

**JOINT WASTE DISPOSAL BOARD
11 MARCH 2004**

**USER GROUP
(Environmental Co-ordinator Bracknell Forest Borough Council)**

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report updates the Board on the work of the Central Berkshire Waste Project, User Group.

2 RECOMMENDATION

That the Board notes the progress of the User Group's involvement in the Re3 project.

3 Supporting INFORMATION

- 3.1 The User Group has met regularly throughout the last year (Minutes annexes 1–7 attached) and has played a crucial role in ensuring that the progress of the project is consistent with the needs of local people.
- 3.2 Key tasks undertaken by the User Group:
- Consultation on the Draft Municipal Waste Management Strategy Statement
 - Representative of the Group attends Joint Waste Board Meetings
 - Three representatives of the User Group attended the ISOP launch (Bidders Day)
 - Selection of evaluation criteria to be used by the User Group to assess bids
 - Consideration of the four outline bids at the ISOP stage (specially prepared by bidders for the User Group)
 - 2 Site Visits to Materials Recycling Facility and Composting Plant at Beenham, Longshot Lane Transfer station and Smallmead Landfill site
 - Involvement in the Waste Watch Project
 - Regular consultation with the groups they represent
 - Proactive in taking information out and about within the community
- 3.3 The next key task for the User Group is to undertake a structured assessment of key elements of bidders' proposals against the previously identified sub-set of evaluation criteria. This work will culminate in the production of a written report by 1 April 2004 that will be considered by the ITN Evaluation Team when the scoring of bidders' proposals is being agreed.

- 3.4 Membership of the group has remained consistent throughout the period with a core of 15 representatives drawn from a cross section of stakeholder groups in the three areas. Meetings on average attract an attendance of 12 members. Providing the services of a consultant waste adviser to work with the group has proven extremely worthwhile enabling them to develop a good knowledge of the issues and to be guided through the procurement process.

4 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 The User Group is now a cohesive and committed group and has clearly demonstrated its ability to provide meaningful and useful input into the project. It is envisaged that the group will continue to provide valuable community input during the evaluation period leading to awarding of the contract.

5 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 None directly as a result of this report.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 External facilitation and administrative costs are shared equally between the three Councils for which budgetary provision has been made.

Background Papers

Central Berkshire Waste Project - Stakeholder Involvement - Office for Public Management

Contact for further information

[Pauline Nabarro, Environmental Co-ordinator, Bracknell Forest Borough Council – 01344 352503]

[pauline.nabarro@bracknell-forest.gov.uk]

MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL BERKSHIRE WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECT – USER GROUP
5th February 2003, 7 p.m. – 9.00 p.m.
Edward Court Hotel & Restaurant, Wokingham

Present:

Project Representatives:

David Coleman (User Group Adviser)
Pauline Nabarro (Bracknell Forest Borough Council)
Janine Locke (Bracknell Forest Borough Council)

Community Representatives:

Brian Stanley (Baha'i Faith)
Gerald King (Baha'i Faith)
David Boobier (Katesgrove Residents' Association and Globe group - Reading)
David Carter (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce)
Derek Hampshire (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce)
John Heggadon (Wokingham Biodiversity Group)
Susanne Snell (Berkshire Age Concern)
Val Crosby-Clarke (Sandhurst Residents Association)
Anya Elie (Warfield Environment Group)
Sheila Collings (Warfield Environment Group)
Jack Meatcher (Wokingham Biodiversity Group)
Jill Hodges (RFTRA Joint Environment Cttee/TREGA - Reading)
Mildred Perryman (Wokingham District Carers Forum)

1. Welcome and introduction (PN)

PN welcomed the assembled members, all were introduced to Anya Elie & Sheila Collings representing Warfield Environment Group and John Heggadon (Wokingham Biodiversity Group).

2. Feedback from Joint Waste Disposal Board (DH)

Derek Hampshire, the representative elected at the last meeting, gave a summary of his presentation of the group's suggestions to the Board. The draft minutes of the board meeting were circulated.

There were three main concerns discussed:

- DH was excluded from parts of the meeting. It was appreciated that certain items involved confidential information, however it was suggested that these parts could have been discussed at the end of the meeting. It was also suggested that DH might be able remain in future subject to signing a confidentiality agreement.

- The landfill tax suggestion was a) dismissed without discussion and b) possibly not understood correctly.
- The need for the Joint Board to define the group's role and boundaries in the development of documentation for the project; involvement in the evaluation and selection process; and their long-term role in the project.

DH reported a positive reaction to the suggestion of including business waste. The group anticipates formal feedback from the board on all the suggestions put forward by DH and this would provide confirmation of the value of the group's role.

3. Timescale for Procurement Process

DC discussed the next two stages in the tender process, see the Indicative Timetable (handout). Two representatives (see below) were elected to attend the Bidders Day and report back to the next meeting.

