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Kettering Borough
Kettering’s Waste Facts

♦ In-House Service – Collection Authority
♦ Servicing 44,000 properties
♦ 44 staff
♦ Operating 5 days over a 4 day 9.25 hrs per day – 37 hrs
♦ RCV’s, Split bodied 70/30, 18, 26 and 32 tonne vehicles
♦ Operating 7 domestic and 1 commercial round
♦ Each crew member walks 14 miles on an average day
♦ Each crew empties between 1500 and 2000 bins per day
♦ Emptying a total of 4,472,520 bins per year
♦ Returning to 1,467 bins reported missed bins
♦ Covering 4 towns and 28 villages of varying scale.
♦ Travelling 127,331 miles per year
♦ Using 180,419 litres of diesel
What We Do

♦ Domestic Collections – Refuse and Recycling
♦ 800 Commercial Customers – operate 3 days
♦ 616 residents receive Assisted Collections
♦ Schedule 2 Waste – 143 customers charged
♦ 1409 Bulk Collections–offering 6 items twice a year
♦ Clinical Waste - Chargeable collections!
♦ Christmas Tree Collections – 1824 - 2015/16
♦ Bring Bank Operating at 11 Sites KBC / 32 borough
♦ Emptying of Dog Waste and Litter Bins
♦ Bin repairs, replacements, new and additional bin deliveries within 5 working days.
Service Overview

♦ Alternative Weekly
♦ Domestic – currently 1 x 240 litre black bin (regardless of size of family)
♦ January 2016 all new and replacements black bins reduced to a 180 litre.
♦ Blue 240 litre – dry recycling (co-mingled)
♦ Red 55 litre – paper box
♦ Grey 240 litre – Garden/green (free)
♦ All and multiple recycling bins and boxes free of charge
Borough Recycling

♦ Pre 2002 – recycling rate 2% via Bring Banks (32 sites)
♦ Alternative Weekly Collections introduced 2004
♦ New co-mingled scheme introduced 2013 with (11 bring bank sites)
♦ 2006 - 45%
♦ 2013/14 - 46.04% 10 months of new scheme
♦ 2014/15 - 48.33% Co-mingled scheme
♦ 2015/16 - 51.00% (not Verified)

♦ Nominated for APSE ‘Best Performer Refuse’ 4 years running - “Winner 2015”
Projects
Making the Difference

♦ Projects to provide a thorough cleanse of the area
♦ Delivered in a short time scale
♦ Noticeable difference and impact within the community.
♦ Engaging the Community – door knocking and surveys
♦ Delivered within Areas of high deprivation
♦ High Crime Hotspots – Criminal Activities
♦ Tackling – Environmental Issues
♦ Waste Amnesty
Project Elizabeth

Project Elizabeth Waste Amnesty White Goods and General Bulk Collections

- White Goods Waste Amnesty: 8110
- Bulk Collections Waste Amnesty: 9100

Project Area - Comparison with General Waste Collection with Waste Amnesty Day Collection

- General Waste Tonnage - Collected Alternative Weekly: 17.2
- Total Tonnage of White Goods and Bulk Collections on Waste Amnesty: 16.5

Kettering Borough Council
Waste Amnesty
Project Elizabeth
Health and Safety

♦ Safety Training – High Focus
♦ Reversing DVD
♦ Reversing Practices
♦ Tool Box Talks
♦ Constant and Continued field Monitoring
♦ Refresher training and field assessments
♦ Train the Trainer - staff development
♦ Full training programme
♦ Drivers hand book and working procedures
♦ Risk Assessments – working with the team
♦ Regular team meetings – performance reviews all levels
♦ PPE – Armani or Boss?
• Kettering operate full Tachograph rules to ensure standards are maintained – monitored breaks
Strong Focus on Education

♦ National Campaigns
♦ Master Composters
♦ School Curriculum workshops
♦ School Assemblies
♦ WI’s, Parish Councils, Fun days and Road shows
♦ Scouts, Brownies, Beavers etc.
♦ Coffee mornings and society groups
♦ Field Trips to the depot
♦ Dedicated education team and bus
Waste Ted
Education Team Member
Importance of Performance Data

- Data needs to be accurate
- Data verification – factual not thin air
- Compare with others – Benchmarking
- Monitor what we do and how well we do or not do it
- Sharing Expertise and Experiences – priceless
- Ability to learn from others – Best Practices
- Not afraid to re-think and change what we do or how we do it
- Benefits – improve the service and residents overall perception
- Improvements don’t always cost the earth
Cost of Refuse Collection Service per head

♦ PI 02d - KBC
Cost of Refuse Collection Service per head – Group R1
Cost of Refuse (whole service) Collection per head
PI 02d – Cost of Refuse Analysis

- Lowest £9.47 – Average £23.93 – High - £59.41
- 15 in group R1 – KBC 4th in Group - £13.18
- 51 in service – KBC 7th in service

- Improvement – below 2011/12
- Analysis of data – obtain results/reasons
- Solid data for reporting
Transport Costs

♦ PI 10b - KBC

![Graph showing transport costs over years]
PI 10b – Transport Data

- Family Group R1
- Lowest – 14.26%
- Average – 25.81%
- Highest – 38.81%
- 14 in group – KBC 15.45%
- 49 in service
- Improvement – lowest in 4 years
- Analysis/results/reasons/compare
Analyse Data

♦ Shift either way – Why?
♦ KBC – Hitting the top quartile
♦ Change of Service and practices
♦ Kerbside to Co-mingled – retaining commodities!
♦ Reduction in Fleet
♦ Reduction in Staff
♦ Improvements in recycling
♦ Lower Costs achieved
♦ Looking at new opportunities
Missed collections per 100,000 (full year)

• PI 22a - KBC
Missed bins

group comparison

Missed collections per 100,000 collections
Staff Absence

♦ PI 20a - KBC
Staff Absence
group comparison

All staff absence

Kettering Borough Council
Analysis and Review

♦ What is the Data Showing
♦ Overview – Sickness in relation to missed bins – Authorities with High Sickness are reporting more missed bins – Why?
♦ Staff are not familiar of the collection rounds?
♦ Agency staff – do they come and go - who may not care?
♦ High Sickness this a result of low moral?
♦ Authorities supplying data comparison – top and bottom – low sickness/less missed bins, high sickness/high number of missed bins
Staff are key to High Performance & Excellent Service Delivery
Analysing Data

♦ Analyse the data
♦ Track your performance
♦ Use it
♦ Improvements/changes-improve on what you do
♦ Confidence in your data will make you push your boundaries
♦ Consistency and benchmarking are fundamental to success in this service area.
♦ If you know you are sure!
♦ Use to promote and celebrate
What’s Next

♦ Textile Recycling – First collection 2\textsuperscript{nd} May 2016
♦ Continue to support education and campaigns to promote recycling
♦ Weekly WEEE kerbside recycling service - tbc
♦ Continually Tackling Contamination to increase recycling rates and awareness
♦ Residents questionnaire – commitment to all residents
♦ Staff training and development – continuous
♦ Continue to work with APSE through performance networks and advisory groups and it’s members
♦ Continue to monitor and review our services and best practices
And Finally –
Yes We Won!!!!
Thank You - Questions

Contact Dela Moreland – Waste Operations  - 01536 534461
delyenemoreland@kettering.gov.uk
There's Money in Waste - Efficiencies and Income Generation in Waste Services

Waste Management, Refuse Collection and Street Cleansing Advisory Group
Simon Dale
Plymouth City Council
There's Money in Waste - Efficiencies and Income Generation in Waste Services

- What can we achieve through commercial services in waste and street cleansing?

- Ensuring waste disposal contracts are fit for today's purpose - effectively negotiating contract change.

- Savings in resources - staff, equipment, & fuel costs

- Customer focus - what can be secured through channel shift initiatives?
There's Money in Waste - Efficiencies and Income Generation in Waste Services

What can we achieve through commercial services in waste and street cleansing?

- Waste and Street Cleansing are resource businesses
- Competitiveness if we know our baseline (cost & volume)
- Effective Cost management
- Creating the right income generation opportunities
- Exploiting embedded positions
- Collaborations
- Freeing assets
There's Money in Waste - Efficiencies and Income Generation in Waste Services

Ensuring waste disposal contracts are fit for today's purpose - effectively negotiating contract change.

