



**MINUTES of the Meeting of the
CHILTERN & WYCOMBE JOINT WASTE COLLECTION COMMITTEE
held on 28 NOVEMBER 2013
at WYCOMBE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

PRESENT:

Councillor P E C Martin (Chiltern District Council) - Chairman
" Mrs J Teesdale (Wycombe District Council) - Vice Chairman

Councillors: C Harriss (Wycombe District Council) and C J Wertheim (Chiltern District Council)

Officers: S Gordon, K Eastman (Chiltern & Wycombe Senior Waste Officer), A Goodrum (Chiltern District Council & South Bucks District Council), C Hughes (Wycombe District Council), C Marchant (Chiltern District Council & South Bucks District Council), S Markham (Chiltern District Council) Catherine Spalton (Wycombe District Council), and I Westgate (Wycombe District Council)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Tim Guile and Mark Sturgeon (Serco) – for Item 5

25 ROLL OUT UPDATE

In light of the attendance of external representatives at the meeting it was agreed that Item 5 - Roll Out Update - be taken as the first item of business.

The Chairman welcomed Tim Guile and Mark Sturgeon, representatives from Serco, to the meeting. Tim Guile provided an overview of the roll out of the joint waste collection service in Chiltern and Wycombe and emphasised that in light of the significant level of service change implemented, it was considered that the roll out was going well overall. Although complaints had been received, positive feedback had also been provided.

The Committee expressed significant concern regarding the high level of complaints received from residents relating to: missed waste collections; overflowing bins; reports of poor behaviour from collection crews; level of abandoned phone calls; receptacles not being put back correctly and food waste container lids being left open.

There was a particular problem with recurring complaints which had not yet been resolved. A sample of some complaints received was circulated and those concerning the collect and return service were highlighted in particular

since they impacted vulnerable residents. There were also concerns regarding the negative media coverage. Members emphasised that the problems identified needed to be resolved as a matter of urgency.

Members acknowledged the positive work being carried out overall, but emphasised the importance of resolving recurring complaints. Although the overwhelming majority of residents were receiving a good service, the recurring complaints received from a small minority of residents had a significant impact on the perception of the waste collection service generally.

The representatives from Serco noted the feedback provided and stated that they would aim to resolve the issues raised by the Committee by the end of December 2013. They pointed out that missed collections were not always due to a failure by Serco. It was noted that Serco had already utilised additional resources from other contracts to help resolve some of the difficulties experienced. A further review of the resources in place for rectifying recurring complaints would also be conducted, with a view to providing additional resources, if required.

In response to reports of poor behaviour of some waste collection staff, it was advised that overall the staff were doing a good job, however Serco would investigate all reports of poor behaviour thoroughly, and where evidence was provided appropriate action would be taken.

Regarding difficulties experienced with vehicles unable to reach properties due to access restrictions it was advised that the collection vehicles used were considered appropriate and that additional information regarding access was being collected in order to modify routes and resolve the problems experienced.

It was agreed that a further partnership meeting would be held in December 2013 and January 2014 to enable representatives from Serco to provide an update to Members of the Joint Waste Collection Committee regarding the progress made in addressing the concerns raised at the meeting.

RESOLVED –

That the update on roll out be noted.

Note: Tim Guile and Mark Sturgeon (Serco) left the meeting at 11:27 am.

26 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

Minute 23: Programme Report & Risk Register

Further to the discussion at the previous meeting, it was noted that the advice provided to residents was not to apply stickers to wheeled bins e.g. endorsing a 30 mph speed limit.

Concerns were raised regarding the length of time taken to answer phone calls and complaints received from residents who had been cut off whilst waiting on the phone. It was felt that the complexity of recurring complaints had contributed to increasing the length of time taken to resolve calls. It was noted that the additional temporary staff resource to handle high call volumes would be retained for longer.

The Committee welcomed the attendance of representatives from Serco to future meetings as a way of facilitating direct feedback from Members.

Minute 24: Recycling Containers

Further to the Committee's decision at the previous meeting to enable residents to purchase additional recycling bags from the Council, it was felt that this should be advertised on both Councils' websites.

27 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

28 JOINT WASTE CLIENT BUDGET MONITORING REPORT

The Committee considered the budget monitoring report which outlined the full year budget for 2013/14, the profiled budget and actual spend to 30 September 2013.

