

Adur & Worthing Services  
working in partnership

Meeting	<b>Simultaneous Executive Meetings</b>	Subject	<b>Adur and Worthing Services – Single Service Vehicle and Wheeled Bin - Update</b>
Date	<b>27 February 2007</b>	Joint Authors	<b>Ian Lowrie Chief Executive, Adur and Interim Chief Executive, Worthing on behalf of Joint Chief Officers Team</b>

---

## **1.0 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report updates members on the procurement process for the new single service vehicle fleet, wheeled bins and recycling boxes.
- 1.2 As previously agreed, Worthing is the lead authority for the process. The procurement has been progressed on the basis that the best financing method for obtaining the vehicles and equipment is outright purchase, financed by way of loan, using Prudential Code borrowing.
- 1.3 The costs and benefits of the new single service are to be shared on the same ratio as the number of properties receiving the refuse/recycling services in both Councils.
- 1.4 The quotations for the supply of bins have been obtained through an e-auction process and a range of prices based on various bin sizes have been assessed. The leading bidders have been interviewed and their products seen. This report seeks confirmation of the final size to be selected and recommends a supplier to be accepted. The colours of the bins and lids will be as previously agreed by SEMs.
- 1.5 Members are asked to consider and decide on whether to include an electronic chip on the wheeled bins as standard.
- 1.5 The quotations for the supply of vehicles have been undertaken using the Braintree Framework Directive. These to have been assessed and recommendations are made for acceptance of the most advantageous bid. The colour of the vehicles is recommended to be blue.
- 1.6 The revised financial position is reported, together with information about the commissioning and operation of the new Ford Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) that will handle the recyclables from the single service.

## **2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

**2.1 The Adur Policy and Strategy Committee and the Worthing Cabinet are recommended to:**

**a) note the success with the procurement arrangements;**

**b) confirm that the wheeled-bin size to be used as the base for both residual waste and recyclables from households is a 140litres (as previously agreed by SEMs) with the 240litres size as the “larger” bin option that can be supplied in the circumstances set out in this report;**

**c) confirm that the colour of the wheeled bin body be charcoal, as previously agreed, with the lids being coloured charcoal for residual waste; blue for co-mingled dry recycling and green for garden waste;**

**d) that the wheeled-bins be purchased from Craemer as this represents the most advantageous price taking into account the final branding of the bins and the delivery arrangements to households;**

**e) decide whether or not the wheeled-bins should include an “electronic” chip;**

**f) accept the quotation from Dennis Eagle Ltd for the supply of operating vehicles as being the most advantageous taking into account the ease of dealing with a single supplier/manufacturer and the known track record of that supplier;**

**g) confirm that the base colour of the vehicles should be blue;**

**h) note the revised estimated financial implications of the single service style and the use of the new Ford MRF; and**

**i) authorise the Head of Legal Services (Adur) and Assistant Director (Legal and Democratic Services) (Worthing) to complete the appropriate documentation to secure the purchases.**

## **3.0 BACKGROUND**

**3.1 Both Councils have agreed to introduce a single service style for refuse collection and recycling services throughout Adur and Worthing, based on a wheeled-bin system with a weekly collection of residual domestic waste and an alternate week collection of dry recyclables.**

**3.2 As agreed by SEMs and to enable this new service to be provided, the existing ageing vehicle fleets are to be replaced (with reduced numbers over existing and a universal style for the single service), as previously reported and agreed. The agreed system will involve the provision of wheeled-bins (with a common charcoal coloured body and different coloured lids to distinguish between waste and recyclables).**

- 3.3 The planned sizes are for a basic 140 litres size with optional larger 240 litres for families. A supply of additional recycling boxes will not now be required for glass as the new Ford MRF is to be a fully co-mingled sorting facility (please see later paragraphs for details).
- 3.4 SEMs agreed on the procurement process and financial strategy and confirmed the costs/benefits sharing arrangement.
- 3.5 Information on the quotations received for the vehicles and wheeled bins / boxes is set out at Annex A. (This information is exempt from publication under Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972).

