

---

## Project Integra Draft Action Plan 2012/13

### Executive Summary

Following the conclusion of the main elements of the Project Integra Review in January 2012 this Action Plan:

- Sets out the proposed key actions for the Project Integra Partnership in 2012/13;
- Links these back to the agreed objective and operational focus of the partnership;
- Reaffirms the financial and environmental benefits of working together in partnership; and
- Sets out the budget for the proposed activities and the contributions of each partner.

#### **Key Activities for the Project Integra Partnership 2012/13:**

##### **A Concluding the remaining elements of the PI Review.**

A1 Review of PI Executive and amendments to the Constitution.

##### **B Working to reduce costs across the whole system.**

B1 To increase income and reduce disposal costs by increasing the amounts of existing materials collected for recycling.

B2 To increase income and simplify the management of textile banks by tendering a joint contract.

B3 To reduce the costs resulting from contamination in commingled recycling collections by developing a partnership wide approach to addressing contamination.

B4 To continue the behavioural change strategy by promoting more resource efficient behaviours amongst the public.

B5 To ensure the tonnages and income from commingled recycling collections reflect the levels of contamination for each authority.

##### **C Looking ahead together.**

C1 To provide a strategic direction of travel for waste management in Hampshire through a 'refresh' of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

C2 To develop a Waste Prevention Plan as part of the JMWMS.

---

## Project Integra – Draft Action Plan 2012/13

### 1 Purpose

- 1.1 To set out a Draft Action Plan for the Project Integra Partnership for 2012-13 for consideration by the Partner Authorities.

### 2 Approach

- 2.1 The purpose, structure and activities of the partnership have been the subject of an ongoing review. The majority of issues raised by the review were determined by the Project Integra Strategic Board (PISB) at its meeting on 12 January 2012 and are incorporated into this Draft Action Plan.
- 2.2 Decisions on the requirements and structure of the Project Integra (PI) Executive could not be progressed until other issues were determined. As a result the actions to complete this remaining part of the review are incorporated in this plan.

### 3 Structure of Action Plan

- 3.1
- Partnership purpose & objectives
  - Partnership Rationale
  - Proposed activities 2012/13
  - Resources
  - Monitoring & reporting

### 4 Partnership Purpose & Objectives

- 4.1 The Project Integra Strategic Board is constituted as a Joint Committee of the 14 local authorities with responsibility for waste management in Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton. The long term waste disposal contractor Veolia Environmental Services (VES) is a non-voting member of the partnership.
- 4.2 As part of the review the PISB reaffirmed Project Integra's overall objective as follows:  
*To provide a long-term solution for dealing with Hampshire's municipal waste in an environmentally sound, cost effective and reliable way. Success in achieving this depends on joint working between all the parties in the best interests of the community at large.*
- 4.3 The PISB also agreed the operational focus for its activities as follows (text in brackets references the overall objective):

#### **Working to reduce costs across the whole system through:**

- waste prevention (*environmentally sound, cost efficiency*)

- recycling and performance improvements - for instance through reducing contamination, increasing capture of materials, improving income for materials, changing management arrangements (*environmentally sound, cost efficiency*)
  - reducing landfill (*environmentally sound, cost efficiency*)
  - training (*cost efficiency*)
  - joint working between authorities (*cost efficiency, joint working*)
- Looking ahead together** (*long term solution & strategy, joint working*).

## 5 Partnership Rationale

- 5.1 The effective delivery of Project Integra's purpose and objectives requires joint working between the authorities. The mechanics and principles for this are established in the following ways:
- 5.2 A joint Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) setting out the principles of the respective local authorities' responsibilities and obligations supported by all Project Integra partners.
- 5.3 A tri-partite contract management agreement between Hampshire County Council and the two unitary authorities of Portsmouth and Southampton.
- 5.4 A formal meeting structure that includes representation by all Project Integra partners at officer and elected member level.
- 5.5 A formal agreement to share income from the sale of commingled recyclables between the disposal contractor and the waste collection authorities.
- 5.6 A joint waste volume planning process establishing service needs and aspirations for the next five years which is updated annually by each authority.
- 5.7 A Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) - developed and adopted by all the partners.
- 5.8 Building on these foundations further joint working arrangements have developed:
- 5.9 A dedicated Materials Analysis Facility (MAF) to monitor contamination levels and ensure that performance and income from collections of dry mixed recyclables is apportioned fairly between the partners.
- 5.10 A joint behavioural change campaign – Recycle for Hampshire (RfH) - focusing on waste minimisation and recycling.
- 5.11 A joint contract for the reprocessing and sale of glass collected.
- 5.12 A joint waste service contract between East Hampshire District Council and Winchester City Council.
- 5.13 A joint waste service contract between Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council and Hart District Council.
- 5.14 A joint contract for the removal of abandoned vehicles.

