

6. CANTERBURY HAZARDOUS WASTE SUBCOMMITTEE

General Manager responsible:	General Manager City Environment, DDI 941-8572
Officer responsible:	City Water and Waste Manager
Authors:	Trudy Geoghegan and Darren Patterson, Environment Canterbury

INTRODUCTION

1. At the meeting of the Canterbury Hazardous Waste Subcommittee (CHWS) on 8 October 2007, the issue of representation, and whether the CHWS should be combined with the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee (CWJC) was raised. After some discussion it was requested that a report be prepared for the CWJC. The following resolution was made:

“That a report be prepared providing background and options for consideration of incorporating the activities of the Hazardous Waste Subcommittee into the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee.”

2. This report will briefly discuss the background and work of the CHWS; then look at the potential impacts of changing the current committee-subcommittee structure, and the advantages and disadvantages of such a change.

BACKGROUND

3. Prior to June 2006 the role of the CHWS was carried out by the Canterbury Hazardous Waste Working Party (CHWWP). When Environment Canterbury joined the CWJC the working party became a subcommittee of the CWJC but retained its structures, budgets, work programs, and objectives.
4. The CHWWP was established in 1999 to enhance co-operation between local authorities on regional hazardous waste issues. The working party was co-ordinated by Environment Canterbury, and its objectives were to:
 - (a) Develop and adopt a regional strategy for the management of hazardous waste and make recommendations relating to the strategy to the Joint Committee.
 - (b) Co-ordinate responses to hazardous waste management issues in Canterbury, where it is appropriate for a joint authority response.
5. The Canterbury Hazardous Waste Management Strategy (the Strategy) was published after public consultation, in May 2001; and reviewed in 2006 with the publication of a three year implementation programme. A number of projects in the programme are ongoing.
6. Programmes from the Strategy undertaken or supported by the CHWWP include:
 - technical advisory services and reference guides
 - domestic hazardous waste drop off points
 - waste oil collection programmes and facilities
 - industrial waste programmes for cyanide, and chlorinated solvent sludge
 - targeted special wastes programme (asbestos, treated timber)
 - targeted agrichemical collection
 - product stewardship schemes – Paintwise (paint) and Agrecovery (plastic agrichemical container)

Potential Options

7. There are two potential options:
 - Maintain the status quo.
 - Abolish the CHWS.

Potential Impact of abolishing the CHWS

8. Abolition of the CHWS would have a number of impacts. It would:
- alter the funding proportions
 - require a revision of representation on the CWJC, include the position of Chair
 - require a new constituting agreement
 - increase the workload of Councillors not currently on the CHWS and require a commitment to continue to meet community expectations for hazardous waste
9. These are discussed in detail below.

Funding Proportions

10. Incorporating the CHWS funds under the sole direction of the CWJC would significantly alter the proportions contributed by some Councils if it is assumed that each organisation continues to provide the same dollar amount. Table 1 shows the current contributions, and each council's proportion of the total. Table 2 gives each Council's contribution if the CHWS was abolished and its work brought into the CWJC. As you can see ECan's contribution goes from 25% to 38.9% while the CCC's contribution drops from 51% to 35.2%.

Table 1 – Current funding contributions

	Canterbury Waste Joint Committee			Canterbury Hazardous Waste Subcommittee		
	No. Councillors	Funding contribution		No. Councillors	Funding contribution	
Environment Canterbury	2	25%	\$37,500	2 (chair)	50%	\$88,150
Christchurch	3 (chair)	51%	\$75,000	1	22%	\$38,786
Kaikoura	1	0.5%	\$750	1	2%	\$3,390
Hurunui	1	1.6%	\$2,400		2%	\$3,390
Waimakariri	1	5.9%	\$8,850	1	5%	\$8,476
Selwyn	1	4.4%	\$6,600		4%	\$6,781
Ashburton	1	3.8%	\$5,700		4%	\$6,781
Timaru	1	6.2%	\$9,300	1	7%	\$11,866
Mackenzie	1	0.5%	\$750		2%	\$3,390
Waimate	1	1.1%	\$1,650		2%	\$3,390
Total	13		\$148,500	6		\$174,400