4. Open discussion to enable the group to explore areas for future involvement

The User Group agreed the following:

- Following the Bidder's briefing day (late March) there should be feedback from the group's representatives.
- The group should have the opportunity to comment on the Outline Proposals received from Bidders. It was requested that this be done by means of a presentation of those proposals highlighting the ways that they addressed the various key issues identified by the User Group.
- The group would like to know how many companies completing the pre-qualification questionnaires had been selected to submit outline proposals.
- Expressed concern about the group's responsibility, as representatives of the community, to effectively impact the project and the various contractors' proposals. It was stressed that the way the Joint Board responded to the group's suggestions would be a clear indication of the value of the group.
- To request clarification on whether the evaluation criteria will include the User Group list of key issues?
- The recommendations to the Joint Board need to also include collection and disposal policies, as the community view needs to relate to the whole waste process.
- The group should receive a monthly update on the progress of the project including as much detail as possible.

- PN to produce a monthly newsletter for the User Group to pass on to their organisations and the public
- The Joint Board should advise of the rules for confidentiality
- Another member of the User Group should attend the Board meeting as an observer and potential substitute in addition to Derek Hampshire as the Group's representative.
- The group would welcome confirmation from the board that they can really influence the board (or are they wasting their time?)
- The need to challenge authorities to meet the needs of community collection/disposal.
- There should be uniformity of collection across authorities planned in with operation of contract.
- Where the contractor does not meet recycling targets there should be a liability for additional landfill tax or penalty. This should be benchmarked by recycling targets across the UK (or even Europe) e.g. should be in top 30%.
- To request advice on the criteria for the method and location of final disposal

The group would like a formal reply to the User Group's questions.

5. Nomination of representatives to participate in Bidders Day

Jack Meatcher – Wokingham Biodiversity Group
David Boobier - Katesgrove Residents' Association and Globe Group – Reading)

PN to confirm date as soon as possible.

6. Close of meeting

All agreed that the meeting had been a success but the future commitment of all would depend on the Board's responses.

All were pleased to continue with new venue and food will be provided at the next meeting.

PN asked for suggestions of other groups to invite to join the User Group.

The next meeting will be held on the 9th of April providing a response from the board has been prepared.

CENTRAL BERKSHIRE WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECT
9th April 2003, 7 p.m. – 9.00 p.m.
Edward Court Hotel & Restaurant, Wokingham

Present:

Project Representatives:

Pauline Nabarro (Bracknell Forest Borough Council)
Janine Locke (Bracknell Forest Borough Council)
Andrew Withey (Project Manager)

Community Representatives:

Brain Stanley (Bahai)
David Carter (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce)
Derek Hampshire (AED Practice)
John Heggadon (Wokingham Biodiversity Group/ Wokingham Parish Council)
Susanne Snell (Age Concern)
Val Crosby-Clarke (Sandhurst Residents Association)
Anya Elie (Warfield Environment Group)
Sheila Collings (Warfield Environment Group)
Jack Meatcher (Wokingham Biodiversity Group)
Jill Hodges (RFTRA Joint Environment Cttee/TREGA)
David Coleman (User Group Adviser)

6. Welcome and introduction (PN)

It was suggested and agreed that in future the first agenda item would be matters arising from the previous minutes and confirming them as a true record.

7. Project Update (AW)

Progress with Procurement

Thirteen very good applications had been evaluated and of those eight companies had been invited to submit outline proposals

JL to circulate outline proposals document.

The eight bidders have five weeks to prepare their proposal. A data room has been made available at Bracknell Forest Borough Council providing information to assist with preparation of proposals. The project team will then evaluate the proposals and, in June, will go to the board with recommendations for a short list. The procurement process will then commence.

In addition to John Osborne and Andrew Withey the project team consists of:
Ernst and Young – financial advisors
Babtie – technical advisors
Eversheds – legal advisors

Concerns were raised over the possible changing of key board members after the elections. It was agreed that a list of current members would be circulated (see Appendix A on last page of minutes) and the user group would be updated on any post election changes.

Response of Joint Waste Disposal Board to User Group issues

AW discussed the circulated paper setting out the issues identified by group and JWDB response. AW explained that the advisers are still working on the detailed evaluation criteria and in due course AW will add a third 'criteria' column to the handout.

In particular the issues on education, opening hours and ease of access for facilities (such as waste reception and recycling centres) and landfill tax were discussed.

Concerns were raised with the current waste disposal sites, in particular the weigh bridge, barrier and accessibility.

It was asked whether the final group of bidders would be given specific requirements concerning issues identified by the User Group such as the opening hours of the facilities. AW explained that minimum requirements are given and it is up to the bidders to adequately address these.

