feedback from an equalities perspective and the recommended approach shows compliance with this.

Procurement Implications

74. In delivering the procurement for recycling treatment and disposal, the Council will ensure that all procurement activity is conducted in compliance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.
75. There is a procurement risk as set out in the legal section above; however officers will seek to minimise the risks associated with this by engaging with the market before any procurement activity officially commences both to help reduce the risk of any challenge and also to investigate the best route to market.
76. The procurement team will be fully engaged during the process and will remain engaged until contract award. A full audit trail will be in

place covering the entire exercise which will be kept as a full record of the process for the required period.

Conclusion and next Steps

77. Subject to approval of this reports recommendations, officers will:

- Design and deliver a consultation of the options;
- Liaise with relevant departments and the current contractor to extend the existing waste collection and street cleansing contracts;
- Investigate the practicality and opportunity of adding glass in to the co-mingled recycling collections with BBC and potential Materials Recycling Facility providers;
- Return to Executive with a paper setting out recommendations for the future collection model and commissioning approach.

Appendices

The following appendices are attached to this report:

Appendix A: Future Collection Options- pictogram and detail

Appendix B: Detailed Considerations for the Collections Options

Background Papers:

None

Report Author:

Tracey Harris, Assistant Director Environmental Services,
tracey.harris2@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk