

REPORT TO THE OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP**26 JANUARY 2007****WASTE COLLECTION OPTIONS****1 Background**

- 1.1 At the last meeting of the OWP Councillor de Vere (VWHDC) requested an explanation as to why Option I had been chosen as the preferred option when Option A on evaluation appeared to offer significant financial savings.

It was agreed the Officer Strategy Group would consider this and give an explanation setting out reasons why Option I had been selected as opposed to Option A.

2. Explanation

- 2.1 Members will recall a lot of detailed work was carried out as part of the development work of the Oxfordshire Waste Strategy by the partnership supported by consultants ERM and Enviro on considering the various collection options which were available to the five collection authorities.
- 2.2 The recycling and composting options assessed and modelled were considered by the OWP on several occasions and the advantages and disadvantages of these were discussed in detail. Unlike other option appraisals it was hard to decide that one was 'the best' as there was a range of issues which impacted on the decision which could not be included in the evaluation model as they affected individual Districts.
- 2.3 The main reasons why Option A was discounted can be summarised as follows:
- The recycling percentages which would be achieved by Option A were evaluated as between 32 to 36% depending on the treatment option. This compares unfavourably to Option I which delivers recycling percentages of between 47 to 51%.
 - The Waste Strategy which all partner authorities have now signed up to requires Oxfordshire to deliver a recycling rate of 40% by 2010 and 55% by 2020. Option A would not deliver this.
 - Collection authorities are very driven to provide services which meet the needs of their customers. The evaluation exercise could not take account of the particular needs of individual Districts. Option I was an option which was put in following results of local customer questionnaires which indicated for example the desire to have a food waste collection service. It produces high levels of recycling ranks well compared to other options considered and is mid-range in the estimated costs.
 - The deliverability of options was considered critical. Option I is based on either existing or preferred collection options and hence was a much more deliverable Option than A which would require some Districts to withdraw popular services and go backwards in relation to their level of recycling, both of which were considered unacceptable.