There was discussion over question two - concerning the group's ability to comment on the Outline Proposals. The project's legal advisers main concern with sharing this information is the danger of commercially sensitive information reaching bidding companies and giving unfair advantages. It was suggested that information is shared but the actual bidders remain anonymous.

It was agreed that the elected user group members (see item 5 below) would go through the evaluation criteria with AW and select out the parts that the user group can contribute to. This will be arranged by PN and will take place before the next User Group meeting.

The group members confirmed that they were very pleased with the question and answer sheet.

Introduction to draft waste strategy

AW briefly talked the group through the Joint Waste Strategy Statement handout and asked for observations on the Draft Municipal Waste Management Statement at the next meeting of the user group on the 23rd of April.

8. Feedback from attendance at Joint Waste Board meeting – DH

DH reported on the last Joint Board meeting and explained that the board meetings were run in a manner that did not promote discussion. Although they were more a process of “rubber stamping” they obviously followed a process where most of the key evaluation and recommendation processes were undertaken by the Project Team. This ‘rubber stamping’ might be unfortunate but it was not the most important element, which was that the wishes of the User Group were taken into account. . It was suggested that an item on the board meeting agenda be added to enable the group to bring up issues for discussion. The group raised concerns over the apparent limited discussion at the Joint Board by elected members and asked if the way the process actually functioned could be explained to them.

9. Feedback from the ISOP launch – JM, BS

JM and BS reported on the Bidders’ Day. The day was used to get information rather than to ask questions and was very professional. The lack of questions from bidders suggested they were well aware of the issues. The only question asked was “Who gets the benefit from exceeding targets”. The eight bidding companies were clearly amongst the largest and most substantial waste management contractors in Europe.

The evaluation criteria and their weighting were discussed - these can found on the bidder’s day handout that JL will circulate.

10. The way forward for the group and future actions (D Coleman)

Observations on the waste management statement are needed by 25th April before the document goes out for public consultation in May. It was agreed that an additional meeting would be held on the 23rd April to be confirmed as soon as possible to enable the group to provide observations on the strategy. It was noted that the strategy provide the opportunity for the group to comment on collection arrangements for waste and recyclables, a matter that had been of concern at previous meetings. It also indicated that notice was being taken of the group’s request that the three unitary authorities should operate more uniform waste and recycling collection arrangements.

It was agreed that Susan Snell, Jack Meatcher and Derek Hampshire would meet with AW to would go through the evaluation criteria before the next meeting.

To go on the agenda for the next meeting:

- Key issues from the meeting with AW
- Comments on the Waste Strategy statement
- Outstanding issues from the question and answer sheet

PN will have the newsletter ready for circulation in the next week.

6. Close of meeting

The next meeting will be held on the 23rd of April.

APPENDIX A

Central Berkshire Waste Board Members – April 2003

Bracknell Forest Borough Council

Councillor T Mills

Councillor Mrs M P Ballin

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

Councillor J Orton

Councillor C Maskell

WOKINGHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL

Councillor R Stanton

Councillor Mrs C A Ferris

CENTRAL BERKSHIRE WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECT
23rd April 2003, 7 p.m. – 9.00 p.m.
Edward Court Hotel & Restaurant, Wokingham

Present:

Project Representatives:

Pauline Nabarro (Bracknell Forest Borough Council)
Janine Locke (Bracknell Forest Borough Council)

Community Representatives:

David Boobier (Katesgrove Residents' Association and Katesgrove Globe)
Brian Stanley (Baha'i Faith)
Gerald King (Baha'i Faith)
Derek Hampshire (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce)
Susanne Snell (Age Concern)
Sheila Collings (Warfield Environment Group)
Jack Meatcher (Wokingham Biodiversity Group)
Jill Hodges (RFTRA Joint Environment Cttee/TREGA)
David Coleman (User Group Adviser)
John Pedlar (Sandhurst Residents Association)
Mildred Perryman (Carers Forum)

Apologies:

David Carter (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce)
Jill Allingham (RFTRA)
John Heggadon (Wokingham Biodiversity Group/ Wokingham Parish Council)
Any Elie (Warfield Environment Group)

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION (PN)

Minor changes agreed to last meeting Minutes.

PN confirmed that each member of the group had been given a copy of the ISOP document and also copies of the newsletter which would be available shortly on each Councils web site. Further hard copies were available from Janine Locke.

Sub group report back on selection of evaluation criteria

The sub group consisted of:
Jack Meatcher
Derek Hampshire
Susanne Snell

Andrew Withey and Pauline Nabarro also attended the meeting.

Derek Hampshire briefly explained why the meeting was arranged to those who were absent at the last meeting.

The sub group met to select a number of evaluation criteria that would enable the User Group to comment on the different bids using issues that were important to the group.