Regular budget monitoring reports were welcomed and the importance of the timely sharing of budget monitoring information with each authority was emphasised.

It was suggested that the figures relating to national insurance, pension at current rate and pension deficit contribution be amalgamated to a single cost in future reports. It was noted that the figures relating to travel and subsistence were due to be reviewed. The authorities had yet to be billed for the contribution to the Bucks Waste Partnership, but this was due to be received before the end of the year. Bucks County Council was due to be invoiced for recycling credits payments.

The variance in the predicted income from the collection of school and Schedule 2 waste was explained as these charges were billed in arrears and there had been a delay in issuing invoices. The figures would be reviewed to check the predicted underspend in 2013/14.

A review of underspent budgets for 2013/14 relating to postage, staff parking, internal printing, stationery and photocopying would be carried out. As it was the first year of the joint waste client some variations in predicted and actual costs were anticipated.

The Committee was committed to ensuring the successful delivery of the joint waste collection service and additional resources had been provided where required. This was reflected in the variance in costs relating to agency staff.

RESOLVED –

That the budget monitoring report be noted.

29 JOINT WASTE CLIENT BUDGET 2014/15

The Committee considered a report detailing the proposed draft Joint Waste Client budget for 2014/15, direct income and expenditure sharing proposal and support cost sharing proposal.

Draft 2014/15 Budget

Members discussed the draft budget for 2014/15. The budget had been prepared that neither party would experience additional costs through creating the joint client team as future savings would be shared. It was noted that the costs relating to employees were expected to reduce over time as temporary contracts came to an end. It was felt that the customer services element of the budget should remain at the 2013/14 rate until call volumes had reduced to a stable level.

Direct Income and Expenditure Proposal

Members reviewed the proposed cost splits as detailed in the appendix. It was noted that an accurate picture of a steady cost share between both authorities would not be known until after the roll out phase and that the cost share arrangements would be reviewed again in 2015/16. An indication of the cost savings achieved by the joint waste client team was requested for a future meeting.

Support Costs

The Committee, whilst considering whether to share support costs, noted that there was a marginal difference in the estimated support costs for both authorities in 2014/15. Members felt that it was important to keep support costs under review and agreed that each authority continues to bear its own support costs.

RECOMMENDED –

- 1. That the 2014/15 Joint Waste Client Budget be agreed, as detailed in the Appendix.**
- 2. That the 2014/15 Cost Sharing Proposal for direct income and expenditure be agreed, as detailed in the Appendix.**
- 3. That each authority bears its own support costs with any specific additional external costs (including internal audit reviews) to be split 50/50 between both authorities.**

30 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC:

RESOLVED –

That under section 100 (A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item(s) of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

Note: the relevant paragraph number and description is indicated under the Minute heading.

31 PROGRAMME REPORT & RISK REGISTER

Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

The Committee was pleased to receive an update on the joint waste collection contract and agreed to reduce the risk rating to green, pending sign off of some outstanding documentation. There was a discussion on the performance management arrangements in place with the contractor. It was noted that a contractual mechanism was in place which enabled the Councils' to follow up poor service performance with penalties, once certain thresholds had been reached. The performance management mechanism applied from 15 April 2013 but Key Operating Targets relating to waste and recycling collections specifically were suspended for a period of four weeks in each District immediately following the first collections of the newly rolled out services.

There was a discussion regarding depots and facilities. Members discussed the options for providing vehicle maintenance workshop facilities at Clay Lane. It was agreed that opportunities would be explored as a matter of urgency and that Members be kept abreast of developments.

An update was provided on communications. Although there had been some negative media coverage, overall communications had been generally well received during the roll out in Wycombe.

The County Council was due to arrange a meeting with the districts regarding the countywide inter authority agreement, however as yet no meeting had been arranged.

Concerns were raised about the number of properties that waste collection vehicles were unable to access due to restricted vehicular access. The Committee requested that options be explored to address this problem, including contacting neighbouring authorities who have specialist vehicles.

Members noted the service data and call volume statistics in particular.

RESOLVED –

That the report be noted.

