

REPORT OF THE WASTE REDUCTION GOAL SUBCOMMITTEE

PART A - MATTERS REQUIRING A COUNCIL DECISION

1. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COUNCIL'S WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Officer responsible City Water & Waste Manager	Author Councillors Denis O'Rourke and Sue Wells
--	---

The purpose of this report is to recommend changes to the waste management plan for solid and hazardous waste as proposed by the Waste Reduction Goal Subcommittee of the City Services Committee.

BACKGROUND

At its 22 March 2001 meeting, the Council resolved:

- “1. That the Council publicly notify its intention to amend, by way of the special consultative procedure, parts of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan of 1998 (SHWMP) as set out in the report.
2. That pursuant to section 716A(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 1974 the Council give public notice on Saturday 24 March 2001 calling for submissions from interested persons in accordance with section 716A, such submissions to close at 5pm on Friday 27 April 2001.
3. That the Council appoint a subcommittee to consider public submissions on the proposed changes to the SHWMP, and that the Subcommittee be authorised to report directly to the 24 May 2001 meeting of the Council.”

The amendments proposed in the March report were as follows:

- (a) Zero waste to landfill as soon as possible, taking into account social, legal and economic constraints.
- (b) A minimum reduction by 50% of waste to landfill from 2000 to 2020.
- (c) Zero organics to landfill by 2010.

At its 24 May 2001 meeting, the Council further resolved:

- That the report on the proposed changes to the solid waste reduction targets be considered at the June meeting of the Council.

The Waste Reduction Subcommittee has met on a number of occasions to hear submissions from the public, evaluate the submissions and formulate recommendations for amendment of the current Waste Management Plan for Solid and Hazardous Waste 1998 ('WMP'). A brief summary of submissions is attached.

BACKGROUND

In March 1994 the Council released its “Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Strategy 1994” which was followed in August 1996 by the “Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Strategy – Summary Update 1996”. Neither that Strategy nor the Update contained a “zero waste” goal or targets, but generally aimed at a reduction in waste going to landfill and adopted the five Rs (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover, residual disposal).

In 1996, at the same time that the “Update” was published, Amendment Act No. 4 to the Local Government Act was enacted. This required the Council to adopt a Waste Management Plan, under which the Council is responsible for solid and hazardous waste management in its area. It introduced two new requirements:

1 Cont'd

- a consultation procedure before adoption, and
- a specification that the plan *should* include funding options and *could* include economic incentives and disincentives (eg our waste minimisation levy).

Consequently, the WMP is intended to be used by the Council as the basis for future **financial planning** and as such has to correctly reflect what is practically and economically achievable by the Council as agent for the whole community.

The 'Christchurch Waste Management Plan for Solid and Hazardous Waste' was adopted by the Council in August 1998, using 1994 as the base year. It was based on the previous strategy, and included the new requirements of the Local Government Amendment Act No. 4. The WMP currently contains the following vision and goal.

"Vision The long-term objective for this Waste Management Plan is:

To minimise the impact of solid waste on the environment"

"Goal To reduce the rate per person of solid waste going to the landfill as follows, taking account of Real Costs"

The "Real Costs" of waste management are defined in the plan to include "social, environmental and economic costs", to be assessed and reported annually.

The plan promotes these per capita targets for waste reduction:

- "by 14% by the year 2000
- by 30% by the year 2005, and
- by 100% by the year 2020 or by time the new regional landfill is filled."

The definition of the word 'Landfill' is well set out in the current plan, as:

"a site for the entombment of residual waste without any intended design for future resource use. The beneficial filling of land with inert material to add value to the land is not a landfill. For instance in Canterbury there are many shingle pits that could be restored by filling with inert material, before being appropriately covered."

