



## Project Integra – Strategic Board Minutes

Name of meeting	Project Integra Strategic Board	
Date of meeting	29 <sup>th</sup> June 2023, 10-12	
Venue	Online Meeting via Teams	
Attendees:	<p><b>Councillors:</b>            Cllr Nick Adams-King (NAK)            Cllr Dave Ashmore (DA)            Cllr Ian Bastable (IB)            Cllr Lulu Bowerman (LB)            Cllr David Drew (DD)            Cllr Steve Hammond (SHa)            Cllr Steve Leggett (SL)            Cllr Robert Mocatta (RM)            Cllr Chris Tomblin (CT)            Cllr Richard Quaterman (RQ)</p> <p><b>Officers:</b>            Linda Bratcher (LB)            Mark Bowler (MB)            Tara Cartledge (TC)            David Emmett (DE)            Sean Herdman-Grant (SHG)            Sam Horne (SH)            Samantha Kenyon (SK)            Olivia Longley (OL)            Sophie Nichol (SN)            Chris Noble (SN)            Yvonne Perkins (YP)            Sonja Reames (SR)            Gareth Roberts (GR)            David Robertson (DR)            Ben Slater (BS)            Gale Smith (GS)            Gary Squire (GSq)            Helen Taylor-Cobb (HTC)            Ruth Whaymand (RW)            Alan Wheeler (AW)            Ashley Wild (AWi)            Campbell Williams (CW)            Paul Wykes (PW)            Abigail Wylde (AW)</p>	<p>Hampshire County Council            Portsmouth City Council            Fareham Borough Council            Havant Borough Council            Test Valley Borough Council            Gosport Borough Council            Southampton City Council            East Hants District Council            Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council            Hart District Council</p> <p>Southampton City Council            Fareham Borough Council            Hampshire County Council            Portsmouth City Council            East Hants District Council            Hampshire County Council            East Hants District Council            Project Integra            Veolia            New Forest District Council            East Hants District Council            Havant Borough Council            Hampshire County Council            Havant Borough Council            Veolia            Eastleigh Borough Council            Fareham Borough Council            Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council            Rushmoor Borough Council            Gosport Borough Council            Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council            Winchester City Council            Test Valley Borough Council            Project Integra</p>
Apologies:	Cllr Geoffrey Blunden Cllr Rupert Kyrle Cllr Kelsie Leaney Mark Grey	New Forest District Council Eastleigh Borough Council Winchester City Council Veolia
		Actions
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions and Domestic Arrangements</b>	

2.	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>2.1 Cllr Geoffrey Blunden from New Forest District Council Cllr Rupert Kyrle from Eastleigh Borough Council Cllr Kelsie Learney from Winchester City Council Mark Grey from Veolia</p>	
3.	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>3.1 None declared.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (Report 121)</b></p> <p>4.1 Point 5.6 EPR Models – AW outlined that no information has been released by the government to update the models, AW to update when more information is available.</p>	
5.	<p><b>PI Annual Report (Report 122)</b></p> <p>5.1 AW gave a presentation on the key points of the PI annual report, this included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The key message from the report, shown on page 4 in table 1, is that tonnage has dropped across all waste streams. The reduction in total household waste is just under 40,000 tonnes, the decrease in recycling tonnage unfortunately comes largely from kerbside collections and banks. However, for residual the biggest decrease has come from HWRC wood and HWRC combustible and landfill tonnage, whereas proportionally kerbside residual has seen the smallest reduction.</li> <li>• There have been several articles recently in industry news where other authorities are reporting a similar story. Presumably the seemingly nationwide reduction in tonnage is being driven by national issues such as the cost-of-living crisis.</li> <li>• The average recycling rate across all PI authorities has increased up to 37% however this remains lower than the pre-pandemic rate of 39%.</li> <li>• Despite the overall increase in recycling rates most PI authorities have actually seen a decrease in their recycling rates with the exception of HDC, NFDC, PCC and RBC.</li> <li>• Landfill tonnages have dropped to below 5%, this is only the second time on record levels have been this low. This will have been driven partly by the shift of POPs material to incineration due to new regulations.</li> <li>• After decreasing last year contamination has risen again to 17% which is the second highest recorded rate, second only to the 17.5% rate seen in 2020/21.</li> <li>• The increase in contamination is across all authorities except BDBC, GBC, SCC and WCC who all had small decreases in their contamination levels.</li> <li>• There has been a small decrease in the number of recyclables found in the residual waste, from 11.43% last year to 8.91% this year.</li> <li>• The Hampshire Recycles social media accounts reached 145,478 users over the year and in total obtained gained 500 new followers.</li> <li>• The Health and Safety data for this year shows that overall, there is a reduction in the total number of accidents, however there was a slight</li> </ul>	

	<p>increase in the number of slips, trips, and falls, and vehicle and plant incidents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the 2022/23 PI accounts, the account came in below a forecasted budget of £148,000. This is largely due to an underspend in the PI Service Level agreement with HCC. There is still money in the historic PI underspend, however this is gradually reducing.</li> <li>• As usual the report includes a set of recommendations for Board to approve as well as an appendix showing authority activity and work done by the PI executive over the last year.</li> </ul>	
5.2	<p>DD asked who the report is produced for and whether an abbreviated version is published for residents. AW explained that the report is for the PI Board but once the data is verified by DEFRA that authorities are able to share the report publicly. An abbreviated version of the report is not produced but key statistics are shared with residents via the Hampshire Recycles social media accounts. RM highlighted that previously discussions have taken place regarding publishing the report for residents, he expressed that he thought this would be a good idea going forwards.</p>	
5.3	<p>DD asked whether the residual waste tonnage per household is available for individual authorities. AW confirmed the data is available and will circulate.</p>	AW
5.4	<p>IB expressed concerns about the visibility of the Hampshire Recycles website and limitations of social media, indicating that not all Hampshire residents choose to engage with social media and therefore key information should be disseminated in other ways. He suggested that the Hampshire Recycles website be updated. AW to look into updating website and alternative media options.</p>	AW
5.5	<p>IB indicated that going forward it would be helpful if a more comprehensive explanation of how the contamination rates is calculated could be provided, outlining that this will be particularly important in relation to the new contamination arrangements proposed in the IAA. He asked what the error rate for contamination calculation is and how sampling is conducted to ensure that it is representative. AW suggested adding contamination and the MAF sampling to the agenda of a future meeting but shared that HCC is working on a project to improve the MAF sampling to ensure that samples are collected as effectively and efficiently as possible.</p> <p>RM asked whether each authority receives the same number of samples each year. AW explained that the number of samples taken per authority is representative of their size but that the team aim to sample each round at least once per year. She acknowledged that during the pandemic this was not always possible and reiterated that the HCC project will ensure that samples are collected appropriately moving forward. RM indicated that recent contamination rates are much higher than seen in previous years and asked if this could be linked to the volume of sampling. SH explained that the contamination rates assess the number of target and non-target materials whereas the total residue is based on the material which comes out of the MRF process which cannot be recycled. He indicated that the larger numbers are due to high residual rates.</p>	
5.6	<p>The recommendations of the annual report were agreed.</p>	

5.7	The data used in the annual report has not been validated so the report is not to be to be shared until further notice.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Fly-Tipping Annual Report (Report 123)</b>	
6.1	<p>The Fly-Tipping report was circulated prior to the meeting. GR summarised the key points which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC continues to play an active role in the National Fly-Tipping Prevention Group which allows Hampshire to have a national voice. TVBC and several other authorities have been involved in presenting robust cases which has contributed to updates to national guidance.</li> <li>• Following three successful applications to the WRAP Fly-Tipping Intervention Grant from BDBC, WCC and EBC these authorities were awarded a total of £101,204, the majority of which has been spent on CCTV cameras and associated signage.</li> <li>• A comms toolkit has been circulated to all authorities, the team would like to move away from themes presented in historic comms and move towards the #Scrapflytipping campaign which is used by a range of authorities across the country.</li> <li>• The number of reported incidents in Hampshire has decreased by 16.65%, falling from 26,024 in 20/21 to 21,691 in 21/22. This is a larger decrease than 4.6% decrease seen nationally.</li> <li>• In 2021/22 most of the Fly-Tipping incidents in Hampshire occurred on public highways at 44.97% and the majority of fly-tips were single items at 32.26%.</li> <li>• Fly tipping incidents in Hampshire most commonly involved 'other household waste' at 34.03%.</li> </ul>	<b>GR</b>
6.2	<p>RM asked whether the data presented in figure E of the report, the Representative Distribution of Fly-Tipping by Land Type in Hampshire, is available for each authority individually. GR confirmed that this data is available and that he will circulate it to the group.</p>	
6.3	<p>DD highlighted that fly-tippers are unpopular with residents and there is generally support from the public for harsher punishments. He outlined that in TVBC they have noticed that some fly-tips are coming from across the border in Southampton and other areas, indicating that there is an opportunity for the group to work more collaborative and across borders to deter fly-tipping. GR outlined that HCC is aware of the problem and have set up an enforcement working group which is in regular contact and work to resolve cross-border fly-tipping. He noted that in the past the partnership has worked to successfully pursue a joint prosecution for cross-border fly-tipping.</p> <p>RM encouraged the group to think about what PI can do going forwards to tackle fly-tipping.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Inter Authority Agreement and Governance</b>	
7.1	<p>SH provided an update on the Inter Authority Agreement (IAA), explaining for new members that the purpose of the agreement is to amend the relationship between HCC and the districts, including the two unitary authorities, based on both operational and financial elements. The latest version of the IAA was shared with the partnership in March and since then HCC has met with all</p>	

authorities individually to gather feedback, these suggestions have since been passed to the legal team at Bonds who are currently working on a revised version which should be available shortly.

SH outlined that a letter from HCC and Cllr Nick Adams-King was circulated to each authority recently which summarised the key aspects of the IAA and acted as a formal notification of what will take place going forward. This was supposed to be followed by a group meeting for members however due to a low attendance rate it was decided that individual meetings between HCC and each authority would be more effective. SH explained that these meetings are an opportunity to raise any concerns about the proposal before the document is taken to the next stage.

SH then explained HCC's timeline, outlining that the team are working towards taking a paper to cabinet on the 19<sup>th</sup> of July to seek approval for the IAA with some flexibility included to make minor changes to the document. He emphasised that it is key to establish the agreement formally to enable HCC along with SCC and PCC to proceed with the plans for the new Eastleigh MRF. Planning permission has been granted for the site subject to some conditions which are being worked through, and HCC with Veolia are keen to stick to the planned timeline which aims for a mid-2025 operational date. However, this depends on getting work started on site as soon as possible which cannot happen without guarantees from the districts. Veolia is working on waste flow modelling to establish what the operational changes will mean for the wider infrastructure network in Hampshire and how it will be managed going forward. SH reiterated that HCC is working towards existing timelines and are not planning any changes at this time.

7.2 RM asked how many authorities HCC need to sign the IAA to proceed and if there's a minimum number HCC would progress with. SH outlined that the key for HCC is having confidence that PI authorities are committed to the change and are planning to use the new MRF. HCC together with SCC and PCC are contributing £30 million in capital investment as well as the associated costs of running the infrastructure and therefore are looking for clear intention from the authorities that this investment will be used by the partnership. SH noted that the capital investment is only possible if the financial arrangements are amended as proposed in the IAA and that HCC is not in the position to fund the infrastructure without this. He recognised that the delays to funding information from the Government is causing uncertainty amongst districts and in light of this HCC would accept authorities signing up to the IAA in principle awaiting national updates, however he could not confirm a minimum sign-up number. RM asked for confirmation that HCC would accept an in-principle agreement to the IAA outlining authority's intentions rather than full signatures. SH explained that HCC would like full signature but recognise that the national situation presents uncertainty which may prevent authorities signing up fully. RM asked whether an in-principle agreement would need to be secured prior to HCC's 19<sup>th</sup> of July cabinet date. SH outlined that a decision did not need to be reached before the July cabinet date but ideally HCC would like decisions around September / October but recognised that this may present challenges for some authorities.