32 FUTURE MEETINGS:

Thursday 13 February 2014, 10.30am

Thursday 10 April 2014, 10.30am

Thursday 26 June 2014, 10.30am

The meeting ended at 12.57 pm

**JOINT WASTE COLLECTION COMMITTEE
28 NOVEMBER 2013**

JOINT WASTE CLIENT BUDGET

Contact Officer: Rodney Fincham 01494 732260, e-mail rfincham@chiltern.gov.uk

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the 2014/15 Joint Waste Client Budget is agreed, as detailed in Appendix A, for forwarding to the appropriate Councils.

That the 2014/15 Cost Sharing Proposal for direct income and expenditure is agreed, as detailed in Appendix A.

That a principle is agreed for sharing support costs.

1. This report is to provide Members with details of the Joint Waste Client Budget for 2014/15.

Joint Waste Client Budget

2. Attached as **Appendix 1** is the proposed Joint Waste Client Budget for 2014/15. The budget has been prepared on the basis of a single cost centre for all client side costs.
3. Members are requested to review and approve this.
4. If the Joint Waste Committee agrees the proposed budget then the next step will be for CDC and WDC to incorporate their appropriate shares in their individual 2014/15 budget setting processes.

Direct Income and Expenditure Sharing Proposal

5. The starting point is that both authorities should not be financially any worse off from having a joint waste client than if they retained their own client team. However it is also important that client team costs are shared in line with what drives these costs.
6. At present the waste service is in a transition period due to the roll outs and thus it is not possible to get an accurate picture of what the steady state cost share should be.
7. For 2014/15 it is therefore proposed that:
 - Except where specific cost shares have been agreed, all joint waste client expenditure is shared in line with the pre joint client budgetary provisions. Nb: This is the same approach that we used for 2013/14.

Minute Item 29

- All general income (ie excluding income from chargeable green waste) is shared in line with the general household split.
8. **Appendix 1** shows the proposed splits for each budget line and the following table summarises the direct cost shares.

	CDC Only Costs Note 1 £'000	CDC Shared Costs £'000	WDC Shared Costs £'000	Total £'000
2013/14 Original Budget (pre joint client)	106	497	543	1,146
2013/14 Estimated Share of joint client	106	417	494	1,017
2014/15 Budgeted Share of joint client	68	383	450	901

Note 1: Pension Deficit contribution, green waste admin expenditure.

9. Members are requested to review and approve the splits as detailed in appendix 1.
10. It is proposed to review the cost share arrangements again for 2015/16 when we will be in a better position to understand the cost drivers.
11. With regard to potential Avoidable Financial Pressures (AFP) income from BCC, this has not been included and a separate agreement will need to be reached regarding this.

Support Costs

12. CDC, as the host authority, incurs support costs associated with hosting the joint client team (ie additional financial, HR, legal and ICT support) and also bears costs associated with providing accommodation for the shared client team.
13. It was originally understood (and draft agreements were produced on this basis) that CDC would bear all these costs (with no recharge to WDC).
14. The main reason to share support costs is that it is equitable for both parties to contribution to all the costs of operating the shared client team.
15. However there are the following contra arguments to consider:
- There is a benefit, perceived or otherwise, to CDC being the host authority (ie easier direct access to the client team) which compensates for the additional costs.
 - It is difficult to identify the true additional costs of providing support to the waste team – ie 17 staff (ie the combined CDC / WDC waste client team) only have a marginal impact on the level of HR resource that is actually needed.

Minute Item 29

- Although there may be savings to WDC from not hosting the joint waste client it is very difficult to realise these (ie will only have a marginal reduction in the level of HR support that is required). Therefore WDC could end up contributing to the CDC support costs, without realising a compensating saving.
16. Given that the estimated 2014/15 WDC support costs are £293,000 and the estimated 2014/15 CDC support costs are £295,000 it is suggested that an appropriate way forward would be for each authority to bear its own support costs, but any specific additional external costs (eg additional legal advice) are split 50/50 and the cost of any internal audit reviews are also split 50/50.