#### **4.0 THE FORD MRF**

- 4.1 Members are aware that a new Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) is being provided at Ford as part of the development programme under the major Reclaim Contract let as part of the West Sussex Waste Management Partnership (the Partnership).
- 4.2 The final format of the MRF and in particular the range of materials that it should handle is currently under debate. The decision that it should be a co-mingled MRF to handle the full range of dry recyclables (including glass) has been the desire – an early agreement was achieved within the Partnership to this approach. However, the financial impact of inclusion of glass within this range of materials is unclear and has caused considerable investigation, assessment and debate.
- 4.3 Recently, it has been possible to reach agreement to this in principle. This does mean that all the 7 waste collection authorities have the option to include glass in their kerbside household collections. Whilst this is clearly the better option in terms of public participation and ease of use, it carries an additional price tag in the fees that will have to be paid for the sorting of the recyclables. It is this that has been the subject of much difficult and prolonged negotiation.
- 4.4 In so far as AWS is concerned the financial implications are potentially considerable (please see the Financial Implications section of this report for more details). However, this also affects others, especially Chichester and Horsham DCs and the Partnership has accepted that the sharing of the savings made from diverting the recyclables from landfill should be used to assist those authorities who are most affected.
- 4.5 The issue will be considered at the Inter Authority Waste Group (elected members) meeting on 21 February and the decision will be reported. It is expected that the decision will be to allow the total dry recycling to include glass. This assumption sets the parameters for the remainder of this report.

- 4.6 This impacts on the style of vehicles required (and therefore the costs). Your officers have designed a revised single service style to reflect the need to collect glass with other dry recyclables and details have been reported to the Members Working Group. All of the main features of the agreed style are there, just the type of collection vehicles have been changed.

## 5.0 THE PROCUREMENT PROCESS

### a) Vehicles

#### *i) Type and Numbers*

- 5.1 As previously agreed quotations for the supply of the new vehicles have been obtained through the Braintree Framework Contract arrangement. This is totally compliant with the European Procurement Regime and allows flexibility in the type and timing of new vehicle delivery.
- 5.2 The new service is to be provided in 4 phases, the first starting on 17 September 2007. In order to make best use of procurement experience, Worthing are the lead authority as it has staff with some experience of using Framework Contract procurement. There has been close liaison with AWS officers throughout the process.
- 5.3 The final specification for the AWS vehicles reflects the single service style and provides for two types of vehicle. The first is a twin pack vehicle with a vertically split body that will be used to collect residual waste for disposal and green waste for recycling, on a weekly basis – some 15 of these will be needed; the other is a traditional refuse vehicle (now that the Ford MRF will be totally co-mingled to include glass) to collect the co-mingled recyclables, on an alternate week basis – 9 of these are required.

#### *ii) Quotations Received/Assessment*

- 5.4 Quotations were received from the following companies (in alphabetical order):

Dennis Eagle Limited; Geesink Norba Group; Heil Europe Limited

The following is the value of the bids (full details will be available on a confidential basis for members at the meeting):

Tenders received for the refuse vehicles (in ascending order):

	<i>Chassis</i>	<i>Body</i>	<i>Bin lift</i>	
(i)	mixed manufacturers			£153,214
<b>(ii)</b>	<b>Dennis / Dennis / Terberg</b>			<b>£153,835</b>
(iii)	single manufacturer			£154,335
(iv)	mixed manufacturers			£154,513

Tenders received for the recycling vehicles (in ascending order):

	<i>Chassis</i>	<i>Body</i>	<i>Bin lift</i>	
<b>(i)</b>	<b>Dennis / Dennis / Terberg</b>			<b>£119,652</b>

(ii)	mixed manufacturers	£120,252
(iii)	single manufacturer	£120,402
(iv)	mixed manufacturers	£121,222
(v)	mixed manufacturers	£121,360
(vi)	mixed manufacturers	£122,330

(the tenders recommended for acceptance are shown in bold type)

All of these meet the basic specification required, but all vehicles will require an additional spend of approx. £3,000 for in-vehicle communication, enhanced safety markings and livery. In accordance with Standing Orders best practice only the lowest (potentially cheapest) 2 of each type were assessed in detail.

