

Councillor Questions and Answers

Pūroro Waihanga | Infrastructure Committee meeting of 9 December 2021

The following questions were received from Councillors regarding items on the agenda of the Pūroro Waihanga | Infrastructure Committee meeting of 9 December 2021.

Item 2.1 Priority Investment Quarterly Report

Can we get further clarification on the difference between Amber and Red? It seems like there is some middle ground between these which is not covered, where there will be cost/schedule overruns but these are not major issues? As an example, can we get clarification about why St James Theatre is rated as Amber and not Red given that there are both cost and schedule overruns associated with that project?

We have defined project tolerances that determine the RAG per each of the project parameters – Budget, Schedule, Scope, Risks, Issues, Benefits and Resources. We also have an Overall RAG which is calculated by the combination of RAGs generated per parameter. Projects are also able to set their own tolerance levels at the start of the project through the appropriate project governance.

Red (trouble): Project is at risk to miss a scheduled completion date, may be over budget or out of scope. Immediate management attention is required as resolution is beyond the scope of the project manager

Amber (danger): Project may be at risk and have missed some targets but overall, the team can still bring the project to completion within the currently approved tolerances. May need management attention to resolve.

Green (all good): Project is on track to meet scheduled dates and the project manager and team have everything under control

Schedule overrun - St James

Projects are inherently risky and are subject to a lot of change in order to manage that risk. Once changes are formally agreed on projects by the relevant decision-makers, the project is re-baselined and will report the new current status against the new baseline. For St James, the project schedule has overrun against the original timeline, but a new project completion date has been agreed (May 2022) and so the project is re-baselined, and the new agreed date becomes the project completion date that we track against. If there is 100% confidence in delivering to the new baseline date, then the project status would return to green. If there is still some residual risk, then we would return to Amber to ensure we are closely monitoring the situation.

Cost overrun - St James

The Current cost overrun is projected as \$1.6M against the agreed baselined budget of \$40.6m, reflecting a projected end cost of \$42.3m (rounding). This is an expected project cost overrun of 4% of the baselined budget, which is within the tolerance range of Amber.

Item 2.2 Earthquake prone buildings programme update

Could we add an amendment to write to Minister Poto Williams sharing the results of the survey and our concerns about the risks related to the Government's current policy and timetable?

Yes, this amendment can be added.

Was a late response analysis done on the survey responses to give some indication as to what the non-response bias might be? If not, can a late response analysis be completed please.

A late response analysis has not been completed. As detailed in the committee report, officers will continue engagement and attempt surveys with owners who did not respond to the survey during this first phase. The focus of the second phase will be on those whose notices are expiring between now and 2027. A late response analysis could be completed after this second phase and be included in the report back to the committee in June 2022.

Item 2.3 Strategic Waste Planning Review

Just for clarity. One of the amendments made October 14th was that the residual waste decision and the new roadmap plan would be in consultation at the same time. My read of this paper is saying this won't happen.

Also, that we were to bring a budget bid for the 22/23 annual plan - to progress the plan. This is also not clear if this will happen?

Yes, you are right in your reading of this. In terms of consulting on both the residual waste decision and the strategic roadmap there are a couple of reasons why this won't be possible:

- We need to consult on the residual waste decision as part of the annual plan process if we are going to have any chance of meeting the 2026 deadline for resource consent on the landfill. We have established the working party to assist with this decision making and the team are working extremely hard to meet the compressed timeframes whilst ensuring the working party has sufficient input into the process.
- The Strategic Waste Roadmap has to be positioned within the overall process for development of the next Waste Management and Minimisation Plan as this is the operative waste management plan that the Council has adopted in accordance with the statutory requirements of the Waste Minimisation Act. The report outlines how we will approach the development of the next WMMP by using the Strategic Waste Roadmap as a key input. We will be collaborating and co-designing this next iteration of planning but we cannot do that within the time constraints of this coming annual plan which requires all consultation material to be issued by the end of February 2022.

In terms of financial implications, we have sufficient allocation in the 22/23 year to progress the waste minimisation programme initiatives outlined in the paper – Table 2.

Is it possible to have an update on the resolutions made on October 14 and what this paper is proposing next to the resolutions?

Updates on resolutions can be found in the Action Tracking paper.

Is it also possible to understand what the timeline is for the residual waste consultation?

Three workshops with the Residual waste Working Party – first one was held on 18 November, workshop 2 is 14 December and the third workshop will be held in January. We will take the input from these workshops into our analysis of options to derive a preferred option and this is what we will consult on as part of the Annual Plan process.