- Renegotiate contracts – HWRC management, clinical waste, charities, churches, landfill gas, wood, dry recyclates, EfW, RSL’s,
- Charge for whatever you can – food waste collection pilot, garden waste collection, disposal of non-domestic waste, business waste at HWRC’s, domestic waste bags, removal of benefits concession for bulky waste collection service and wheelie bins delivery
Savings in resources - staff, equipment, & fuel costs

- Route Optimisation
- Handing back/sharing/pooling of vehicles
- Supplies contracts
- Establishment and working hours reviews
- Crew number reductions
- Task & Finish elimination
- Shared services with neighbouring authorities
- Alternate weekly collection
There's Money in Waste - Efficiencies and Income Generation in Waste Services

Iceberg Effect
A full cost focus - looking above and below the waterline to create cost effective delivery

- **More visible costs**
  - more easily identified
  - but less scope

- **Less visible costs**
  - less easily identified
  - but large scope to create efficient delivery

- **Staff, premises, supply chain, overheads, vehicles**
- **Poor quality or incomplete information**
- **Tactical Re-design**
- **Vehicle damage/service strikes - insurance costs**
- **Maintenance & operator input to design**
- **Learning lessons - prevent repeat failure**
- **Continuous operational performance management, workforce involvement & communication**
- **Waste - throughout the design and delivery process**
- **Absence**
- **Standing time**
- **Poor communication**
- **Safety costs**
Customer focus - what can be secured through channel shift initiatives?

- Demand management
- Focus on improving customer service through re-design or review of existing services
- Reducing costs
- Streamlining of “middle” office
- More personal service
- Complaints handling improvement
- Avoidable contact improvement
There's Money in Waste - Efficiencies and Income Generation in Waste Services

Summary

- “Further and faster”
- No sacred cows
- 5C’s – compare, challenge, cost, compete and change
- “Need to hear” rather what you “want to hear”
- Project manage
- Take risks, learn from failure
- Know your costs
- The money, the money, the money - £5m saving
There's Money in Waste - Efficiencies and Income Generation in Waste Services

Questions?
Refuse collection, recycling and street cleansing trends: how are we performing?

Tuesday 26 April 2016

Debbie Johns, Head of Performance Networks
What is the evidence saying?

PI 01a - Cost of refuse collection service per household (including CEC)

Refuse collection

PI 03a - Net cost of recycling per household
PI 03  Cost of cleansing service per household (including CEC)

---

**Street cleansing**

- **PI 40** Percentage of street cleansing budget allocated to education/publicity
- **Fixed penalty notices issued per 1,000 head of population**
What is your expectation of the level of funding in your service budget in the coming five years?

- Decrease by more than 20%: 10.5%
- Decrease by up to 20%: 23.7%
- Decrease by up to 15%: 10.5%
- Decrease by up to 10%: 26.3%
- Decrease by up to 5%: 26.3%
- Increase by up to 5%: 2.6%
- Increase by up to 10%: 0.0%
Typical cost break down

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost area</th>
<th>Refuse collection</th>
<th>Street cleansing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>47.67%</td>
<td>67.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport costs</td>
<td>25.09%</td>
<td>21.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central recharges</td>
<td>6.48%</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of service

**PI 12a - Percentage of total waste collected which is sent for recycling**

- 10/11: 37.71%
- 11/12: 41.16%
- 12/13: 42.24%
- 13/14: 40.29%
- 14/15: 41.18%

**PI 32a - Kg of residual waste sent to landfill per annum per head of population**

- 10/11: 236.25
- 11/12: 194.72
- 12/13: 147.15
- 13/14: 150.55
- 14/15: 138.29
**PI 37a** NI 195 percentage of sites that fall below grade B
(England only - full inspections)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>5.9%</th>
<th>7.1%</th>
<th>6.1%</th>
<th>5.2%</th>
<th>4.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PI 20a** - Staff absence (all employees) – Refuse Collection

**PI 17** Community consultation and quality assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>76.04</th>
<th>69.95</th>
<th>65.53</th>
<th>63.67</th>
<th>60.83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PI 39** Community / customer surveys undertaken satisfaction levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>64.1%</th>
<th>66.4%</th>
<th>67.2%</th>
<th>70.2%</th>
<th>71.3%</th>
<th>70.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are you planning any education campaigns in the next 2 years? If yes, what are these?

- Litter campaigns: 92.9%
- Dog fouling campaigns: 67.9%
- Educational awareness in schools: 57.1%
- Smoking-related litter campaigns: 35.7%
- National Love Where You Live campaign: 17.9%
- Community wardens: 17.9%
- Chewing gum campaigns: 14.3%
- Food on the go campaigns: 10.7%
- Graffiti campaigns: 10.7%
- Regional campaigns: 7.1%
- Junior citizen events: 7.1%
- Parking campaigns: 0.0%

www.apse.org.uk
If you are anticipating future reductions in sweeping and litter picking work, which areas of land do you think this will relate to?