- 5.5 The bids were basically either using a chassis with a body made by two different manufacturers; or was a complete chassis and body from a single manufacturer. Both incorporated one of the specified lifting mechanisms.
- 5.6 Both configurations of vehicles would be able to undertake the intended tasks. There is recognition that the use of a matched chassis and body would be less likely to give rise to potential operational problems. This is because they are a proven match and have been used elsewhere to good effect. Adur has also used vehicles from that manufacturer for many years with most satisfactory performance.
- 5.7 It is possible that should there be operational problems with the configuration of mixed manufacturers, it could give rise to dispute as to which part of the vehicle (and which manufacturer) was the source of the problem. There are known to be locally reported problems with continued trivial electrical failures with the alternative chassis offered in the some of the mixed manufactures set-ups. There were driving/use trials of both configurations and the workforce preferred the single manufacturer vehicle due to its slightly smaller height and shorter length.
- 5.8 The cost of the single manufacturer vehicle for the twin pack (the bulk of the fleet) is £621 per vehicle more expensive, but it is felt on balance to be more advantageous when a longer term view is taken – it should pay dividends as the vehicles age and more stress is put on the operational parts as maintenance should be less and more easy. Over the life of the vehicle (estimated to be 7 years) this is felt by your officers to represent an overall lower cost. Members are reminded that whilst the twin pack style of vehicle is slightly more expensive, using this collection method reduces the total number of vehicles required by 3 – saving more than the marginal additional costs.
- 5.9 The final selection of the vehicle style is determined by the range of recyclables to be collected. With glass included in the dry recyclables then the less expensive style of a standard Refuse Collection Vehicle (RCV)) can be used for recycling. This has been factored into the revised estimated costs.

- 5.10 The quotations from Dennis Eagle Ltd for the single manufactured vehicles, both for the twin pack and the standard RCV are therefore recommended for acceptance. These are highlighted in bold type above.
- 5.11 Before the order is placed it is necessary to know what colour the vehicles are to be. It has already been specified that the AWS branding will be on the vehicles – this is being explored by the Working Group of Members established by SEMs (with joint membership) and the final form should be agreed shortly, following the submission of options from local designers.
- 5.12 It is understood that the members currently favour blue as the base colour and confirmation of this is sought. There are no financial implications of choosing this as the base colour.

## **b) Wheeled Bins/Boxes**

### ***i) Type, Numbers and Electronic Chipping***

- 5.13 The quotations for the wheeled-bins were obtained using electronic e-auction procurement. The auction was held on 30 November 2006 and hosted by East Devon DC, together with the South East Centre for Excellence (SECE). Some 14 authorities were party to the e-auction.
- 5.14 The question as to whether or not the wheeled-bins are to include an electronic chip needs to be addressed. Potential suppliers have given a price for this as an optional extra.
- 5.15 Much has been written in the national press about the use of chips. What is being considered for the wheeled-bins is a basic chip that will contain only a unique number that is set against the address where it was delivered (house location) and when. No other data will be on it.
- 5.16 The key to the range of information available is in the software that needs to be installed on the collection vehicle. This would be able to record when the bin was emptied and how much weight was in it. Without the software and modifications to the collection vehicle lifting gear, no such data can be collected.
- 5.17 However, it is suggested that due to the high cost, no software be installed in the vehicles at present. The proposed lifting gear will not have the ability to weigh bins, so the chips will be inactive. The reason for putting them in now is cost. Should the Government decide to press ahead with the proposals to charge for the collection of waste by weight, then some form of weighing and data collection will be needed. It is not known whether this will come to fruition, or if it does, what the timetable is for that scheme. It could be that this will be after the life of the new fleet (7 years), but within the life of the bins (10-15 years). The chips will then be needed.

