Somerset Waste Board meeting 28 September 2018 Report for information



Performance Report - April 2018 to June 2018

Lead Officer: Mickey Green, Managing Director

Author: David Oaten, Contracts Manager - Treatment & Infrastructure

Contact Details: 01823 625705

| Forward Plan Reference: | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Summary: | This report summarises the key performance indicators for the period from April 2018 to June 2018 and compares these to the same period in 2017. It updates the board on the current kerbside collection service performance issues and the actions being taken to address these issues. In addition to the usual September Board Performance Report, the proposed future performance report format is included at appendix C, on which feedback is welcomed. | |
| Recommendations: | That the Somerset Waste Board notes the tonnage and performance results within appendices A & B, and provides feedback on the draft future performance report format in appendix C. | |
| Reasons for recommendations: | Report for information only. | |
| Links to Priorities and Impact on Annual Business Plan: | Transparency – Publishing Key Performance Indicators | |
| Financial, Legal and HR Implications: | Report for information purposes only - no financial, legal or HR implications. | |
| Equalities Implications: | Report for information purposes only - no equalities implications | |
| Risk Assessment: | Report for information purposes only - no risk assessment undertaken. | |

1. Background

1.1. Reports with a reduced range of key performance indicators for services managed by Somerset Waste Partnership are presented to the Board in September (Quarter 1 performance) and March (Quarter 3 performance).

1.2. The Board have previously endorsed the incremental improvement in the way we report performance in order to give the Board a more rounded view. Appendix C sets out a first draft of what such a performance report would look like, and feedback from the board is requested to inform its development.

2. Performance Findings

National Indicators

Residual waste per household (NI

2.1. Headline figures to note for April 2018 – June 2018 compared to the same period in 2017 are shown in the table below. A verbal update will be provided to the board on trends in waste over the Summer:

Result

124 84

% Change

+2 49%

Appendix

A1

Lines

(39)

| 191) - kg/hh | 124.04 | +2.49% | | (39) |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| Recycling & reuse rate (NI 192) - % | 55.10% | +0.37% | | (40) |
| Waste landfilled (NI 193) - % | 43.41% | -0.42% | | (41) |
| Waste Streams | Tonnes | % Change | | |
| Total Reused, Recycled & Composted | 38,854 | +4.00% | | (24) |
| Residual Landfilled | 30,253 | +2.16% | | (27, 30, 31) |
| Recovery | 1,462 | +8.96% | | (28, 29, 32) |
| Total Household Arisings | 70,519 | +3.32% | | (33) |
| Total Commercial Arisings | 1,738 | +7.19% | | (25, 35) |
| | - | | | |
| Kg/hh Headlines | Kg/hh | kg/hh + / - | A2 | |
| Garden Waste | 61.86 | +4.02 | | |
| Recycled | 72.42 | +1.67 | | |
| Residual Landfilled | 124.84 | +3.03 | | |
| Total Household Arisings | 278.02 | +8.92 | | |
| Missed Collections | No. | % Change | B1 | |
| Refuse | 2,224 | +33.01% | D 1 | |
| Garden Waste | 1,824 | +19.92% | | |
| | 4,561 | +55.19% | | |
| Recycling & Food | - | | | |
| Repeat Missed Collections | 5,837 | +26.10% | | |
| Flytips | No. | No. + / - | B2 | |
| Total No. | 1,090 | +6 | | |

- **2.2.** The Q1 2018-19 indicators, compared to the same period last year, are:
 - Appendix A1 shows tonnage by material type as well as the former key national performance indicators, for the Partnership. This now arranged in alphabetical commodity order and reduced to 3 comparative years.
 - Appendix A2 shows headline kg per household performance, now split on a 'Kerbside Services' and 'Recycling Sites' basis with a combined Somerset Waste Partnership result.