## 6 Proposed Activities 2012/13

- 6.1 Following on from the operational focus established for the Partnership's activities (4.3) the following key activities are proposed.

### **Working to Reduce Costs Across the Whole System**

#### 6.2 Waste Prevention

*The highest tier of the waste management hierarchy – preventing waste has significant environmental benefits as well as saving the costs of managing waste.*

- Development of a joint Waste Prevention Plan as part of the refreshed JMWMS (see 6.7 below).

#### 6.3 Recycling and Performance Improvements

*Increasing the amounts of waste recycled/composted rather than sent for energy recovery results in reduced processing costs as well as increased income from material sales.*

- Contamination reduction – build on previous work and carry out more as required to build a business case for a 'compact' between authorities setting out expectations, responsibilities and finance that will form the basis for addressing contamination in the future.
- Increased materials capture – research what has worked elsewhere and carry out trials in two authority areas with MRF & MAF monitoring – to establish business case for future roll out across rest of partnership.
- Joint textiles bank contract – to simplify management of textile banks and develop an income stream.
- Contamination monitoring programme – implement improvements to MAF sampling programme to provide increased confidence to authorities and improved presentation & analysis of data.
- Behavioural change – continue to promote more resource efficient behaviours through a range of approaches - schools recycling programme, recycle week (focussing on small WEEE), events etc.

#### 6.4 Reducing Landfill

*Landfill is the least preferable option environmentally for managing most waste streams and is also a costly option due to landfill tax increases.*

- The HWRC Service Programme review.
- Segregation of combustible materials at HWRC sites where practicable.
- Trials of processing wastes currently sent to landfill to produce a Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF).

#### 6.5 Training

*Managers and decision makers need to understand waste management, the training programme was developed to provide a low cost, locally tailored and delivered way of providing this.*

- Revise the PI training programme courses & charges to meet demand and become self-funding.

#### 6.6 Joint Working between Authorities

*Savings can be achieved through reducing duplication of activities between one or more authorities.*

- Provide support to authorities as requested.
- Respond to consultation & FOI request as required.

#### 6.7 **Looking Ahead Together**

*This has been a longstanding strength of the partnership – partners benefit today from forward looking decisions made together in previous years.*

- Refresh the JMWMS – to provide a strategic direction of travel for waste management in Hampshire.
- Incorporate briefings into PISB meetings.
- Annual Conference.

#### 6.8 **Other**

- Conclude the PI Review - review of executive team & roles, amendments to constitution.
- External speaking engagements etc – respond to requests.

**Table 1: Key Actions for Project Integra 2012/13**

	<b>PI Review</b>	<b>JMWMS Refresh</b>	<b>Waste Prevention</b>	<b>Behaviour Change</b>
<b><i>Aim</i></b>	To conclude the PI review	To provide a strategic direction of travel for waste management in Hampshire	To reduce costs & environmental impacts by reducing the amount of waste collected	To promote more resource efficient behaviours amongst the public
<b><i>Objective</i></b>	To ensure the PI constitution reflects decisions made following the PI review  To ensure the roles and resources required by the PI Executive reflect the revised objectives and activities of the partnership	To refresh the 2006 Joint Strategy	To develop a joint Waste Prevention Plan as part of the JMWMS	To support other initiatives (prevention, reuse, recycling) through reinforcement of messages to households across Hampshire  To reinforce behaviour change through engaging students in practical waste minimisation and recycling at school
<b><i>Expected Outcome</i></b>	Revised constitution agreed by all partners  Roles & resources revised as necessary and agreed by PISB	Updated Joint Strategy	Partnership wide approach & actions to prevent waste	To provide opportunities to view and opportunities to engage  To have delivered the schools recycling programme to 60 schools
<b><i>Budgetary Implications</i></b>	HCC legal charge - via SLA  Costs of changes to be met from PI balances. Revised costs to be incorporated into budget	TBA	None - HCC leading	Within RfH budget
<b><i>Timescale</i></b>	To go to authorities with Action Plan 2013/14  To PISB July 2012	TBA	TBA	Ongoing programme