- 5.18 To install a chip as a “retro-fit” will currently cost around 3 times that of installation at manufacture. That is likely to rise as bins have weathered over the years. The cost under the recent procurement is 65p per bin for fitted at supply.
- 5.19 Members are recommended to provide a chip in the new wheeled-bins at manufacture, but not to activate their use under the single service at this time. This will save money in the long term if chips do later become necessary.

**a) Residual Waste**

- 5.20 As previously explained to SEMs the service will be introduced over 4 phases. The Working Group has agreed that as each phase is “rolled” out it will be preceded by leaflet delivery seeking requests for larger containers where considered appropriate (followed by individual assessment) – each time this will be completed in advance of each phase. The Members Working Group has accepted that the 1<sup>st</sup> tranche will be in Worthing and the 2<sup>nd</sup> in Adur.
- 5.21 However, in an attempt to give some estimate of the likely numbers for each size, data on households and family sizes has been drawn from the 2001 Census (updated from local estimates as usual). This shows that only some 16% of households have 4 or more occupants. Only 6% have 5 or more.
- 5.22 The Working Group has received a detailed report on sizes and their suitability for various sizes of households. As a general rule the 140litres size equates to approx. 1 and one-half traditional dustbins and should hold at least 3 refuse bags making it large enough for households up to 4 people where collection is made on a weekly basis (providing that all recyclables are taken out).
- 5.23 Members are reminded that the main reason for selecting the 140litres size is to help promote better management of waste by householders. By using that size, the total capacity of the 2 wheeled-bins should be sufficient, but it is dependant on householders maximising the use of recycling to fit their residual waste in the other wheeled bin supplied. This will assist in meeting the Councils Performance targets for reducing the weight of waste collected per household.
- 5.24 The use of the wheeled-bins will be backed up with a no side waste policy for residual waste, further adding to the pressure on householders to manage their waste more considerately.
- 5.25 The Working Group has accepted that to assist householders there should be a protocol for the provision of larger wheeled-bins for residual waste. This will be:
- a) as a guideline provision will not normally be considered for households of less than 5 people; and
  - b) all requests will be determined by way of application and assessment.

A request for a larger wheeled-bin for recyclables will be agreed where need is demonstrated.

- 5.26 It is therefore likely that the total requirement for the 240litres containers for residual waste could be no more than 3,500 properties (7,000 wheeled-bins if also used for recycling) out of an estimated total of 58,000 properties (approx. 116,000 wheeled-bins after allowing for flats etc.). These figures will be used as a guideline for potential suppliers.
- 5.27 There is also a need for 5,000 (approx.) 660litres and/or 1100litres wheeled-bins for use to service flats.

#### **b) Recycling**

- 5.28 It is planned to use a 140litres wheeled-bin as the base to be supplied for the storage of the dry recyclables. Since it now seems that the new Ford MRF will include the handling of co-mingled glass it will be possible for householders to place bottles in the dry recyclables.
- 5.29 This is clearly the way to maximise householders participation as it clear and easy to understand and use – all dry recyclables can be placed in the same bin. It will mean that the further supply of recycling boxes will not be required.
- 5.30 Because of this the question as to whether the 140litres wheeled-bin will be sufficient to store 2 weeks of recyclables has been revisited. It is known that the national best performing authorities and locally those authorities that run an alternate week collection use the 240litres as a base size (Chichester and Arun do this).
- 5.31 There is a desire not to provide too large a container as this takes up more space for the householder (a comment made at many of the road shows held during the public consultation), but sufficient space is needed to last 2 weeks. It would be more expensive to provide 240litres bin by approx. £2 per household. As the 140litres is nearly 3 times the size of the existing recycling boxes this should be sufficient in the majority of cases.
- 5.32 Bearing in mind that a larger bin for recyclables will be made available upon demonstration of need, it is felt that the 140litres bin should be used as the base size.