Can we please have as part of this the report / or an update on the Organic trial that should have now concluded in Miramar. From what I can see the paper doesn't mention it, and this has been a focus of Council work that we have (long) been waiting for. I don't think it looks good for Council that it hasn't been included as it was a trial to inform how we progress organics.

The trial is actually still ongoing, as we have had some COVID delays for some of the activities that we needed to complete before we could conclude the trial, mostly the final waste audit, where the auditor is based in Auckland. We also are about to complete a survey of trial participants, and we wanted collections to continue while we wrapped up this part of the process.

We also looking at whether there are any user pay options that we could offer participants when the WCC trial wraps up – we're in discussions with KaiCycle about this, but we need the results of the survey to gauge interest to see if KaiCycle can manage the number of households (noting EnviroWaste has declined to offer a user pays service). One of the questions in the survey is around a willingness to pay, so we need the results first. We wanted to keep the collection trial going until we knew whether or not we had an alternative to offer participants rather than just stopping.

Timelines

What is the reason for not being able to achieve the process with community by April?

First and foremost, the need for an extended timeframe is necessary to allow time for effective co-design and collaboration with stakeholders. The proposed timeframe will allow stakeholders time to consider the implications of the planned strategic waste projects and assess the implications for the scope of the desired waste minimisation projects to be included in the next WMMP. Relatedly, community groups will likely want to review the findings of the Regional Waste Assessment, to ensure the scope of our next generation of waste minimisation initiatives effectively addresses any key issues raised in the assessment findings.

Is it because we are not resourced enough?

As noted above, the primary reason for the alternative proposed timeline is the planning and review cycle, and the need to consider the outputs of the planned review and business case development which will inform the development of the next Wellington City Council WMMP Action Plan.

Have we considered that mana whenua may need to be resourced to be able to prioritise being part of the engagement group?

Officers are aware that our Iwi partners face resourcing challenges, which limit their ability engage with the Council's waste-related projects and we are working to address this.

Is more resource needed to speed the process up? Will this be put into the AP process?

Over the past 6 months officers have taken steps to increase the level of resourcing to increase our capacity to deliver strategic waste planning and related projects. At this stage, additional resourcing is anticipated to be placed by the end of February 2022. As such, no additional resourcing will be required as part of the AP process.

Regional Waste management and Minimisation Plan Committee.

Is it statutory that we follow the current plan?

In accordance with legislative requirements, a territorial authority is required to establish a WMMP in accordance with the Special Consultative Procedure, which ensures an inclusive and democratic plan making process. The purpose of the WMMP, is to specify the objectives, policies, and methods for achieving effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within the territorial authority's district. Due to the public process which informs the development of a WMMP, it is considered best practice for a TA to work in alignment with an adopted WMMP. Legislation further mandates that any waste levy money spent to promote or achieve waste minimisation, must be done so in accordance with its waste management and minimisation plan.

What analysis has been done from a climate emissions reduction lens and an alignment to Te Atakura goals on the benefits or barriers of remaining /not remaining part of the regional committee?

No analysis has been undertaken, as such an assessment would need to be informed by the detailed scope of a revised individual TA WMMP.

Will WCC be able to be as aspirational with it's WMMP if we are working with the region?

This would depend on the scope of the WMMP, and the level of agreement for such aspiration by other territorial authorities in the Region. However, Wellington City Council's waste minimisation actions can be ambitious regardless of any agreed regional targets.

How much of the workload would WCC say it is contributing to the workload and resource to the regional plan at the moment?

WCC is currently project managing the implementation of the National Waste Data Framework through the establishment of Waste Operator Licensing. An officer from Wellington City Council is also co-chair of the Regional WMMP Officer Steering Group.

Have we considered recommending funding from each council to the committee to give it more resource?

Councils already commit funding to support to the implementation of the existing WMMP, which is fully committed over the coming 18 months. The scope of funding required in the future will vary relative to any shared regional actions mutually agreed by Territorial Authorities.

Would officers say the current plan has/ will be effective in the goal of minimising waste?

The Regional Waste Assessment in 2022 will provide an overall measure of WMMP effectiveness.

How much waste has Wellington City reduced from landfill since the inception of the WMMP?

Since the implementation of the WMMP in 2017, landfill waste tonnages have remained relatively consistent despite ongoing population increases. An overview of the varying municipal waste tonnages (excluding asbestos and contaminated soil) that have been received by the Southern Landfill since 2017, are as follows:

Year	Landfill Tonnage
2017	82,000
2018	81,500
2019	79,600
2020	74,500*
2021	79,900

* Level 4 lockdown will have contributed to this tonnage drop

How much time/ emissions reduction/ waste minimisation would we be able to achieve if we went on our own compared to what we would achieve if we stick to the regional plan?