Table 2 – Potential joint funding amounts

	Total \$	Proportion
Environment Canterbury	\$125 650	38.9%
Christchurch	\$113 786	35.2%
Kaikoura	\$4 140	1.3%
Hurunui	\$5 790	1.8%
Waimakariri	\$17 326	5.3%
Selwyn	\$13 381	4.1%
Ashburton	\$12 481	3.9%
Timaru	\$21 166	6.6%
Mackenzie	\$4 140	1.3%
Waimate	\$5 040	1.6%
Total	\$322 900	100%

Representation

11. Christchurch City Council currently has three representatives on the CWJC and holds the position of Chair, with ECan having two. Due to the change in the proportion of funding provided by the councils it would be appropriate for there to be some alteration to these numbers. Either CCC could reduce their numbers to two representatives or ECan have theirs increased to three.

The Chair

12. The current constituting agreement requires that the Chair be held by the Christchurch City Council (CCC). However if the CHWS is to be abolished the subsequent change in the relative levels of funding would mean this should be reconsidered. There are three potential scenarios. The Chair:
 - alternates between CCC and ECan,
 - it rotates around all the councils or,
 - it is nominated and elected by the representatives with no requirement for the position to be held by one particular council.

Constituting Agreement

13. When the constituting agreement of CWJC was drawn up in 2006, it was decided to retain the CHWWP's function, but make it a subcommittee of the CWJC. If the CHWS were abolished there would need to be a new constituting agreement as the current agreement requires the establishment of a hazardous waste subcommittee.
14. The Constituting Agreement of the CWJC May 2006 states that:

'The Committee shall (a) appoint a subcommittee of the committee to be known as the Canterbury Hazardous Waste Subcommittee.'
[Section 5(a)]
15. An amendment to the constituting agreement would also be required to change the Chair, representation or funding structure of the CWJC. However, the CWJC can change the make up of the CHWS without needing to change the constituting agreement. The current agreement dictates the minimum number of members from ECan (one) and CCC (one) and the Chair (ECan) but states that:

'In all other respects the composition of the Subcommittee shall be as determined by the Committee from time to time.'
[Section 5 (b)]
16. So reviewing the representation model of the CHWS is an alternative to abolishing it.

Workload

17. The CHWS currently meets 2-3 times a year to discuss hazardous waste issues and the implementation of the CHWMS. If abolished, Councillors who are not currently on the CHWS would have an increased workload as longer meetings would be required of the CWJC to consider the implementation of the CHWMS.

Community Expectation

18. Finally, as the CHWMS has undergone a public consultation process, and Councils have commitments either through their LTCCP and/or their Waste Management Plans, to improve hazardous waste management through the implementation of the CHWMS, any new agreement would need to ensure funds allocated for the implementation of the Canterbury Hazardous Waste Management Strategy were kept separate from funds assigned to other activities of the CWJC.

SUMMARY

19. The subcommittee's predecessor, the CHWWP, was established not just to involve Environment Canterbury in some waste issues but to ensure hazardous waste is managed in a co-operative manner on a regional basis. The CHWS functions in its own right and currently has a set of community approved objectives under the CHWMS with a number of programmes underway.
20. Removing the CHWS would require the CWJC's constituting agreement to be changed, and is likely to bring about changes to the funding and representation structure of the CWJC, and/or selection of the committee's chair.
21. The current structure of having a separate hazardous waste subcommittee works well to ensure hazardous waste issues are given their due consideration and the expected level of services are provided to the community.
22. As there has been no question of the ability of the subcommittee to fulfil its role there appears little justification for disbanding it.
23. Ways to address the current concerns with representation could include:
 - Reviewing the need for extra members.
 - Having a different sub-regional structure.
 - Alternating the sub-regional representatives each three year term.
 - Reviewing the selection process for sub-regional representatives.
 - Setting guidelines for sub-regional representatives for reporting to the districts they represent on the CHWS.
 - Making it known to the CWJC that all members are welcome to attend the CHWS meetings but only the nominated representatives may vote.
24. Staff considers the CHWS should continue to function in its current form with councillors able to attend meetings but only the nominated the representatives voting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Canterbury Hazardous Waste Subcommittee continues to function in its current form.