Contrary to common perception, there is currently no "zero waste" goal in the plan, although one of the targets is to promote reduction "by 100% by the year 2020 or by the time the new landfill is filled". Therefore if the new landfill is not filled by the year 2020 then the target is extended indefinitely until landfill space is exhausted. The belief by virtually all of the submitters that Christchurch has had a 'Zero Waste Goal' is a misconception. Accordingly the suggestion made by several submitters that the Council is resiling from, or as some stated "reneging on the zero waste by 2020 goal", is incorrect. In its 22 March resolution the Council proposed an amendment to the WMP to add a zero waste goal. The Waste Reduction Subcommittee agrees with several submitters that the current goal is inadequate and that it is not appropriate for it to refer to the time the new regional landfill is filled, nor indeed for it to refer to any landfill at all.

TERMINOLOGY

Throughout the course of the subcommittee's submission hearings, it became apparent that there was an immense lack of clarity of both terminology and data. The words 'goal', 'targets', 'vision' were used interchangeably by many submitters. Some went so far as to confuse the historic Waste Plan vision statement with 'visions' lifted from other totally unrelated documents not associated with the policy of the Council.

The confusion which surrounded that issue was of real concern to the subcommittee, which believes that the revised WMP should clarify and simplify the terminology.

VISION

In reconsidering the vision statement, the subcommittee heard submissions that the current vision is too narrow in that it refers only to minimisation of the impact of solid waste on the environment. The subcommittee agreed that the vision should also incorporate resource productivity considerations and that the current statement should be strengthened. The new vision could read:

1 Cont'd

Vision

That the whole community will manage solid waste in ways that:

- ✓ **avoid irreversible damage to the physical environment**
- ✓ **minimise the adverse effects of solid waste management generally**
- ✓ **use waste as a resource.**

GOAL AND TARGETS

Having heard the submissions and reconsidered the goal and targets, it is noted that:

- The reference to 'landfill' in the existing goal does not take into account other disposal options and therefore is not broad enough. The term '*residual disposal*' should therefore be used to include landfilling as well as other forms of disposal.
- The goal needs to be strengthened to incorporate the concept of 'Zero Waste' (as proposed in the Council's 22 March amendment to the current WMP)
- Targets need to be separately stated from the goal to avoid confusion between these two terms – as was evident in the submissions.

The goal could accordingly be more simply restated as:

Goal

- ✓ ***Zero Residual Disposal of solid waste.***

The subcommittee also found that:

- It was not appropriate for the goal to be constrained by "Real Costs" as in the current Waste Plan. "Real Costs" are more usefully referred to as constraints in the achievement of the Targets.
- The existing definition of "Real Costs" (which omits legal constraints), and also the 22 March proposal as to "social, legal and economic constraints" (which omits environmental constraints) are both insufficient. The "Real Costs" definition could be expanded to include social, legal, environmental and economic costs and constraints.
- It is therefore proposed that the "Real Costs" be identified as follows:

Real Costs

- ✓ ***The Real Costs are constraints that will impact on achieving the targets which are set in the Waste Management Plan as milestones towards attainment of the goal. They include environmental, social, economic and legal costs.***

TARGETS

It has to be emphasised here again that the WMP, and especially its targets, are intended to be used for future financial planning and modelling by both the Council and others. While the setting of targets was viewed by some submitters only as an important means of motivation for both Council and others, it is important that it become better understood by all, that plans and financial models, and ultimately budgets, must be based on these targets. The potential impacts on Council policy and budgets, RMF policy and initiatives, and on the Transwaste financial model and gate charges, could be huge. Consequently, the targets must be practical and realistic and must be set in the context of the constraints on a City Council in an area where its control and influence is clearly significantly limited.

Responding to various submissions, the subcommittee believes that revised targets should be set based on per capita volumes of waste disposed of, and resources recovered, so that the effects of city growth are automatically taken account of.

The existing waste management plan targets are repeated as follows:

1 Cont'd

Reduction:

- by 14% by the year 2000 (13% achieved)
- by 30% by the year 2005, and
- by 100% by the year 2020 or by time the new regional landfill is filled (base year 1994).