This would remain subject to the scope of any new WCC WMMP, and the scope of any subsequent co-development Regional WMMP.

How Different is the current ambition of WCC to minimise waste to the other regional councils?

This remains unknown at this point in time.

Sludge removal

Is there a timeline for this available yet as there was a discrepancy on dates of implementation at the last Oct 14th meeting?

Current programme for sludge sees plant in operation by March 2026

How will dates on this fit in with the timeline in this document and the next WMMP?

The Sludge project is not dependent on the WMMP timelines.

Kerbside Recycling review

What is the estimated Waste reduction Improvement of the kerbside recycling review?

This work remains underway and is scheduled to be reported to the Infrastructure Committee on 23rd February 2022. As part of this work, various waste servicing models will be presented, with their corresponding diversion potential.

What are the desired outcomes?

The objectives of the kerbside review modelling work that is currently underway, is to develop a suite of potential kerbside servicing options for Council consideration, which will:

- i) Significantly reduce household and commercial waste within Wellington City, while providing value for money for ratepayers.
- ii) Address the diverse commercial and residential waste-related kerbside servicing needs of stakeholders in a fair and equitable manner.
- iii) Support operational efficiency for the Council.
- iv) Promote the health and safety of both waste service providers and users.

Is there any evidence from other councils that waste minimisation is an outcome of this type of review?

Yes. We know that the type kerbside waste servicing system (including the level of service provided and the scope of supporting regulation) has the potential to affect the potential level of waste diversion associated with that service.

If it does have a potential impact, should it be part of table 1?

At this stage, officers believe our City's kerbside diversion potential is likely to overlap with the potential areas of waste reduction already listed in Table 1 (e.g. Organics removal from waste, and a reduction of potentially divertible materials within the waste stream that will be associated with behaviour change, including regulation).

As well as being a review of private operations will there be a review of bringing services back in house?

Yes, the kerbside servicing options considered will cover the full breath of the theoretical waste servicing models, including the consideration of:

- o Status Quo and User pays waste servicing
- o Rates Funded waste-related servicing, and
- o Privatised Collection Services (involving Council exit from service provision).

Engagement

Does this mean that we will be going out for consultation on residual waste options without a waste minimisation strategy alongside it as requested in the resolutions October 14?

As indicated by the previous answer, the Strategic Waste Roadmap has to be positioned within the overall process for development of the next Waste Management and Minimisation Plan as this is the operative waste management plan that we are obliged to follow within the statutory requirements of the Waste Minimisation Act. The report outlines how we will approach the development of the next WMMP by using the Strategic Waste Roadmap as a key input. We will be collaborating and co-designing this next iteration of planning but we cannot do that within the time constraints of this coming annual plan which requires all consultation material to be issued by the end of February 2022.

If yes- how will this be dealt with questions from the community?

We will position the Strategic Waste Roadmap within the context of the residual waste options.

Waste reduction action

What is the proposed action and planned waste reduction over the next 2 years while we wait for the next WMMP?

Refer table 2 of the report which outlines the Project delivery timelines – we will be co-designing a suite of initiatives to inform the next draft WMMP Action plan. This will be brought back to Council in October 2022. We will also be conducting the kerbside waste review, developing the business case for resource recovery and investigating organic waste processing options in parallel with this work.

Annual plan 2019/20

In the last annual plan - there was a resolution moved by Councillor Fitzsimons and me for a % of the profit to be given to waste minimisation projects or to the waste minimisation seed fund.

I don't think we've had an official response on what happened to this resolution so please could we have this? What is the correct process for this to go through?

We are looking into this now. It should be noted that officers recently established an organic waste diversion fund, valued at \$100,000 per year to one application in 2022 for three years which will be funded through waste levy money.

Cr Foon requested 2% price increase added to year 1 of LTP which was implemented. This 2% was for extra funds to be generated towards waste minimisation initiatives. We have budgeted \$185k from year 2.

Will full Council insourcing of Kerbside Waste Services be considered as an option in the review coming to Council on 23 February 2022? If not, why not?

Yes.

When will we receive a report back on the Organic Waste Trial in Miramar and how will those results be used to influence further Organic Waste Processing Investigations?

A findings report, which integrates kerbside trial audit data and participant survey findings, will be progressed once officer resourcing is in place after February 2022. The findings report will provide an input an investigation into organic processing technology options and end markets, which is scheduled to be progressed in 2022.

Item 2.5 Forward Programme

Why is the Island Bay Traffic Resolution coming to Infrastructure Committee on 23 March 2022 when Planning and Environment Committee hold the delegation for major traffic resolutions?

This is an error and will be updated – the Island Bay Traffic Resolution is planned for a P&E Committee meeting in March.