

The Executive – 25 August 2010

Minutes of the meeting of **The Executive** held on **25 August 2010** when there were present:-

Chairman: Cllr T G Cutmore
Vice Chairman: Cllr Mrs M J Webster

Cllr Mrs L A Butcher
Cllr K H Hudson

Cllr C G Seagers
Cllr M J Steptoe

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Mrs T J Capon and K J Gordon.

OFFICERS PRESENT

G Woolhouse - Deputy Chief Executive
R Evans - Head of Environmental Services
A Lovett - Streetscene and Open Spaces Manager
N Khan - Principal Solicitor
J Bostock - Member Services Manager

VISITING

Cllr C I Black

213 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2010 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved

That the Press and public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining business on the grounds that exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 would be disclosed.

214 CONTRACT FOR MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY 2010-15

The Executive considered the exempt report of the Head of Environmental Services on awarding the contract to provide a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) from 1 October 2010 to 31 March 2015.

Members endorsed the suggestion of the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Cllr M J Steptoe, that it would be appropriate for any contract to include an arrangement whereby some of the savings can be used for the purpose of further waste composition analysis. The Portfolio Holder had asked that there

be a focus on identifying where contamination is significant, so that publicity can be allied to addressing that aspect.

During discussion it was observed that, given that Bidder D could accept a high range of materials including empty plastic sacks, care would need to be taken to ensure that current practice whereby unwanted plastic sacks are filled with other materials is minimised. Generally speaking, an increase in the number of items that can be recycled should mean that the service is easier for residents to use.

It was noted that, while the financial value of the contract was much lower than for contracts where Members had been traditionally involved in hearing presentations from tenderers and the Portfolio Holder had been kept apprised of the process, the competitive dialogue nature of the MRF bidding process was such that it could be seen as appropriate for Members to have had involvement at the Bidders' Conference. The factors associated with the earlier elimination of bidders A, B and C were noted.

It was recognised that some local authorities suffered from poor publicity with regard to the approaches they take to addressing contamination. However, there had been no issues with the waste composition analysis approach taken by Rochford, which focussed on whole streets rather than individual households.

Reference was made to how pleasing it was that the success of the recycling service was such that the Council has been consulted on its views by a Government Minister.

Responding to questions, officers advised that:-

- The funding for promotional activities referred to under Bidder D's submission details was in addition to waste composition analysis.
- Currently, plastic bags could be classed as contamination regardless of any content. The Bidder D submission provided for sacks to be opened to check if there is recyclable material inside. The Council would be able to spot-check that this was happening and would be able to challenge claims made by the contractor about contamination levels.
- Once the latest raw data on contamination was analysed, the information could be circulated in the Members' Bulletin.
- Publicity would include reference to the financial benefits of a reduction in contamination levels. There would also be a publicity push to assist in refreshing residents' knowledge of all the items that can be recycled. New bin labels would be provided as production permitted.
- A copy of the matrix applied by officers for initial bid comparison purposes could be circulated for information.

The Executive – 25 August 2010

- Credit rating checks had raised no issues in respect of Bidder D.
- Consideration was being given to the policy for making larger bins available where the Council is satisfied that household recycling rates merit this. The only cost of such an approach would be the difference in price between smaller and larger bins when new larger bins were needed. If smaller bins were released, they could be re-used elsewhere.

On a motion, moved by Cllr T G Cutmore and seconded by Cllr K H Hudson, it was:-

Resolved

- (1) That, subject to the inclusion of an arrangement whereby some of the savings can be used for the purpose of further waste composition analysis, the contract to provide a Materials Recovery Facility from 1 October 2010 to 31 March 2015 be awarded to the company identified as Bidder D in the exempt report (with an option to extend by a further 7 years).
- (2) That the decision is urgent and not subject to call-in/referral because of the financial implications of delaying the commencement of the new contract. (HES)

The meeting closed at 8.16 pm.

Chairman

Date

If you would like these minutes in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 546366.