Submitters have proposed that a wider range of targets be considered, that:

- a division between commercial and domestic targets be identified;
- different types of waste stream materials be targeted (eg construction and demolition waste, hazardous waste, paper, putrescibles etc).

Submitters also suggested that targets identified should not be restricted to those known to be achievable at the current time, but should also include a possible future scenario (showing what might be possible if the constraints are reduced), and that targets should be reviewed every five years or when needed (eg changes in constraints).

Submitters made the point that the 16% of the waste stream currently controlled by the Council should be more easily dealt with than the 84% of the waste stream outside the Council's control.

The subcommittee therefore believes that the following targets would be both practical and achievable within the period stated, while being extremely demanding targets, which will challenge the Council and the wider community alike:

Targets

That taking account of Real Costs, per capita waste to residual disposal be reduced as follows:

- ✓ ***90% of green waste and kitchen putrescibles received by the Council, by 2010***
- ✓ ***80% of kerbside waste collected by the Council, by 2010***
- ✓ ***65% minimum, 100% maximum, of the waste stream overall, by 2020.***

Base year: 1994.

Target period: 25 years

REVIEW

It is intended that the Council will engage the domestic and business community and the government on an ongoing basis, with the intent of mitigating and ultimately removing most of the constraints which make up the "Real Costs". It is also intended that the Council will review the WMP, and the waste reduction targets in particular, so that as the constraints are reduced, the targets can be upgraded to become more and more demanding, thus bringing forward the time when the zero waste goal is achieved.

The purpose of this report is to review the waste vision, goal and targets only, as decided by the Council in its 22 March resolution. The current WMP states that "An assessment of the degree to which the key elements of the Plan have been achieved and to what extent a review of the Plan might be advisable is planned for three years after adoption of the Plan. This, however, is not a fixed time frame and will depend on a variety of factors." As the WMP was adopted in August 1998, the review is due after August this year. One of the intervening factors is the fact that the term of the current Council ends in September 2001.

The subcommittee will therefore recommend that a comprehensive review of the WMP take place next year, following an extensive programme of public consultation. Because the vision, goal and targets component of the WMP review will, if the subcommittee's recommendations are adopted, have been done, the intended more general review next year will concentrate on the other parts of the WMP – in particular the much more important aspect of *how* the outcomes sought will be achieved.

As some submitters have requested that a greater range of targets be included, including targets for materials recovered, and measures of the effectiveness of actions taken to avoid or minimise environmental damage, the Subcommittee agrees that in the forthcoming general review, these matters should then also be addressed.

1 Cont'd

COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS

A. Costs and Constraints

Some submitters asked for information on the nature of the constraints referred to in the Council's resolution of 22 March. The following is a brief description of some of the constraints the subcommittee has identified.

Environmental costs and constraints (effects on the physical environment)

- Examples include costs incurred to avoid or mitigate leachate and landfill gas from landfill, CO₂ produced by composting, emissions from waste incineration, toxic residues from incineration, as well as environmental effects associated with all forms of transportation of waste.
- The costs of NOT reusing, recycling or recovering materials need also to be included.

Social Costs and Constraints

- Eighty four percent of waste that is currently disposed of at Burwood is not controlled by the Council. Although in terms of the Local Government Act 1974 the Council is responsible for solid and hazardous waste management in its area, private and commercial collections are able to collect and dispose of waste in a way and at a location **outside the control of the Council**. These sectors need to contribute significantly to the costs of diversion/avoidance/minimisation.
- With only 16% of waste collected under direct control of the Council, encouragement and offer of assistance are the only tools currently available in 'today-fact' terms. **Necessary legislative change falls outside the scope of the WMP.**
- It is proposed to increase waste disposal charges from \$59 to around \$90 over the next three years, with green waste disposal being 60% of the charge for mixed waste. There is some public and commercial resistance to this, based on affordability. Future avoidance of waste to disposal will inevitably cost society more than at present, thus exacerbating affordability concerns, although with improvements in secondary markets for recovered materials being developed by the RMF and others, these cost increases will be mitigated to some degree. The subcommittee also noted that private dump facilities may well be chosen over Council facilities if the price becomes too high.
- Unlike the European Union where there are laws requiring people to separate their waste, New Zealand has no such laws or regulations. With no legal support and without 100% co-operation by private and commercial waste generators there are significant social constraints. Large scale changes in public attitudes are required. Council intends to invest more in public education and promotion programmes to help in generating this change. The RMF has similar objectives, and the two organisations are working together to maximise their very limited resources in this area. In addition, the Canterbury Waste Joint Standing Committee, with the co-operation of Transwaste Canterbury Limited, last year launched a campaign 'No Time to Waste' which was aimed at better informing the public about the issues surrounding solid waste, and in particular the need for a change of attitudes within the community at large. The rate of change however is likely to be slow, as waste issues are commonly not high in the minds of the public generally.