7.3 IB highlighted that one of FBC's main concerns with the IAA is the proposed changes to the DMR revenue share arrangements. He explained that whilst all authorities want to recycle from an ethical standpoint, that in reality finances drive decisions. He expressed that FBC is disappointed that the new IAA

arrangements do not provide any financial incentives to improve recycling. RM asked SH to comment on whether HCC perceive that financial incentives to recycle have been removed. SH explained that the residual waste targets included in the IAA act as an incentive, if authorities perform well there is potentially income available, however he recognised that the direct incentive of DMR income is being removed. SH emphasised that HCC cannot continue to fund the cost of recycling without the financial arrangements being amended.

RM suggested that the new financial arrangements incentivise authorities to reduce contamination and total household waste rather than increasing recycling, highlighting that this is an important shift in message and something that needs to be communicated to residents. SH agreed that waste reduction is a topic that will need to be discussed at a national level, highlighting that it is recognised that recycling alone will not meet the Government's environmental targets and that messaging will need to shift to consumption and waste volume. RM supported this but indicated that this is something that currently residents may not be aware of and instead assume that the answer is to recycle more.

LB asked how this messaging is going to be presented to residents and whether there is a budget within planned comms to include waste reduction messages. She outlined that social media is not the only platform that needs to be used to communicate these challenges. SH agreed and indicated that all comms channels will need to be maximised, but this will require financial commitment from authorities. LB suggested using HCC's school network to create a new channel of comms aimed at school children. It was agreed that this was a good idea.

AW highlighted that PI has a Resource Aware (RAG) working group which focuses on comms and how best to communicate messages to residents, a few months ago a RAG event was held with external speakers and one of the proposals from this was to work with schools, the project is still in the early stages, but the group are meeting again in September.

AW expressed that a good time to consider behaviour change will be as service changes such as the introduction of food waste, as residents will be required to change their waste disposal behaviour and may be more susceptible to accepting other waste reduction changes at the same time. RM highlighted that this may be a challenge as authorities are going to change their services at different times. NAK indicated that this is also a strength as best practice and learnings can be shared within the partnership. RM asked whether officers have systems in place to share this information. AW confirmed that officers are in regular contact and there have already been examples of authorities sharing their food waste service implementation experiences.

7.4 NAK outlined that HCC is having conversations at an individual level to better understand the challenges that PI authorities are facing. He shared that all authorities are aware that residents in Hampshire want to recycle more and have already agreed to switch to a twin stream system through the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS). He acknowledged that the national delays are frustrating and that conversations around the IAA would be easier with more information, but that as we're heading towards a general election unless information is released in the next few months it is unlikely to be released before the elections. Regardless of who wins the election there will still be a need to change how recycling is done in Hampshire, and NAK

