

### **3. FEEDBACK FROM RECOVERED MATERIALS FOUNDATION ON THREE WASTE MINIMISATION PROJECTS**

The Subcommittee considered reports from the Recovered Materials Foundation (RMF) on three regional waste minimisation scoping studies. Copies of the reports were previously circulated with the agenda. PowerPoint presentations were also provided and copies of these presentations have been forwarded to members.

Background issues:

- availability of reliable information
- anecdotal vs actual data
- balancing the regional perspective

The presenters also responded to questions from members of the Subcommittee and the summaries and recommendations from the respective reports are set out below:

#### **RECOVERY AND RECYCLING OF WOODWASTE IN CANTERBURY (Sarah Gordon)**

The report covered:

1. Introduction
2. Current Woodwaste Management in Canterbury
  - Canterbury territorial local authorities
  - Landfill disposal options
  - Cleanfill pits
3. Reuse, Recycling and Energy Recovery Options for Woodwaste
  - Woodwaste Recovery
  - Current Markets for Woodwaste
    - Solid Energy Renewable Fuels
    - Construction and Demolition Woodwaste
      - Crusaders Construction and Demolition (C&D) Yard*
      - Screening and Crushing Systems*
    - Treated Timber
4. Summary
  - National Construction and Demolition (C&D) Waste Reduction Programme.
  - Local and regional issues for Canterbury.
  - Identified current and potential options for untreated woodwaste and sawdust.
  - Treated timber unsuitable for reuse is the main issue for most TLA's.
  - Treated wood shavings are now a major issue for businesses generating large volumes.
5. Recommendations
  - Identify what can be addressed at a local level, and what requires a regional approach.
  - Liaise with producers of treated sawdust and shavings.
  - RMF to continue discussions with Carter Holt Harvey Fibre Board Plant.

#### **FUTURE WASTE TYRE RECOVERY AND RECYCLING OPTIONS FOR CANTERBURY (Sarah Gordon)**

The report covered:

1. Introduction
2. Background
3. Estimated Volumes of Waste Tyres in Canterbury
4. Current End of Life Options for Tyres
5. Current Collection and Processing Infrastructure in Canterbury
6. Potential End of Life Options for Tyres
7. Summary
8. Recommendations

## **Recommendations**

### **High priority : Further research to confirm current waste tyre generation and end use**

1. Research and survey silage contractors operating in the Canterbury/North Otago districts.
2. TLAs to investigate and report back on number and use of cleanfill pits operating in their areas and acceptance criteria – ie: whether waste tyres are acceptable “cleanfill”.
3. TLAs to monitor and record number of waste tyres accepted at refuse transfer stations and note (where possible) end uses by collectors.
4. TLAs to influence tyre suppliers through procurement contracts to become members of Tyre Track programme to ensure that waste tyres are responsibly disposed of.
5. Maintain and continue to research/refine information on local tyre production and importation.

### **Medium Priority**

6. Further research on reuse/recycling/disposal options for waste tyres.
7. RMF to continue discussions with all potential end users of waste tyres (although this is subject to being able to confirm quantity and consistency of supply of waste tyres).

### **Low Priority**

8. Develop and implement communication strategies to advise Canterbury residents of the issues and options surrounding waste tyre disposal in the future.
9. Work with MfE on education and promotion of Tyre Track so customers are aware of the relevance of supporting retailers that have signed up to this programme.
10. CWSC consider producing a booklet on resourceful and innovative uses for waste tyres as part of an overall education strategy.

## **BARRIERS TO RECYCLING AND COMPOSTING (Julie McCloy)**

The report provided:

- Background
  - Parameters
  - Stakeholders
- Key Results
  - Knowledge
  - Practical
  - Misconceptions
  - What's in it for me?
  - Organisation of scheme
  - Lack of ownership
- Key Outcomes
  - Large amount of research
  - Barriers don't stand or fall in isolation
  - Long term commitment and investment
  - Cohesion and co-operation

## **Recommendations**

- Convenience – simple, cost-effective, availability, provide leadership and guidance
- Communication and education – vital. Underpin many other barriers. Knowledge, influence, ease
  - Consideration of what is communicated, and how – remember your audience and target them effectively
- Incentives and disincentives – encourage engagement and discourage non-engagement. Integration into overall policy

## Further Research

- Organic waste – disposal; incentives to use a specific disposal method; feelings about green waste and kitchen waste
- Collection services – where they do not exist: payment of, use of, preference
- Rural/semi-rural areas - what disposal used, issues of transport, collection
- Marketing related – profiles of 'typical' recyclers or composter, and their antithesis.

## Summary

- Need for regional co-ordination and funding (Eco-recycle Victoria)
- Need for consolidated information base

*Kate Valley provides optimised disposal solution... must be balanced with optimised diversion solution (Measurement before management)*

The Subcommittee then **resolved**:

- (a) To receive the reports.
- (b) To consider the recommendations in the reports at the next meeting after receiving a staff report including cost estimates from the RMF to advance the recommendations.
- (c) To recommend to all members that recommendations 2, 3 and 4 in the tyres report be considered for action.
- (d) To request staff of all member Councils to use a standardised research and survey methodology in respect to recommendation 1 of the RMF report on tyres, with CCC staff to co-ordinate.
- (e) To request that the RMF and all other territorial local authorities review charges for tyres received at refuse stations throughout the region.