#### ***ii) Quotations Received/Assessment***

5.33 From the results, it is clear that bids were keen and that the different size of wheeled-bins attracted more or less competition depending on their popularity. The following is a summary of the two best bids received for the 140 and 240 litres wheeled-bins (full details will be available on a confidential basis for members at the meeting): -

**Companies with Best Bids** (in alphabetical order)  
Craemer; Plastic Omnium

### Range of Bids (not attributed)

Bin Size	Bin Price	Delivery	E-Chip
140litres	£11.40	55p to £1.45	65p to £1.40
240litres	£13.40	55p to £1.45	65p to £1.40

- 5.34 The auction produced a list of “best” bids for each size of wheeled-bin and each individual authority has the option to choose from one of these based on its own requirements e.g. quality, track record, trading life, experience of direct delivery etc.
- 5.35 Most of the quotes were from well-known suppliers who have been in operation for many years. There were however, some companies less well known in the Great Britain market and one of these has provided the best quote for some wheeled-bins.
- 5.36 During the debate on the use of wheeled-bins, much was made of the need for the final provision to be of a high quality container. This was felt to be a key factor along with cost, with an active option being not to accept automatically the lowest quote unless the product quality standard was proven to be acceptable.
- 5.37 In order that a decision can be made on the “best” supplier it was necessary to ascertain:
- a) whether there is an extra charge for applying the AWS branding, identification nodes for the partially sighted, information sheet display, different coloured lids and what provision is made for householders to write their house numbers on bins;
  - b) a demonstration of the quality of the bins; and
  - c) the track record of delivering bins direct to households in large numbers and how they intend to do this for AWS.
- 5.38 The 2 potential best-price suppliers have been interviewed. The prices quoted here reflect the total cost including the items in 5.37 above. It should be noted that neither bidder offers an information display sheet attachment for the 140litres bins – permanent advisory stickers will be used. Other ad hoc leaflets will have to be delivered to householders.
- 5.39 To check the quality of the bins on offer, it had been hoped to use a laboratory in Yorkshire to run tests. Unfortunately, they no longer offer this service and the nearest independent testing facility is now in France. In fact it is that facility that is used by most of the manufacturers and they can supply certificates showing the results of the testing of their respective products.
- 5.40 With the support of the Working Group the “best” price bidders were required to supply the backup quality testing certificates. They have also provided samples of the wheeled-bins for inspection and basic assessment. An example of a 140litres and a 240litres wheeled bin from the recommended supplier will be available at the meeting.

- 5.41 It is recommended that the quotation from Craemer at a cost of £11.95 for 140litres wheeled-bins; £13.95 for the 240litres wheeled-bins (delivered to households) be accepted. If the bins are to be chipped then an additional 65p per bin needs to be added.
- 5.42 The situation regarding larger bulk bins (660litres and 1100litres) is still being explored, but it is hoped to secure a price from the recommended supplier of the 140 and 240litres bins. A verbal report will be made at the meeting.

## 6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

### a) Vehicles

- 6.1 Due to the lead in time for the delivery of vehicles, orders for those for the first phase will have to be placed during the current financial year. Capital budget provision has been made from 2007/08 onwards.
- 6.2 Taking into account the inclusion of glass in the dry recyclables, the following table shows the comparison of the original estimate of cost for vehicles with the recommended supplier costs.

Vehicle Type	Estimated Cost		Original budget	Recommended Supplier Cost (including communication equipment)		Revised budget	Variance Total
	£000 per vehicle	No.	£'000	£000 per vehicle	No.	£'000	£000
Twin Pack	133.0	15	1,995	157	15	2,355	360
Standard RCV	136.5	8	1,092	123	9	1,107	15
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>23</b>	<b>3,087</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>3,462</b>	<b>375</b>

- 6.3 As can be seen the costs are higher than estimated and a revised budget of £3.462m (compared to £3.087m) an increase of around £375,000 is required for vehicles.