Economic Constraints

- The current 13% diversion of solid waste (recycling and composting) is costing \$6.0 million per annum. By contrast \$12.5 million is spent on residual disposal related costs for the remaining 83% of the waste stream. The cost of diversion is thus very high compared to costs related to disposal/landfill.
- Diversion costs are currently met from a waste minimisation charge levied against residual waste disposal. This levy is limited in scope and size, and the amount recovered from this source will reduce as residual waste tonnages are driven downwards. Therefore there will be an increasing call on rates funding for these purposes. There are many competing demands on rates and much public opposition to rates increases.

1 Cont'd

- Although domestic recycled materials have in the past two years earned the Recovered Materials Foundation substantial surpluses for some materials on current market prices they are subject to significant fluctuation. Stockpiling in anticipation of future markets is not an economic option. It would also carry environmental costs and be subject to legal constraints. Therefore the only protection the RMF has against these sometimes extreme price fluctuations, is the establishment of reserve funds, so that the sale of materials can continue, even through times of extreme low prices. Some materials are especially subject to these market forces, and markets for materials in this category can sometimes disappear completely. The fact that there is still a high degree of reliance on overseas markets, (eg for newspaper), tends to exacerbate this problem. In response the RMF is seeking to develop local markets and job opportunities, even if this means accepting lower average prices, but this process takes time and is highly reliant on the vagaries of the New Zealand market, which is very small. The same considerations apply to commercial recyclers.
- If economic constraints are viewed in a triple bottom line perspective (economic plus social plus environmental costs reporting) then a rise in economic costs could be offset by a reduction in environmental costs. It is very unlikely that they would further be offset by the social costs, and in fact may increase social costs in some respects. For example, some submitters prefer the Council to continue the Burwood Landfill rather than to proceed with the proposed Kate Valley landfill (in the expectation that landfilling will have a more limited duration than the Council envisages). Such a decision would generate very high opposition in the Burwood area and in Christchurch generally, based on the not unreasonable belief that there would be significant social costs associated with an expanded landfill at Burwood.

Legal Constraints

- Resource Management Act consents to landfill Christchurch's waste at Burwood landfill expire on 31 May 2002. An application has been lodged to extend the consent till May 2006, or until the new regional landfill is operational, whichever is the earlier, upon the grounds that it may not be possible to open the new landfill until up to 2006. Consents to operate Burwood beyond 2006 would probably not be achievable.
- As noted above, staying at Burwood has been suggested but this is very unlikely to be the best environmental outcome. While working towards zero residual disposal we need the best disposal facility in the meantime. While the current Burwood landfill is well managed, with low environmental impacts, it is not a fully engineered facility reticulated for leachate and gas collection and the other sophisticated controls and supervision and monitoring facilities which modern environmentally secure landfills have. If an attempt is made to continue landfilling at Burwood the legal requirements would result in the same standards having to be achieved, but probably at even higher cost due to the less favourable geological and hydro-geological conditions present at Burwood.
- The Local Government Act 1974 restricts the charging of a waste minimisation levy to Council owned waste refuse stations and landfill operations, although there is some uncertainty over the interpretation of the legislation. Waste going through commercially owned facilities are currently escaping such a contribution towards waste minimisation, thereby increasing the financial burden on ratepayers.
- There is no 'flow control' legislation in New Zealand. This means that it is not possible for the Council to direct waste to designated disposal sites or methods, as some submitters thought or suggested.
- There are also no landfill standards in New Zealand. The effect of this is that the market decides what the Council can afford to charge at residual waste disposal facilities. If charges are too high, waste will flow 'over the border' to privately owned cheaper facilities with probably lower environmental standards, thereby also avoiding paying the waste minimisation levy to assist with waste minimisation initiatives.
- The Commerce Act restricts co-operation between Canterbury local authorities and with private organisations through potential price fixing restrictions impinging on regional waste management issues such as a transport equalisation schemes for both waste and recyclables for district councils within the region.