It was agreed, subject to legal consent, that AW would write a brief non-technical synopsis for each outline proposal and disclose to the User Group sections relating to the eight criteria selected. The summaries will enable the User Group to understand the overall structure of proposals but will not disclose specific details of bidders.

AW said that the proposals will be evaluated by the Joint Waste Project Evaluation Panel on a point scoring system and it would be useful to have comment from the User Group to assist this process. To enable this to happen the User Group will need to undertake a structured assessment of the proposals supplied by AW and would need to provide a written report clearly setting out an assessment of each bidders proposals against the selected criteria. He also said that a consensus within the group on issues does not always have to be reached but the group's assessment will be a material consideration in the scoring of relevant criteria by the Evaluation Panel.

DH read out the eight criteria selected (see appendix A)

The group raised particular concern with regards to the site planning criteria and their possible inability to influence this decision, as there could be legal, planning and commercial problems in identifying the specific sites nominated by the bidders. It was noted that AW was consulting on this with legal advisers and the group agreed to wait and see what was produced for the evaluation process.

However the group would like to be given the locations of the twenty-seven sites set out in the Waste Local Plan.

Work schedule and timescale for User Group involvement with above

The eight criteria were agreed and the following dates were proposed:

Tuesday 10 June – Meet to receive information from proposals. This may then be distributed between sub groups for evaluation.

Wednesday 18 June – Meet to discuss evaluations. David Coleman to compile points from meeting then circulate for comment.

Wednesday 25 June – Meet to finalise comments to go to board.

Monday 7 July – The report will be received by Project Director and Manager.

Review of Waste Strategy – identifying observations to feed back to Waste Team (DC)

David Coleman briefly introduced other authorities waste strategies and guidance on preparing a waste strategy.

The group ran through the document and discussed areas of concern. See appendix B for comments recorded on flipchart.

Close of meeting

Next Meeting Tuesday 10 June to be confirmed.

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- Recognition and mitigation of environmental issues (e.g. pollution, energy use, CHP)
- Changes required to Council collection structure in order to meet the output specification
- Approach to community relations – stakeholders consultation & communications plan
- Monitoring and response to user needs and proposals for Ongoing Publicity and Education
- Approach to Benchmarking and Continuous Improvement
- Ease of use and access to facilities and services
- Possible ‘knock on’ benefits to local businesses/third parties (e.g. enhanced opportunities for commercial waste recycling)
- Site planning risk-local impacts/ transport Implications – impact on people

CENTRAL BERKSHIRE WASTE PROJECT

USER GROUP – MEETING 23 APRIL 2003

COMMENTS ON DRAFT MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

General Comments

- Not 'sexy'
- More measurable targets and a clear plan for continuous improvement
- Document about hopes – requires others involvement
- Whole document confused – it does not read well and does not flow in natural way
- Not structured to provide flow of information
- Who is the document aimed at?
- People need to read it and act having read it
- Tone changes halfway through
- Whole document needs to cover the bigger picture – household waste only 30% 60 – 70% of waste from businesses – need a parallel strategy
- How are all interested parties measuring/benchmarking Council or Contractors performance?

OVERARCHING POLICIES

- Commitment needed in policies
- Policy 5 – **must** be provided with opportunities
- More positive commitment
- Ease of use of facilities must include opportunity to all residents to use standard facilities
- Toxic waste and how it is going to be disposed of – policy needs expanding on – referred to on page 17 – but what happens to it? Good direct advice to householder's required and Council employees are often not given adequate training to do this. Councils must be able to provide this level of advice.
- Policy 7 – Businesses should be included in strategy given the huge amount of waste they produce
- New policy – Councils should lobby Government – feed back unrealistic expectations given rules and regulations (Council should influence/shape/inform)
- Public involvement/ awareness raising must be a policy issue

SETTING THE SCENE

Important section to set the scene

Page 3 in box – poor wording – word collection used twice in opening sentence

Overarching – this word not liked why not overall or just policy statement

Page 4 2nd para – confusion with words/figures

Councils responding to challenge

Page 6 2nd line agreed, following consultation

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

- Further policy on lobbying should be reflected in Options (starting page 10)
- Page 13 – Anaerobic Digestion wastewater – what are we going to do with water?

Do your bit

- Too much jargon.
- Document needs to be more readable - is it a trade document or for the general public?
- INFORMING PEOPLE INFORMATION TOO VAGUE – MAKE IT ACCURATE OR TAKE IT OUT.
- Separate leaflet giving accurate information that informs – do not give misleading or scant information.

IMPACT ON COLLECTION

- 1st and 2nd paragraph should be more positive
- 3rd para last sentence taken out – in fact group are unhappy about the whole section

EASE OF ACCESS AND USE – NEEDS STATEMENT ON PAGE 17

Map should be included on page 17 identifying 27 sites – group stressed the need for clarity re. sites and information supplied

Page 18 – not policy - planning/public consultation should be elsewhere not relevant – what does it mean?