	<p>highlighted that although HCC is considering ways to incorporate flexibility into the IAA that ultimately changes will need to happen. One of the strengths of PI is the ability to work together and share best practice which will be particularly important going forwards and something that PI needs to work on improving. RM indicated that all PI authorities are facing the same issues and that now PI needs to work to lead best practice for the benefit of all authorities.</p>	
7.5	<p>RQ indicated that HDC's biggest concern is the amount of uncertainty surrounding the financial impacts of the IAA given the lack of information being provided at a national level. He outlined that the financial proposals could have significant impacts on authorities and that the partnership needs to have a conversation on how the risks are being shared. RM indicated that his understanding is that the wider financial implications are beyond the control of the partnership and that everyone is waiting on the Government. SH supported this outlining that everyone has been waiting for the consistency consultation and details of EPR for two years and although it has been indicated that some information on EPR will be released over the summer, ultimately, we remain waiting.</p>	
7.6	<p>LB asked whether the uncertainty around the outcomes of the consistency consultation is making it difficult to plan the new MRF. SH acknowledged that it is presenting some challenges, but that HCC is confident that the MRF can be built according to specifications set out in the Environment Act which is very clear on the core and future materials - such as flexible plastics - required for collections. He indicated that the main challenge is the financial uncertainty that the districts have raised rather than materials, highlighting that residents have made it clear that they want to be able to recycle more, and politically it needs to be decided whether this can be acted upon with the current financial information available. RM highlighted that the potential financial implications are key for authorities, outlining that there is a risk that if authorities progress with implementing service changes now that they will not receive funding in the future. NAK recognised this but reiterated that HCC and the partnership need to be on track with the MRF project to ensure that we are prepared for the government changes regardless of when they are published, highlighting that without the MRF the authorities will not be in a position to meet the targets set out in the Environment Act.</p>	
7.7	<p>RM asked whether the government may not fund food waste. SH explained that the government has committed to funding capital and transition costs, but ongoing revenue costs have not been agreed at this stage. Around 50% of local authorities in England already offer food waste and the government could use this to rationalise that it is possible to implement the system without central funding. SH shared that the government was able to waive the requirement for new burdens funding for DIY waste changes and there is concern that similar situations could occur. NAK supported this, reiterating that there are other authorities who have implemented food waste systems without government funding and the expectation may be that others can do the same.</p>	
7.8	<p>AW provided an update on the PI governance proposals, outlining that although the governance was originally scheduled to be agreed as part of the IAA it has now been separated and can be agreed on a different timescale. At the February board meeting it was shared that the two original governance options proposed had resulted in a tie when voted on. A third hybrid governance option was proposed and circulated. AW explained that once feedback has been received on this proposal its viability can be assessed and</p>	

	<p>taken forward, all authorities were asked to consider the hybrid governance option and provide feedback.</p> <p>RM expressed that going forward PI needs to work more collaboratively and in order to do this the governance arrangements need to be changed. He reiterated the need for board members to engage in conversations on governance in order for it to be progressed.</p> <p>RQ asked if the governance options could be circulated to new board members who may not have received the information. AW to circulate.</p>	<b>AW</b>
<p><b>9.</b></p> <p>9.1</p>	<p><b>Disposal Contract Update</b></p> <p>SH provided a disposal contract update:</p> <p>POPs remain a prominent issue, as of the 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2023 all POPs material was required to be diverted from landfill to incineration in order to be irreversibly destroyed and segregated at point of collection to avoid contamination. HCC has done a lot of work together with Veolia, SCC, and PCC to ensure that infrastructure in Hampshire meets the requirements, this has been supported by operational work from the districts and boroughs. Veolia has established a shredding facility at Warren Farm to enable material to be shredded before being transported to the Portsmouth ERF. The required changes have been implemented relatively quickly and Hampshire is a fully compliant authority.</p> <p>SH outlined that POPS are likely to continue to be a relevant issue as recently the Stockholm Convention has identified more chemicals that have been classed as POPs and will need further management going forward. This includes items such as water repelling clothing, flame retardant clothes and soft furnishings, sealants, and electrical equipment. As a result, in the future there will be an increased need to segregate and properly manage these items, and changes will also be needed in the way these regulations are communicated to residents. SH explained that the public response to waste domestic seating POPs regulation has been relatively constrained but that concerns will only rise as more materials are classified as POPs and the long-term impacts of the chemicals are established.</p> <p>DD asked for clarification on what POPs are and whether they are destroyed by incineration. SH explained that Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPS) are chemicals or families of chemical that do not break down in the natural environment and instead bioaccumulate. The Environment Agency has confirmed that they are fully destroyed by incineration in a controlled environment but that the consequences of POPs on human and natural health is currently unknown. POPs are likely to continue to be a waste disposal issue as they are found in a large volume of household objects. RM supported this indicating that he thought the collective knowledge on POPs amongst Hampshire residents was low and is something the group should consider going forwards. SH shared that as well as being involved in the issue on a local level, HCC is represented at a national level and is working with a number of national groups to establish best practice and suggested that Zoe Clegg at HCC provide a more detailed update at the next board meeting.</p> <p>RM asked whether use of the shredding facility at Warren Farm will be offered</p>	