- **Appendix B1** shows the level of reported missed collections, broken down by waste type and District across Somerset.
- Appendix B2 shows the number of flytips, broken down by waste type and District across Somerset
- **Appendix C** the draft future performance report format on which feedback is requested. This report is still a work in progress (hence the other appendices are still provided to the board with the full level of information that would otherwise have been received).
- 2.3. The headline tonnages shown in Appendix A1, reflect a reversal from the previous trend in declining tonnages and show an increase in waste during this quarter from last year (line 33-38) with total household arisings increasing by 3.32% (2264 tonnes-line 33). However this change in waste arisings is somewhat offset by an improving picture on the amount of this material being reused, recycled and composted (lines 24-26). Key drivers for this trend are
 - A general increase in the amount of material being sent for recycling, including cans, cardboard, green, glass, plastic and wood (lines1-23)
 - Where the amount of materials being sent for recycling has declined the reduction in tonnages is relatively low. For example paper (line 19) has reduced by only 2% since the previous year.

2.4. Other factors worthy of note

- The increase in non-household waste being sent to landfill (line 35) and being reused, recycled and composted (line 25). This indicates the continuing effectiveness of the permit scheme and goes some way to endorse the efforts of SWP officers operating in our towns and villages in driving commercial waste out of the domestic stream.
- 2.5. Appendix A2 shows a similar trend to that shown in Appendix A1 with an increase in the overall amount of household arisings being handled through the recycling sites. However it differs from the figures as shown in Appendix A1 and shows a slight dip in the recycling performance at the sites. This indicates the sites may be dealing with greater volumes of residual waste compared to the same period last year. Possible factors contributing to this.
 - SWP officers have been active in enforcing service rules and removing additional bins and non collection of side waste which may be diverting some of this residual waste through the recycling sites. It is also possible the increased number of missed collections may be a contributing factor to this increase in residual tonnages being dealt with through the recycling sites.
- 2.6. Appendix B1 reflects the continuing challenges facing the collection service in dealing with an aging fleet of vehicles. Whilst vehicle breakdown and weather were factors, the major contributing factor to the level of performance is the shortages of staff (in particular drivers) that our contractor has experienced, in particular at their Taunton depot. It should be noted that although SWP appreciate the difficulties within the sector, the quality of service in this quarter was unacceptable. SWP have imposed contractual penalties on Kier, and have worked closely with Kier to address the driver shortage and other

isseus impacting upon service quality. Kier's response to the driver shortage is now starting to bear fruit, but we continue to work closely with Kier to address both their overall level of performance and their performance in specific areas of the service (e.g. assisted collections, repeat missed collections, garden waste collections).

SWP meet regularly with senior representatives of Kier to review the success and effectiveness of their actions. SWP will consider favourably requests from Kier for financial support for particular initiatives, using the contractual performance deductions. However, as with the improvements to security at Walford Cross which SWP part-funded, SWP will only do this when we are confident a fully rounded plan is in place from Kier which meets SWP expectations.

- **2.7.** Appendix B2 shows the number of reported flytips in Quarter 1 2018-19 compared to the same period in 2017-18.
 - Although the overall variation in the number of incidents are
 insignificant and the levels have remained fairly constant there are
 some anomilies which will require further investigation. For example
 TDBC show a significant rise over this period whilst all others with the
 exception of WSDC show a drop in numbers. WSDC variation is not
 significant but we will investigate the issue further with our colleagues
 at TDBC to see if we can identify a reason behind this rise in reported
 incidents.

3. Consultations Undertaken

3.1. Consultation on findings in this report have been undertaken with SWP's Senior Management Group (officer representatives from partner authorities) and with SWP's Senior Management Team.

The Board and SMG have been consulted as part of developing a revised approach to performance reporting, which has been reflected in the first draft of the future performance report format in Appendix C.

4. Implications

4.1. Report for information purposes only – no implications recorded.

5. Background papers

- **5.1.** The following report is available at: http://www.somerset.gov.uk/councillors-and-democracy/
- **5.2.** Report to the Somerset Waste Board on 29th June 2018: Performance Outturn Report April 2017 to March 2018