### b) Wheeled Bins

- 6.4 The following table shows the comparison of the original estimate of cost for wheeled-bins with the recommended supplier costs: -

Container Type	Estimated Cost delivered		Original budget	Recommended Supplier Cost Delivered (excluding any chips)		Revised budget	Variance Total
	£ per bin	No.k	£'000	£ per bin	No.k	£'000	£000
140litres	20	108.3	2,166	11.95	120	1,434	-732
240litres	20	7	140	13.95	7	97.65	-42.35
1100litres	150	2.3	345	not yet known	5	345	0
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>2,651</b>			<b>1,876.65</b>	<b>-774.35</b>

- 6.5 As can be seen the costs are lower than estimated and a revised budget of approximately £1.88m (compared to £2.651m) is required for wheeled bins. This should produce an increased saving of at least £770,000 which more than sufficient to offset the increased vehicle costs.
- 6.6 Adding electronic chips to the bins will cost an additional £83,000, which can be accommodated within the overall budget.

### c) Ford MRF

6.6 As mentioned earlier there is a financial impact from the construction and use of the new MRF. In fact some of this impact has been felt since the closure of the Sompting Waste Complex (Halewick Lane Waste Transfer and MRF). This is because the recyclables are being bulked and diverted to an out of County sorting facility – this has increased processing costs and reduced income.

6.7 The impact of the new Ford MRF can be seen as 3 separate elements all based on tonnage: -

**Expenditure:** Fees for use of Ford (handling, management and gate fees)

**Income:** Value of from the sale of recovered materials (share as set out in the Memorandum Of Understanding) and Recycling Credits for diversion from landfill

6.8 The expenditure is obviously related to the costs of running the MRF and the sorting process. There is currently an estimate of this based on predicted tonnages from the Partnership (over £50 per tonne), which is calculated on accepted principles. This shows a considerable increase in the average fee that had been applied compared to the Halewick Lane operation (£12.55 per tonne) – due to construction costs, more complex sorting (totally co-mingled with glass). It does however, represent investment in the future, as the MRF should operate for at least 25 years and it will allow higher tonnages to be recovered for recycling. Due to the delays in deciding on the glass issue it now seems unlikely that the Ford MRF will open before Autumn 2008.

6.9 The income is much more difficult to predict with accuracy. The Reclaim contractor believes that the market for individual commodities will be sustained. There will be fluctuations in value of these due to market forces (as there has always been) and currently it is estimated that the value of paper will be reduced by about £10 per tonne when coming from a “glass” MRF. This could easily change as the demand for recovered paper increases when the planned new processing plants come into operation in coming years.

- 6.10 There has also been difficult negotiation on the level of the recycling credits. However, an arrangement has now been agreed to settle the short-term situation as reported as part of the budget considerations. In essence the County is to underwrite the recycling credit and guarantee a level of income for both 2006/7 and 2007/8. The longer term is under review and proposals are being discussed to introduce a fairer way to distribute credits within the Partnership.
- 6.11 This is evidenced by the recent agreement to direct more assistance to those authorities that are feeling the greater impact of the closure of Halewick Lane. There is as yet no agreement on how much this will be, or for how long it apply and consequently, it is not possible to estimate the impact of this on the overall costs.
- 6.12 It is important to note that the cost of disposal will increase sharply in the next few years as new contracts are let and more stringent controls are introduced. This will increase the value of the recycling credits. It is also important to understand that the new Ford MRF costs will apply whatever service is operated, so it is important to maximise the savings on collection to help off set some of these increases.