	<p>to other authorities who are struggling to manage their POPs waste. SH explained that where there is spare capacity the shredding facility is being offered to neighbouring authorities but that the majority of waste being processed is Hampshire's.</p> <p>SHa asked how secure Warren Farm is in terms of chemical release. SH outlined that Veolia manage the site very carefully and have put a number of abatement systems in place to ensure that contaminants are not released. He noted that Veolia are undertaking work to future proof this system to ensure the site remains compliant as the POPs situation progresses.</p> <p>9.2 SH explained that in previous years there has been fires in collection vehicles and at recycling facilities caused by batteries. This remains to be a prominent issue, and everyone should be on high alert, SH noted that comms is particularly important in this area and residents should be able to clearly establish the correct disposal route for old batteries. Veolia are working to implement vape collection points at HWRCs to tackle the increasing popularity of disposable vapes and associated disposal problems.</p> <p>9.3 SH outlined that Nitrous Oxide containers are becoming increasingly problematic with teams seeing more misuse and littering of containers in Hampshire. Smaller containers are used to give an illegal high and have been a problem for a while, but increasingly teams are seeing larger containers which are only available to food and medical industries being misused and being found in waste streams. The government is looking to ban Nitrous Oxide containers which whilst positive is unlikely to eliminate the problem in terms of litter and waste stream management. Finding appropriate outlets for Nitrous Oxide container waste is challenging as they contain high levels of greenhouse gasses however HCC is working with the Environment Agency to secure a compliant outlet for containers found in Hampshire.</p>	
<p><b>10.</b></p> <p>10.1</p>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>CT shared that he is the cabinet member for Climate and Ecological Emergency at BDBC and therefore is interested in how this group manages the environmental impact of waste in Hampshire. He asked whether it is in the remit of the group to consider the carbon footprint of Hampshire's waste operations or whether mitigation strategies such as carbon capture systems at the incineration facilities have been considered. AW shared that as part of a modelling project undertaken a few years ago with the consultancy company Wood, projections of each authority's carbon footprint for both their current services and future service changes were calculated. SH outlined that assessing the carbon impact of waste operations in Hampshire is highly complicated due to the continuous movement of the system, noting that the team have previously looked at putting together a model but that it was deemed too complicated to present significant value to the partnership. SH explained that Veolia is continuously considering new carbon reduction plans and more detailed data is likely to be required from the government as part of the net zero plans soon, noting that it is also an issue which residents are highly engaged with. CT indicated it would be useful to know what work Veolia has done and strategies that they are considering, highlighting that it is a topic that should be taken forward by the Project Integra Board. RM agreed, indicating that it will be an important topic to consider going forward, particularly in regard to consistency across the partnership.</p>	

<p>10.2</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.4</p>	<p>NAK suggested that as there are a number of new members on the board that organising site visits to infrastructure in the county may be beneficial, highlighting that seeing infrastructure provides a more detailed understanding of how the current systems work. ALL to let NAK know if interested in visiting the infrastructure.</p> <p>RM asked whether the individual meetings being held with NAK and leaders regarding the IAA could be summarised and circulated. NAK explained that there will be some elements of confidentiality but that it should be possible to summarise some key points.</p> <p>RM outlined that the October board meeting is scheduled to take place in-person at the HCC offices, he asked for feedback from members as to whether they would like to continue with this or reschedule the meeting to take place online.</p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>ALL</b></p>
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b> Proposed date: Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> October 2023</p>	