B. Other issues raised by submitters**WHY WAS 50% REDUCTION TARGET CHOSEN?**

This 50% is in addition to the 13% already achieved since 1994, and would total 63% by 2020. Some submitters commented that a 50% additional waste reduction target was too easy to achieve. Work has been done by the City Water and Waste Unit, Recovered Materials Foundation and Transwaste during the last few years to look at waste reduction trends in Christchurch. Taking note of the reduction of 13% already achieved, and using known information, technologies and data (rather than making assumptions about what may be possible) a further 50% is considered to be a demanding target, taking account of current Real Costs. The Subcommittee, in considering submissions, now believes a 65% target is achievable as from the 1994 base year, by 2020.

NEW LANDFILL NOT REQUIRED

The joint Living Solutions Ltd and Environmental Education and Employment Trust submission mooted swerving the funding for the new regional landfill towards a resource recovery park, with Burwood being retained to landfill residual waste for the 'final four or five years'. Resource recovery parks tend to be boutique operators that have the potential to remove "desirable" articles from the waste stream. Whilst they may make a dent in the waste stream they cannot possibly effectively deal with the quantities of mixed waste a city the size of Christchurch produces. Recycling cannot reduce the waste stream to the extent that no residual disposal is required after 2006.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER LOCALITIES

Various submitters highlighted examples of cities/towns that are achieving attractively high ratios of diversion from landfill. Kaikoura and Hurunui have been mentioned. It should be noted that due to the differing size of each population and the nature of the individual waste streams (eg Christchurch has a large industry base) these comparisons are largely inappropriate.

Canberra has also been held up as an example to follow with a 60% reduction already achieved. Investigations into this achievement by the Recovered Materials Foundation clearly confirms why comparisons cannot be made on just the percentage of reduction achieved. Canberra (roughly the same size as Christchurch) has less industry base, and started off with about 750,000 tonnes, compared to Christchurch's 550,000 tonnes approximately.

The following table demonstrates the differences between Christchurch and Canberra. It shows that, despite Canberra's 60% reduction, Christchurch is landfilling less waste than Canberra, and our recycling rate is climbing towards Canberra's. This illustrates the problem of using percentage reduction figures only.

	Canberra	Christchurch
Statistics		
Population	311,000	324,300
Waste to landfill 1999/00 (MT)	259,084	227,422
waste per capita	0.83	0.70
Measured materials recovery		
household recyclables	49,199	33,457
garden waste	117,592	34,502
ferrous metals	4537	35,000
Total recycling excluding C&D	171,328	102,959
recycling per capita	0.55	0.32
% Recovery: landfill (ex. C&D)	39.8	31.2

PUBLIC SUPPORT?

Canterbury Dialogues has recently reported that 57% of participants in their poll indicated that Zero Waste by 2020 was achievable. Without a proper understanding of the constraints set out in this report such opinions are of little value. Furthermore 57% is hardly a large majority in support.

1 Cont'd

COMMUNICATION

It came through strongly in submissions that there is not sufficient communication between the Council and the public as to what is currently happening in the waste reduction area. The subcommittee agrees and will recommend that this part of the submissions be taken up in next year's review.