#### **d) Overall Impact**

- 6.13 Whilst, your officers have a clear estimate of the majority of costs associated with the new service, there is still no clarity about the future costs and income associated with the new Ford MRF. Where possible the costs have now been revised by taking into account the results of the procurement of wheeled bins and vehicles. However, since the costs of using the new Ford MRF are not yet known, it is not possible to put together a complete revised estimate of cost.
- 6.14 Discussions are continuing with the County Council but for the time being there is no option but to assume the current arrangement runs on. This will mean that as recycling increases under the single service, the previously expected rise in recycling credits receipts may not happen. The recent development raises some hopes that some increased payment will accrue, but the extent of this is still being negotiated. For 2007/8 the County Council have given an undertaking to reduce the impact of Halewick Lane closing. From the start of our new service in 2008/9 there is a potential risk that there could be a joint loss in income of up to maximum of £280,000 in a full year. The current negotiations are addressing this issue.
- 6.15 Members are reminded that the 'buying/owning' authority (Worthing) will pay for the vehicles/bins in the first instances and Adur (as the sharing authority) will reimburse its share of the capital cost on payment.
- 6.16 In addition a repairs and maintenance fund is to be created to fund the future expenses associated with the long-term operation of these vehicles.

6.17 Whilst it is not ideal, members are asked to accept the assurances from the County Council to provide some increased share of the recycling credits in order to reduce the impact of the changed MRF arrangements. We will also have the benefit of some collection savings.

## **7.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 Due to the importance of these arrangements to the AWS project and the significant amount of finance being put into the new service by both Councils, a formal legal agreement has been drawn up to set out the obligations of each Council arising from the procurement of the vehicles and equipment.

## **8.0 CONCLUSIONS**

8.1 Implementation of the new refuse and recycling arrangements, and the development of remaining AWS services is an extremely complex project.

8.2 The procurement of the vehicles and other equipment has shown a satisfactory result.

8.3 The financial arrangement between the two Councils has been formalised.

8.4 The size of wheeled bins to be supplied should now be confirmed by SEMs with the supply of larger bins to households for residual waste being on the basis set out in this report.

8.5 The procurement of the vehicles should continue as outlined and the base colour needs to be confirmed.

8.6 The programme for vehicle acquisition is dependant on the “roll out” phases and the condition of the existing vehicles and how soon they become unusable. However, proper budget provision has been made for an “expected” programme by both Councils, including setting aside funds for future maintenance.

8.7 The revised financial circumstances make the provision of a formal revised estimate impossible to produce at this stage. These will be prepared as more details of the financial arrangement with the County Council emerge. However, members should be aware that there may be additional costs as a result of moving to the new Ford MRF.

**Ian Lowrie**

Chief Executive, Adur  
Interim Chief Executive, Worthing

**Principal Author**

Les Mockford, Head of Policy, AWS Tele: 01273 263054

**Background Papers**

Reports to SEMS – 21 September 2006 and 13 November 2006

European Procurement Directive

AWS Offices  
Commerce Way  
Lancing Business Park  
West Sussex BN15 8TA

LM. 20/02/07

## **APPENDIX A**

### **1.0 Council Priority**

- 1.1 Promoting a cleaner, greener, safe Adur. Improving recycling rates and reduce levels of waste collected.

### **2.0 Specific Targets**

- 2.1 Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of waste management and seek to meet government recycling targets. Improve services people want through better consultation and improved customer involvement.
- 2.2 Move towards the Government recycling target of 30%.

### **3.0 Sustainability Issues**

- 3.1 Matters considered and no issues identified.

### **4.0 Equality Issues**

- 4.1 Matters considered and no issues identified.

### **5.0 Community Safety issues (Section 17)**

- 5.1 Matters considered and no issues identified.

### **6.0 Human Rights Issues**

- 6.1 Matters considered and no issues identified.

### **7.0 Financial Implications**

- 7.1 Matters identified within the report.

### **8.0 Legal Implications**

- 8.1 Matters identified within the report.

### **9.0 Consultations**

- 9.1 Matters identified within the report.

### **10.0 Risk assessment**

- 10.1 Matters identified within the report.

## **11.0 Health & Safety Issues**

11.1 Considered but no direct matters identified.

## **12.0 Procurement Strategy**

12.1 The proposals within this report reflect the approach to be taken under the agreed Procurement Strategy.

## **13.0 Partnership Working**

13.1 The report is prepared on behalf of the AWS Partnership.