- Rural roads: 77.8%
- Low obstruction housing: 55.6%
- Secondary / other retail and commercial: 48.1%
- Other highways: 44.4%
- Recreation areas: 37.0%
- Medium obstruction housing: 33.3%
- Industry and warehousing: 29.6%
- Main roads: 22.2%
- High obstruction housing: 22.2%
- Primary / main retail and commercial: 14.8%
How did you measure street cleanliness quality during 2015?

- Through a locally developed inspection survey: 48.8%
- Using Leqs Pro or Leams across the full recommended sample size: 26.8%
- Using residents perceptions as an indicator rather than quality inspections: 19.5%
- We didn't have the resources to do this: 12.2%
- Using Leqs Pro or Leams but with a reduced sample size: 7.3%
- Cross boundary inspection systems with other neighbouring councils: 0.0%
Land Audit Management System (LAMS)

Period: 3, April 2015 - January 2016

Periodic report
Land Audit Management System (LAMS)

WHAT IS IT?

• A consistent quality audit of grounds and streets maintenance standards
• Trigger for immediate intervention at local level
• Data source for comparative Performance Indicators at national level (real time & annual)
• Balance against cost & productivity PIs
• Simple to undertake & administer
• Will contribute to annual performance awards
LAMS requirements and local options:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of inspections set locally</td>
<td>Bi-monthly data input timetable must be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of inspections (transects) per period/annum</td>
<td>Agreed minimum requirement of 10 inspections per period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention levels / times</td>
<td>Grading standards using Guidance Manual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Audit Management System (LAMS)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>April &amp; May</th>
<th>June &amp; July</th>
<th>August &amp; September</th>
<th>October &amp; November</th>
<th>December &amp; January</th>
<th>February &amp; March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-May-16</td>
<td>31-Jul-16</td>
<td>30-Sep-16</td>
<td>30-Nov-16</td>
<td>31-Jan-17</td>
<td>31-Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03-Jun-16</td>
<td>05-Aug-16</td>
<td>07-Oct-16</td>
<td>02-Dec-16</td>
<td>03-Feb-17</td>
<td>07-Apr-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-Jun-16</td>
<td>12-Aug-16</td>
<td>14-Oct-16</td>
<td>09-Dec-16</td>
<td>10-Feb-17</td>
<td>14-Apr-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staffing

PI 20a - Staff absence (all employees) – Refuse Collection

PI 22a Staff absence (all staff) – Street Cleansing
UK-wide case studies

Best practice case studies 2015
Best and most improved performer award winners 2015

apse performance networks
Preston City Council: refuse collection

- Changed collection methods and reduced number of rounds
- Invested in round design software and vehicle tracking
- Scheduled replacement of vehicle fleet fitted with CCTV recording equipment

Improved productivity by 55% and satisfaction by 9%
Gedling Borough Council: refuse collection

- Improved productivity by 148% and increased customer satisfaction by 3%
- New management regime
- New waste management software
- Reviewed and condensed rounds
- Listening to customer feedback
North East Derbyshire District Council: Street cleansing (Strategic Joint Alliance with Bolsover District Council)

Reduced net cost by 13% between 2008-09 and 2012-13 whilst maintaining their quality assurance and consultation score

- Cessation of public convenience service
- Rationalisation of operational depot facilities and depot sharing arrangements
- Formation of Council’s Strategic Alliance with Bolsover District Council - shared senior management team
- Undertaking a Joint Fleet Transport review
- Rationalisation of sub-compact sweeper utilisation
- Suspension of garden waste collection service
- Established a shared Streetscene Management team
Nottingham City Council: Street cleansing

Reduced net cost by 8%, increased quality assurance and consultation by 18% and had less than 1% sites below acceptable standard for 2012-13.

Done by driving efficiencies rather than cuts in front line service

Enforcement and education

Relentless focus on standards and attention to detail

Workforce development through flexible 7 day contracts and recruitment of 45 apprentices

Optimisation of scheduled work coupled with improved fleet utilisation and renewal

Local campaigns and citizen engagement with increased emphasis on social media

Dedicated neighbourhood teams covering issues such as graffiti and flytipping

Income generation through in-sourcing core work

Consolidated depot occupancy
What’s coming up?

Measure for change
Money doesn’t grow on trees! Controlling cost, quality and productivity in environmental services

Thursday 16 June 2016,
Thistle Euston Hotel, London

Land Audit Management System
Period 6, April 2015 - March 2016

Periodic report
Contact details

Debbie Johns, Head of Performance Networks

Email: djohns@apse.org.uk
Mobile: 07834 334193