	<b>Increase Materials Capture</b>	<b>Joint Textiles Bank Contract</b>	<b>Contamination Reduction</b>	<b>Contamination Monitoring</b>
<b>Aim</b>	To increase income and reduce disposal costs by increasing the amounts of specific materials collected for recycling	To increase income	To reduce costs resulting from contamination in commingled recycling collections	To reduce costs resulting from contamination in commingled recycling collections
<b>Objective</b>	2012/13: To establish through trials in 2 authorities a cost effective approach to increasing capture of materials at an authority wide level. across the partnership	To simplify the management of textile banks and develop an income stream	To develop a partnership wide approach to addressing contamination	To ensure the tonnages and income from commingled recycling collections reflect the levels of contamination for each authority
<b>Expected Outcome</b>	Evidence on which to base decisions for a partnership wide materials capture communications campaign in 2013/14	Partnership wide Textile Bank contract in place	Agreement of a compact between partners on addressing contamination	Increased confidence amongst partners in the contamination monitoring results & greater usage of the results through improved presentation & analysis
<b>Budgetary Implications</b>	Trials to be resourced from within RfH budget	Cost of tendering & management by lead authority - Projects Fund	Within RfH budget	Within MAF budget
<b>Timescale</b>	Trials summer. Reporting autumn to contribute to plans for 2013/14	ITT November. Contract award March 2013?	Compact to be agreed AGM 2013	Revised approach to be incorporated into programme for start in June

## 7 Resources

### 7.1 Working Groups

Appendix 1 proposes a revised structure of meetings following the PI Review. The aim has been to:

- Significantly reduce the number of regular meetings within the partnership;
- Ensure that the invitees and role of each group is clear (revised terms of reference will be agreed by officers).

Additional meetings will take place on a task and finish basis.

### 7.2 Budget

Following the PI Review the budgets for each main element of the partnership are set out in Appendix 2:

- Executive (subject to conclusion of review) £182,500 (-9% change from 2011/12 budget);
- Recycle for Hampshire £200,000 (0% change from 2011/12);
- Materials Analysis Facility £215,515 (+5.4% change from 2011/12<sup>1</sup>).

This represents an overall cost decrease of -1.3% from 2011/12.

### 7.3 Authority contributions

Authority contributions are based on:

- Executive - total number of households with elements for collection (80%) and disposal (20%);
- Recycle for Hampshire – total number of households (WCAs) plus HCC £50,000;
- Materials Analysis Facility – one third WCAs (evenly split), one third WDAs (split by tonnage), one third VES.

The contributions for each authority are set out in Appendix 3 and will be deducted from MRF materials sales income.

## 8 Monitoring & Reporting

8.1 The Board will receive reports at each meeting on progress with main actions and budget.

### Officer contact details

Name	John Redmayne
Position	Executive Director
E-mail	<a href="mailto:john.redmayne@hants.gov.uk">john.redmayne@hants.gov.uk</a>
Telephone	01730 235806 / 07833 046509
Document	Issue No 4 : 23 February 2012

---

<sup>1</sup> The MAF is managed under the terms of the waste disposal contract and is subject to RPI based increases.