Last paragraph of document trite – take out

CENTRAL BERKSHIRE WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECT

18 June 2003, 7p.m. – 9.00 p.m.
Edward Court Hotel & Restaurant, Wokingham

Present:

Project Representatives:

Pauline Nabarro (Bracknell Forest Borough Council)
David Coleman (User Group Adviser)

Community Representatives:

David Boobier (Katesgrove Residents' Association and Katesgrove Globe)
Brian Stanley (Baha'i Faith)
Gerald King (Baha'i Faith)
Susanne Snell (Age Concern)
Sheila Collings (Warfield Environment Group)
Anya Elie (Warfield Environment Group)
Jack Meatcher (Wokingham Biodiversity Group)
Mildred Perryman (Carers Forum)
David Carter (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce)
Peter Borman (Bracknell Forest Tenants & Leaseholders Panel)

Apologies:

Derek Hampshire (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce)
John Heggadon (Wokingham Parish Councils)
Jill Hodges (RFTRA Joint Environment Committee/TREGA)
Val Crosby-Clarke (Sandhurst Residents Association)
Janine Locke (Bracknell Forest Borough Council)

Welcome & introductions (PN)

Minutes of previous meeting (23rd April 2003) agreed.

Group members introduced themselves and Peter Borman, Bracknell Forest Leaseholders and Tenants Association, who had joined the group to replace Richard Ireland, was welcomed.

Copies of 4 Bidders synopses were circulated and extracts from the Waste Local Plan identifying the twenty-seven sites were circulated.

Bidders Outline Proposals (DC)

The Group considered the four outline bids that had been prepared especially for the User Group by each bidder. It was explained to the group that the other four firms who had been invited to submit outline proposals had taken the decision not to proceed – in effect deselecting themselves before going any further.

DC gave a summary of each of the four proposals and how these appeared to address the issues previously identified by the group.

All four bids:

- were robust and appeared to address the selected criteria,
- addressed the authorities specification,
- appeared to address the environmental concerns and uniformity of service across the three authorities,
- addressed site access and ease of use issues,
- offered robust arrangements for partnership with the three authorities, general public (particularly the User Group), voluntary organisations, charities, businesses and residents groups/organisations,
- appeared to rely upon new and (according to the National Waste Strategy and the Cabinet Strategy Unit) unproven technology.
- One bid (No 4) appeared to be more specific in time-scale and detail although this was slightly longer than the suggested ten pages.

The User Group raised the following specific points:

- In view of the reliance on unproven technology, the group felt cost, reliability, time-scale, location and achievability would need to be addressed carefully at the ITN stage.
- Other sites were mentioned as future possibilities but without details of location, use or time-scale – more information would be needed by the group at the ITN stage.
- The group would like to be advised on how the selection process compares bidders proposing a proven technology against those considering more revolutionary solutions.
- It would be useful if further extracts produced specifically for the User Group by bidders could be uniform thus making it easier to compare.

The way forward for the group

Members were asked to forward to Pauline Nabarro any individual comments they wish to make on the information provided by the four bidders. The group was reminded that the crucial piece of work on evaluation would be done fully at the ITN stage, as it was very likely that all four bidders would go forward to the next stage. It was therefore agreed that to simplify individual feedback at this stage, comments should be under two headings, “What do you like?” and/or “What do you not like?” All views/comments would then be forwarded to the Waste Project Team. A time-scale of two weeks would be allowed for this feedback – 7 July 2003 – as the Project Team’s timescale was constrained by the need to progress the next stage.

The group asked that site visits be arranged before the next stage of the process to enable them to see for themselves the new technologies proposed particularly, pyrolysis, anaerobic digestion, in-vessel composting and also the way a Mechanical Biological Treatment (also known as Biomechanical Treatment) plant actually works on site. They also thought it would be useful to have these explained to them on site by operators. PN agreed to discuss this with Andrew Withey to see when and how this could be arranged.

PN was asked to try and obtain a copy of a recent television programme about recycling in Essex. It was agreed that if a copy of the programme were available then it would be shown at the next meeting of the group.

A waste management partnership between Bracknell Forest Borough Council, Reading Borough Council and Wokingham District Council.



The User Group agreed to meet again on Wednesday 3rd September at Edward Court Hotel, Wokingham and will consider the next stages of the bid process and also review the amendments to the Waste Strategy.

The meeting closed at 9 p.m.