**APPENDIX 1
JOINT WASTE CLIENT BUDGET**

2013/14 Agreed Budget	2014/15 Proposed Budget	2014/15 CDC Split 47.4% 35.4%	2014/15 WDC Split 52.6% 64.6%
£	£	£	£
Employees			
Basic Pay, Car Cash etc	500,356	457,920	217,054
National Insurance	37,884	36,430	17,268
Pension at Current Rate	56,769	44,990	21,325
Pension Deficit Contribution	54,354	43,070	43,070
Casual Workers / Agency Staff	5,000	25,000	11,850
Private Health Care	1,410	1,410	668
Training	2,000	2,000	948
Staff Advertising	500	0	0
Professional Group Membership	1,820	1,820	863
Fidelity Guarantee	100	100	47
Group Personal Accident	120	120	57
Employers Liability	1,190	1,190	564
Premises Related Expenses			
Maintenance Plant & equipment	3,600	3,600	1,706
Transport Related Expenses			
Travel & Subsistence	500	5,000	2,370
Supplies & Services			
Tools & Equipment Purchase	10,000	10,000	4,740
Disposal charge from BCC	0	0	0
Office Furniture/Equipment Purchase	500	0	0
Protective Clothing	3,300	3,300	1,564
External Printing & Stationery	500	500	237
Mobile Communications	1,500	1,500	711
ICT Contender annual mtnc etc	11,360	20,000	9,480
Courses/Seminars	8,500	5,000	2,370
Subscriptions	700	700	332
Public Liability Insurance	2,000	2,000	948
Advertising / Communications	142,800	92,200	30,426
Contribution to Bucks Waste Partnership	40,000	40,000	20,000
Green Waste Admin	50,000	25,000	25,000
Staff Parking	1,950	0	0
Internal Printing	500	500	237
Stationery	200	200	95
Postages	1,000	1,000	474
Photocopying	100	100	47
Telephones	1,000	1,000	474
Customer Services			
Customer Services	75,650	75,650	35,800
Total Direct Costs	1,017,163	901,300	450,726

Comment

General Expenditure Split
General Income Split

Reducing over time as temporary contracts end June 14.

CDC Only: Final funding will be dependant on TUPE transfer funding.
Need additional contingency for potential work pressures
£351.60 per employee.

Any advertising costs to be funded from salary vacancy saving
13 staff @average £140.

Approx £70 per employee.

Weighbridge service charge.

More staff travelling

Purchase of wheeled bins, corn starch liners, litter pickers.
Pass on to schools when charge comes in.

11 staff @ average £300.
Abandoned vehicle notices.
14 staff mobiles.

Ongoing need to continue to develop the system
17 @ £300.
LARAC

JWCB report 23/5/12 33%/67%
£20k per authority. This figure may reduce, awaiting JWC decision.
CDC only
CDC only
Joint Waste Committee and Officer Group

Specific split agreed WDC Customer Services Report 2 May 2012

APPENDIX 1
JOINT WASTE CLIENT BUDGET

2013/14 Agreed Budget	2014/15 Proposed Budget	2014/15 CDC Split	2014/15 WDC Split
£	£	47.4%	52.6%
		35.4%	64.6%
		£	£

Comment

General Expenditure Split
General Income Split

**APPENDIX 1
JOINT WASTE CLIENT BUDGET**

2013/14 Agreed Budget	2014/15 Proposed Budget	2014/15 CDC Split 47.4% 35.4%	2014/15 WDC Split 52.6% 64.6%
£	£	£	£

Comment

General Expenditure Split
General Income Split

General Support Recharges

WDC Support Costs	N/A	293,400	0	293,400
CDC Support Costs	295,250	295,250	295,250	0

Nb: WDC also pay £30k re the Northgate contract.

Total Expenditure	1,312,413	1,489,950	745,976	743,974
--------------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------	----------------

Income

Recycling Credits	942,300	942,300	333,574	608,726
Special Collection of Bulky Waste	117,600	117,600	41,630	75,970
Collection of School & Schedule 2 Waste	125,400	125,400	44,392	81,008
Replacement Bins	35,500	32,000	11,328	20,672
Corn Starch liners	2,000	2,000	708	1,292
Green Waste charges	300,000	420,000	420,000	0
Sale of Green refuse Sacks	2,500	0	0	0
Sale of black sacks	250	0	0	0
Recharge litter bins to Town & Parishes	690	690	690	0

This may rise but at present budget has been set prudently

CDC Only
Ended
Ended
CDC Only

Total Income	1,526,240	1,639,990	852,322	787,668
---------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------	----------------

Net Expenditure	-213,827	-150,040	-106,346	-43,694
------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	----------------