Meetings Structure

		Frequency	Notes	Membership	Role
<b>Member Meetings</b>					
	Project Integra Strategic Board (PISB)	3	November (AGM), March, July	Member & Deputy from each authority, VES non voting	To agree annual Action Plan & budget, monitor progress against these, to act as a forum for joint policies & strategy, to receive briefings on issues of interest
	Communications sub-committee	2	June/July October	Chair/vice-chair of PISB, nominees agreed by PISB	To provide Member input on communications issues - June/July to consider results from previous year & October to consider programme for next year
<b>Officer Meetings</b>					
	Strategy Officers Group / Heads of Service Group	3	Ahead of Board or as required	Strategy Officers - all authorities	To prepare an annual programme of activities, co-ordinate resources for delivery and monitor progress
	Strategy Officer Core Group	3	Ahead of SO group	4 or 5 nominees of Strategy Officers - to include WDA representation and chair of Strategy Officers Group	To prepare agenda and approach for Strategy Officer meeting
	Waste Technical Group	3		Nominees of Strategy Officers - to include VES & WDA reps	Joint material sales (overview & contracts), MRF issues, MAF programme, waste data matters, sustainable & ethical recycling (destinations of materials, environmental performance)
	Resource Aware Group	3		Recycling officers & waste communications officers - to include RfH and VES	Public interface of waste services - service details, events, communications, campaigns, waste prevention
	Operations Group (contracted out waste services)	3		BDBC & HDC, RBC, EHDC & WCC, GBC, PCC, HCC, VES	Operational issues & efficiencies amongst contracted out waste services
	Operations Group (in-house waste services)	3		FBC, HBC, TVBC, NFDC, EBC, SCC, HCC, VES	Operational issues & efficiencies amongst in house waste services
	CASH	3		All authorities & contractors	Health & Safety Issues in waste, grounds and street scene services, liaison with HSE
<b>Other</b>					
	Annual Conference	1	June September	Open to Members & Officers from all partners	To inform a wider audience of Members and Officers about current and future issues in waste management both locally and nationally
<b>Total</b>		<b>27</b>			

## Budgets

### Executive

Activities	Costs
Staff Costs	124,100
Events & Activities	5,400
Communications & Research SLA	45,000
Other	8,000
<b>Gross Expenditure</b>	<b>182,500</b>
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>£182,500</b>

### Recycle for Hampshire

Activities	Costs
Staffing costs	60,000
Contamination projects	35,000
Capture projects	43,000
Behaviour change activities	10,500
Schools Recycling Programme Education Officers x 3	45,000
Schools Recycling Programme resources	5,000
Home Composting (leaflets to promote bins)	1,500
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>£200,000</b>

### Materials Analysis Facility

Activities	Costs
Staff costs	119,905
Vehicle costs	43,815
Plant costs	28,334
Other	23,460
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>£215,515</b>

## Authority Contributions

		Project Integra						MAF	Combined
		Project Integra Executive			Project Fund	Recycle For Hampshire	PI Funding	Material Analysis Facility	Project Integra & MAF
Dwellings		Collection 80%	Disposal 20%	Total			Total	Total	
	Basingstoke	70,860	13,448	0	13,448	-	14,186	27,634	5,526
East Hampshire	48,850	9,271	0	9,271	-	9,779	19,050	5,526	24,576
Eastleigh	52,480	9,960	0	9,960	-	10,506	20,466	5,526	25,992
Fareham	47,600	9,033	0	9,033	-	9,529	18,562	5,526	24,088
Gosport	36,250	6,879	0	6,879	-	7,257	14,136	5,526	19,662
Hart	36,510	6,929	0	6,929	-	7,309	14,238	5,526	19,764
Havant	52,530	9,969	0	9,969	-	10,516	20,485	5,526	26,011
New Forest	79,690	15,123	0	15,123	-	15,953	31,076	5,526	36,602
Portsmouth	88,100	16,719	4,180	20,899	-	17,637	38,536	13,688	52,224
Rushmoor	37,940	7,200	0	7,200	-	7,595	14,795	5,526	20,321
Southampton	100,490	19,071	4,768	23,839	-	20,117	43,956	15,090	59,046
Test Valley	48,830	9,267	0	9,267	-	9,775	19,042	5,526	24,568
Winchester	49,150	9,328	0	9,328	-	9,839	19,167	5,526	24,693
Hampshire	560,690	0	26,602	26,602	-	50,000	76,602	54,112	130,714
Veolia				4,254	-	-	4,254	71,838	76,092
		<b>142,197</b>	<b>35,550</b>	<b>182,001</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>199,998</b>	<b>381,999</b>	<b>215,515</b>	<b>597,514</b>

## Notes

*Dwelling Figures are taken from Waste Dataflow, to which figures are provided by each authority  
Differences from budget figures are due to rounding and interest on balances held during the year.*