ANNEX 5

CENTRAL BERKSHIRE WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECT – USER GROUP

3 September 2003, 7p.m. – 9.00 p.m. Edward Court Hotel & Restaurant, Wokingham

Present:

Project Representatives:

Pauline Nabarro (Bracknell Forest Borough Council)
David Coleman (User Group Adviser)

Community Representatives:

David Boobier (Katesgrove Residents' Association and Katesgrove Globe)
Brian Stanley (Baha'i Faith)
Gerald King (Baha'i Faith)
Susanne Snell (Age Concern)
Sheila Collings (Warfield Environment Group)
Anya Elie (Warfield Environment Group)
Mildred Perryman (Carers Forum)
David Carter (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce)
Peter Borman (Bracknell Forest Tenants & Leaseholders Panel)
Derek Hampshire (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce)
John Heggadon (Wokingham Parish Councils)
Jill Hodges (RFTRA Joint Environment Committee/TREGA)

Apologies:

Jack Meatcher (Wokingham Biodiversity Group)
Val Crosby-Clarke (Sandhurst Residents Association)

Minutes and Matters Arising

The minutes of the previous meeting on 18 June 2003 were agreed. PN confirmed that she had finally managed to track down the video and would arrange to have it copied and circulated to members to view before the next meeting.

Draft Waste Strategy

Having received copies of this document the group had read the revised version thoroughly. Whilst welcoming the document, a number of issues were raised including the short amount of time given for public comment. One member pointed out that the parish councils in the Wokingham area only received copies in early August, which is the recess period. This meant that there was no chance of responding by 1 September.

The group expressed concern at future possible changes to collection services alluded to in the document and in particular possible moves towards alternating weekly residual waste and compost/recyclables collections. Views were mixed on this with concern expressed at odour from bins balanced by an acknowledgement that reduction and recycling targets will only be reached by 'forcing' a change of habit.

It was generally agreed that there was a need for the authorities to come out publicly and consult on the issues well before any service changes were made, particularly those that might appear to be linked to the new contract. There was also comment on the need to widely publicise what really happened now on recycling in order to reassure the public that the sorting of recyclables did actually ensure that items were recycled and did not end up in landfill.

Draft ITN and revised timetable (DC)

DC discussed with the group the document he had produced on the comparative waste technologies. He confirmed that a copy would be sent to each member and reminded them that it is an independent and neutral examination into the current position of the new waste technologies, together with an appraisal of the state of their present application and development potential. It does not attempt to make judgements or even comparatively assess systems.

There was a very positive discussion on the ITN process/timetable and the role of the user group. The timetable was noted and the prominent role of the group as set out in the ITN welcomed. It was agreed that the preparation by the bidders of the section of the ITN documentation for the User Group would help matters considerably and the group would be able to analyse each bidders response against each of their eight evaluation criteria.

There might also be further questions relating to sites and planning (although it was noted the preliminary bids had indicated existing or out of area sites initially) together with the implications of any 'new technology.'

It was agreed that:

- the User Group's section of the four ITN returns would be circulated early in January 2004 to members,
- there would be a scoping meeting in the second week of January to discuss preliminary views,
- there would be a more detailed meeting later in January. This could be in a workshop format with a division into small groups of three or four to consider in detail the responses from the bidders against two or three of the criteria,
- in early February there would be a 'bringing together' meeting to focus the responses and to allow DC to write up a uniform response report,
- in late February the final response document would be agreed and sent to the Project Team.

Site Visits

The group discussed the need for site visits before January 2003. A number of members of the group wanted to see what happens at a landfill, a modern reception centre and energy from waste plant. They also expressed a wish to see some of the new technologies if possible. PN agreed to discuss this with the Project Manager and if possible combine all these into one occasion.

Date of next meeting – to be arranged

The meeting closed at 9 pm

ANNEX 6

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL BERKSHIRE WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECT –
USER GROUP – SPECIAL MEETING
12 November 2003, 7 p.m. – 9.00 p.m.
Edward Court Hotel & Restaurant, Wokingham**

Present:

Project Representatives:

David Coleman (User Group Adviser)
Pauline Nabarro (Bracknell Forest Borough Council)

CONSULTANT

Caroline Lee-Smith (CRS – Community Recycling Services)

Community Representatives:

Derek Hampshire (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce)
Val Crosby-Clarke (Sandhurst Residents' Association)
Anya Elie (Warfield Environment Group)
Sheila Collings (Warfield Environment Group)
David Carter (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce)
Peter Borman (Bracknell Forest Tenants' and Leaseholders Panel)
John Pedlar (Sandhurst Residents' Association)

Apologies:

Brian Stanley (Baha'i Faith)
Gerald King (Baha'i Faith)
David Boobier (Katesgrove Residents' Association and Katesgrove Globe)
Mildred Perryman (Carers Forum)
John Heggadon (Wokingham Biodiversity Action Group)
Susanne Snell (Age Concern)
Jill Hodges (RFTRA Joint Environment Committee/TREGA)
Jack Meatcher (Wokingham Biodiversity Group)