INTEGRATED FORUM

Submissions from Rex Verity and Richard Cottrell, among others, recommended that some type of forum be convened so that groups who were interested in waste issues would have the opportunity for input and information sharing. Again, the subcommittee agrees, and noted that there is a current proposal by the RMF to establish a forum to which community groups as well as commercial organisations would be invited for these kind of purposes. The need for integration of information and ideas was clearly expressed by many submitters. The subcommittee recommends that the Council supports the RMF proposal as part of its regional waste minimisation proposals.

PERCEIVED CONFLICT OF INTEREST BETWEEN RMF, CCC, TRANSWASTE CAUSING CONCERN

A number of submitters expressed varying degrees of concern about a perceived conflict of interest issue based on Councillor O'Rourke's chairing of the RMF, City Services Committee and Transwaste Canterbury. The question they appeared to be asking was, why would the Council on the one hand encourage recycling if that reduced the financial rewards to be reaped from the landfill?

The subcommittee notes:

- The City Services Committee is charged with the supervision of all of the Council's waste functions. These are defined in the Local Government Act.
- The Council pursues its recycling objectives through its contract with the RMF.
- The Council is pursuing future residual disposal requirements through the Transwaste joint venture. Currently it does this through its stand-alone operation of the Burwood Landfill.

Through City Services, the Council controls recycling by way of contract with the RMF, and controls residual disposal currently through the Burwood landfill and in future through Transwaste. The local authority directors on Transwaste are nominee directors who *must* vote in accordance with instructions issued by the local authorities through the Canterbury Waste Subcommittee. The Council representatives on the subcommittee are required to cast their three votes (and their casting vote if required) en bloc. Control therefore always resides with the Council as a whole, and not with any individual. It is common for Councillors to develop areas of expertise around various Council matters. An overall understanding of the issues assists in the integration of knowledge which a number of submitters have suggested as being desirable. The Subcommittee sees no conflict of interest as was suggested but does see considerable benefit in the Chair of City Services having direct involvement in the Council's recycling and waste disposal initiatives.

VOLUNTEER SUPPORT

It was suggested that the Council should place more reliance on volunteer support rather than contracting professional organisations for collecting refuse, processing and recycling as is done for example in Hurunui. While we value the support of volunteers, the subcommittee does not believe that this option is feasible in a city the size of Christchurch. It is simply not appropriate or feasible to attempt to transfer rural solutions to a city solution.

REGIONAL COUNCILLOR BURKE

Regional Councillor Burke submitted that all of the Council's solid waste activities should be subjected to public tender, and that Environment Canterbury should conduct the tendering process and choose the preferred solution. The Christchurch City Council would then implement the option selected by Ecan, at the City Council's cost. The reason for this was to overcome what he perceived as the Council's profit motive as a partner in the regional landfill project.

He also believed that the Christchurch City Council would endeavour to extend the life of the new landfill to reap financial reward over the longest possible term. The subcommittee disagrees for these reasons:

1 Cont'd

- Following extensive public consultation (including 14 public meetings throughout Canterbury) the joint venture regional landfill solution was clearly favoured by the public.
- The joint venture partners were chosen following a robust competitive process (the best of six short-listed options).
- The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the joint venture has a term of only 20 years. This clearly demonstrates that indefinite landfilling is not contemplated by the Christchurch City Council.
- The MOU requires Transwaste;-
To co-operate with the Council's proposed Zero Waste Goal.
To actively seek alternatives to landfilling.
To only receive residual waste from Refuse Stations controlled by the participating councils (it has no ability to influence the amount of waste disposed of at the new landfill). Transwaste only takes the residual waste left for it at the transfer stations.
To give the RMF the authority to audit waste passing through the refuse stations to ensure the best possible rate of recovery before residual disposal.
To observe requirements relating to transparency and independent assessment of its financial affairs.

The Subcommittee feels that the Council is likely to find it unacceptable that any outside body should dictate the choice of waste facilities for the city without any accountability for the costs incurred.