11. Welcome and introduction (PN)
- 1.1 PN welcomed the assembled members. It was explained that this briefing session had been called to enlist the help of the User Group with a project that was about to get underway led by Waste Watch. The project has been funded as a result of the award from DEFRA to the Re3 initiative of £195,000 for a promotional and awareness raising campaign. PN then introduced Caroline Lee-Smith from CRS (Community Recycling Services) who had been asked to attend the meeting on behalf of Joint Waste Project Team and Waste Watch
12. Presentation by Caroline Lee-Smith, CRS (Community Recycling Services)
- 2.1 CL-S explained to the members that she was not able to do as the group expected as she had only recently been appointed as a specialist consultant. This will involve dealing with 3 specific issues - in Reading, to increase

recycling participation amongst difficult-to-reach groups especially black and other ethnic minorities and those with English as a second language, Wokingham, to increase participation amongst rural communities and Bracknell, to increase participation amongst blocks of flats. Her work would then inform advice given to door-stepping teams and the communications plan. She had hoped to use the evening to commence this work. It was confirmed that the participation monitoring part of the project was underway which, would be followed by a door stepping exercise in each area. A communications plan was also to be produced. CL-S gave as much information as she could to the group - this was appreciated.

13. A general discussion then ensued with the main points as follows:
 - 3.1 The group was disappointed that a representative of Waste Watch or a lead officer from the Councils did not attend the meeting to give them a full briefing on the project. PN explained that an officer had not attended as a result of her recommendation as she did not feel, based on past experience, that it was necessary to have another officer present especially as Waste Watch were going to attend.
 - 3.2 The group was extremely unhappy to hear that the CRS representative had only been informed in the last week about the existence of the User Group and that it was likely that Waste Watch had not been supplied with information about the group prior to starting the project.
 - 3.3 The group was surprised when the representative from CRS asked who they reported to and did the meetings produce minutes? User Group members confirmed that the group had been set up to report through the Waste Team to the Project Board and where possible a member of the User Group attends Board meetings. It was as a result of his attendance at the Board meeting in October that it had been spotted that the User Group were not involved.
 - 3.3 Whilst the group appreciated that the funding time-scale was short this did not explain why the User Group were not involved in helping shape the project. They were aware that if this went unrectified, then as they are representing a wide cross section of the community for the three areas they could face embarrassment and a loss of credibility as to their role in the Re3 project.
 - 3.4 The group asked for clarification as to who was actually leading on this Waste Watch project on behalf of the three authorities.
- 4 The group requested that the minutes include the following:
 - 4.1 That the Joint Waste Board and the Waste Team be made aware of their concerns as to the fact that they were disregarded in the setting-up of the Waste Watch project.
 - 4.2 They requested that this issue should be remedied and that officers be made fully aware of the group's existence.

- 4.3 Documentation relating to the project particularly survey work and questionnaires be circulated to the group for consultation and comment. This would need to be by post or e-mail urgently in view of the timescale.
- 4.4 The User Group could provide a useful input into the project on those sections of local communities that are not contributing to recycling and who would benefit from being part of the Waste Watch initiative. They would like their views and advice to be considered.
- 4.5 Publicity for the survey and promotional work should include reference to and be in conjunction with the User Group.
- 4.6 The results of the survey work are reported to the group for discussion/consultation.
- 4.7 They are consulted on the proposals for the awareness raising and promotional work at one of their January 2004 meetings.
- 4.8 They suggested that similar events to the recently held Bracknell Forest Environmental Partnerships in the Park conference should be considered by the Board for future promotional work

It was agreed that PN would contact the group shortly with dates of future meetings
The meeting closed at approximately 8.45 PM.

CENTRAL BERKSHIRE WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECT – USER GROUP

Wednesday 25 February 2004, 7p.m. – 9.00 p.m. Edward Court Hotel & Restaurant, Wokingham

Present:

Project Representatives:

Pauline Nabarro - Bracknell Forest Borough Council

David Coleman - User Group Adviser

Community Representatives:

Susanne Snell (Age Concern Berkshire) – representing 3 authority areas

Sheila Collings (Warfield Environment Group) – Bracknell Forest

Mildred Perryman (Carers Forum) - Wokingham

David Carter (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce) - Wokingham

Peter Boorman (Bracknell Forest Tenants & Leaseholders Panel) – Bracknell Forest

Jill Hodges (RFTRA Joint Environment Committee/TREGA) – Reading

Jack Meatcher (Wokingham Biodiversity Group) - Wokingham

Val Crosby-Clarke (Sandhurst Residents Association) – Bracknell Forest

John Pedlar (Sandhurst Residents' Association) – Bracknell Forest

Brian Stanley (Baha'i Faith) – representing 3 authority areas

Apologies:

John Heggadon (Wokingham Biodiversity Action Group) Wokingham

Gerald King (Baha'i Faith) 3 authority areas

David Boobier (Katesgrove Residents' Association and Katesgrove Globe) Reading

Derek Hampshire (Wokingham Chamber of Commerce) Wokingham

1. Welcome and introduction (PN)

1.1 PN welcomed members and visitors to the meeting.

2. Presentation by Waste Watch – Barbara Herridge, Kathryn Burall Stillman and Jon Rolls.

2.1 The representatives from Waste Watch talked to the group about the work they are doing on behalf of the 3 authorities.