SUPPORT

The Subcommittee notes with appreciation the submissions in support from Crown Public Health, Environment Canterbury and the RMF.

CANTERBURY ZERO WASTE CAMPAIGN

The Subcommittee noted the two advertisements in the Press newspaper with tear-off slips attached. 120 people submitted in this way. A petition by 808 people and the advertisements both contained a number of factual errors and as nobody from the campaign attended to speak to their submission, the subcommittee was limited in its ability to assess their concerns. These errors were:

- The *"out of control landfill"*. The participating councils have equal voting power with the waste companies on the Transwaste Board, which therefore can make no decisions without the consent of the participating councils. It should also be noted that Christchurch City only controls 16% of the waste stream yet through its involvement with Transwaste it is able to have greater influence over the commercial waste stream than it would otherwise have had. The City Council's control over the waste stream has therefore been enhanced, not reduced.
- *"Commercial viability"*. Through its advertisement, Canterbury Zero Waste Campaign suggested that through Transwaste the Council needed to maximise waste volumes for the "commercial viability" of the landfill. As the subcommittee noted in considering Kerry Burke's submission, the MOU contains provisions directly contrary to this assertion.
- The advertisement and petition also stated *"Landfill economics are set to dominate"*. This is inaccurate. A review of the Council's Annual Plan reveals that large scale expenditure on the recycling and/or composting of paper, plastics, green waste and putrescible waste is planned.

SUMMARY

There is strong support from some sectors of the community for a zero waste goal. The current waste management plan does not contain this, and we now recommend its insertion.

With regard to waste targets, it would have been expedient to rewrite them now in such a way that we could have produced an outcome that we would have been able to claim as a zero waste target. We chose not to do that. Rather, the targets we are recommending are transparent, realistic and achievable. They were supported by a number of submitters who were opposed to the Council's original recommendation and will require commitment not just from the Council and its budget processes, but from the entire community.

This review has been useful in highlighting a number of constraints that will need to be overcome to meet our zero residual waste disposal goal. Through the process we embark on next year, we will be able to tackle ways to remove or reduce those constraints.

1 Cont'd

**Subcommittee
Recommendation:**

1. That the following vision, goal and targets, and definition of Real Costs, as proposed in this report be adopted.

Vision

That the whole community will manage solid waste in ways that:

- ✓ ***avoid irreversible damage to the physical environment***
- ✓ ***minimise the adverse effects of solid waste management generally***
- ✓ ***use waste as a resource.***

Goal

- ✓ ***Zero Residual Disposal of solid waste.***

Real Costs

- ✓ ***The Real Costs are constraints that will impact on achieving the targets which are set in the Waste Management Plan as milestones towards attainment of the goal.***
- ✓ ***They include environmental, social, economic and legal costs.***

Targets

That taking account of Real Costs, per capita waste to residual disposal be reduced as follows:

- ✓ ***90% of green waste and kitchen putrescibles received by the Council, by 2010***
- ✓ ***80% of kerbside waste collected by the Council, by 2010***
- ✓ ***65% minimum, 100% maximum, of the waste stream overall, by 2020.***

Base year: 1994.

Target period: 25 years

2. That the waste management plan be reviewed in 2002 incorporating the following:
- a division between commercial and domestic targets;
 - targets for different types of waste stream materials (eg construction and demolition waste, hazardous waste, paper, putrescibles etc);
 - five yearly review of targets or sooner should circumstances so require;
 - how the outcomes sought will be achieved;
 - a target for materials recovered;
 - measures of the effectiveness of actions taken to avoid or minimise environmental damage;
 - The requirements of, or the opportunities offered through, legislative change;
 - A general review of the plan.
3. That the Council develop a communications process to advise the public on recycling and waste disposal issues and receive feedback.
4. That the Council support the Recovered Materials Foundation proposal to establish and facilitate a forum for community organisations and commercial firms to provide ongoing input on recycling and waste issues.

CONSIDERED THIS 28TH DAY OF JUNE 2001

MAYOR