Kathryn Burall Stillman then gave a more detailed presentation on the communications campaign.

The User group responded with a range of queries and suggestions.

- *Concern about the timing of the campaign and how this linked in with the work on evaluating bids and letting of the contract.*

It was explained that Waste Watch are planning an initial campaign for a 5 week period commencing 15 March with a second phase from May 2004 – 2006. Waste Watch agreed to follow up the User Group's concerns that the re3 programme and recycling in general does not lose credibility at

this crucial stage. The general public could feel that expenditure on this type of campaign was premature in view of the changes that will be taking place in relation to the PFI contract.

- *Surprise at the selection of the primary target audience aged between 25 – 44 who were already considered medium to high recyclers.*

The User Group was keen to ensure that those who were not recycling were encouraged to do so and could see little benefit in using valuable resources to ask good recyclers to do more. Concerns were expressed that extra financial resources should go into helping poor recyclers in the three areas to recycle in the first place rather than targetting those that already do and in many cases are unable to do more. Waste Watch stated that the first stage campaign was aimed at everyone but it was thought it would be most likely to be accepted by those in the primary target audience. They also agreed to highlight that the second stage would be aimed at low recyclers.

- *The campaign messages and suggestions must be backed up with the day to day operational activity within each of the 3 council areas. Examples were shared amongst the group where the operational activity, particularly in the range and quality of recycling opportunities offered, fell somewhat short of expectations. Waste Watch noted these comments.*

The representatives from Waste Watch responded to the groups concerns and suggestions and explained that they were presenting to the Re3 Project Team on Friday prior to going live with the campaign. They would take up the group's suggestions and comments. Waste Watch left the meeting at 8.20 having been thanked for their informative presentation.

3. Feedback from Site Visits

- 3.1 It was agreed that the recently arranged site visit to Longshot Lane and Beenham had been very successful and the group requested that further trips should be arranged in the spring. It was thought that visits to a waste to an energy operation like Selchip and a mechanical and biological (MBT) plant would be interesting.

4. Update on Essex/Chelmsford Waste Project Video

- 4.1 Group members had now all had an opportunity to view the video. DC updated the group on recycling in Essex. The video provided a good overview of the issues and choices available on recycling. However Chelmsford had in fact only one area, South Woodham Ferrers, currently on the comprehensive recycling collection scheme. Essex overall was very successful but its recycling percentages were very similar to those currently in Mid Berks. The re3 project would take the area well beyond the aspirations shown in the video.

5. ITN Evaluation

5.1 The group discussed the forthcoming work to evaluate the bids. A copy of the original advice on the role of the User Group in the evaluation process was circulated. PN/DC suggested a time-scale that was agreed by the group. This is as follows:

- The documentation received from the bidders addressing the User Group's criteria (re-circulated at meeting) would be sent to individual User Group members on 3 March 2004 with a covering letter.
- Group meet on 10 March at 6.30 pm – 9 pm to undertake group evaluation based on the previously selected criteria. The group did not consider it necessary now to break into workshops and the whole body would consider and agree their submission to the project group. It was agreed that if it was felt necessary to have a further meeting this could be arranged prior to the completion of the final report for 1 April.
- Group members were reminded of their role in the evaluation and that they were going to be exposed to sensitive and highly confidential information. It was therefore necessary to remember that the information must be treated with confidence and not disclosed to a third party.

Jack Meatcher requested that the bid information should be sent to them without any guidance notes that might be considered as 'leading'.

John Pedlar asked if information on waste technology such as MBT was available. The group were reminded of the detailed exposition on current waste technology which DC had provided to the meeting on 3 September 2003. A copy would be sent to Mr Pedlar and any other member who requested it.

5. Any other business

PN asked the group for help in finding a venue for the meeting planned to take place on the 10 March. The Edward Court Hotel was not available for that evening and it had been difficult to find another venue in Wokingham. David Carter agreed to source another venue and once booked PN would contact the group with details/map etc. It was agreed to start the meeting earlier at 6.30 pm to allow further time for the work that had to be undertaken.

It was noted that the allowance made to User Group members had remained the same since the group was formed. PN agreed to suggest to the Project Team that an increase in the amount paid should be made and to feed back information to the next meeting.

6. Close of meeting

The meeting closed at 9 pm. Date of next meeting 10 March 2004 starting at 6.30 pm venue to be advised.