
ORDINARY MEETING

OF

WELLINGTON REGION WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MINIMISATION PLAN HEARINGS SUBCOMMITTEE

AGENDA

Time: 10:45 am
Date: Tuesday, 6 June 2017
Venue: Committee Room 1
Ground Floor, Council Offices
101 Wakefield Street
Wellington

MEMBERSHIP

Councillor Calvi-Freeman
Councillor Day
Councillor Gilberd
Councillor Lee
Mayor Lester
Councillor Pannett (Chair)
Councillor Sparrow

Have your say!

You can make a short presentation to the Councillors at this meeting. Please let us know by noon the working day before the meeting. You can do this either by phoning 803-8334, emailing public.participation@wcc.govt.nz or writing to Democratic Services, Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington, giving your name, phone number and the issue you would like to talk about.

AREA OF FOCUS

The Draft Waste Minimisation and Management Plan (WMMP) Hearings Subcommittee is responsible for sitting in on the draft WMMP oral hearings. The subcommittee will then (if necessary) make recommendations to the City Strategy Committee to amend the Wellington City Council Local action plan; and make further recommendations for the committee to consider with respect to the regional actions.

If/when approved, recommendations relating to local actions will result in the plan being updated accordingly. Recommendations pertaining to the regional actions would then be passed to the Regional WMMP Joint Governance Committee for further consideration alongside any other recommendations from the region's Territorial Authorities.

Quorum: 3 members

**TABLE OF CONTENTS
6 JUNE 2017**

Business	Page No.
1. Meeting Conduct	5
1.1 Apologies	5
1.2 Conflict of Interest Declarations	5
1.3 Confirmation of Minutes	5
1.4 Public Participation	5
1.5 Items not on the Agenda	5
2. General Business	7
2.1 Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017- 2023 Oral Hearings paper	7

1 Meeting Conduct

1.1 Apologies

The Chairperson invites notice from members of apologies, including apologies for lateness and early departure from the meeting, where leave of absence has not previously been granted.

1.2 Conflict of Interest Declarations

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

1.3 Confirmation of Minutes

1.4 Public Participation

A maximum of 60 minutes is set aside for public participation at the commencement of any meeting of the Council or committee that is open to the public. Under Standing Order 3.23.3 a written, oral or electronic application to address the meeting setting forth the subject, is required to be lodged with the Chief Executive by 12.00 noon of the working day prior to the meeting concerned, and subsequently approved by the Chairperson.

1.5 Items not on the Agenda

The Chairperson will give notice of items not on the agenda as follows:

Matters Requiring Urgent Attention as Determined by Resolution of the Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan Hearings Subcommittee.

1. The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
2. The reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

Minor Matters relating to the General Business of the Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan Hearings Subcommittee.

No resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer it to a subsequent meeting of the Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan Hearings Subcommittee for further discussion.

2. General Business

DRAFT WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MINIMISATION PLAN 2017-2023 ORAL HEARINGS PAPER

Purpose

1. To provide a copy of the submissions and a list of submitters making oral submissions in support of their written submissions on the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP) 2017-2023.

Summary

2. On 13 April 2017 the City Strategy Committee agreed to consult with public on the Draft WMMP. Consultation ran from Tuesday 18 April to Friday 19 May 2017.
3. On 13 April 2017 the City Strategy Committee also agreed to establish a subcommittee to review submissions and hear oral submissions on the Draft WMMP.
4. In total, one hundred and nine submissions were received with nineteen submitters indicating that they wished to be heard. A schedule of submitters wishing to be heard has been attached along with their submissions.

Recommendations

That the Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan Hearings Subcommittee:

1. Receive the information and thank submitters for taking the time to submit and present today.

Attachments

Attachment 1. WMMP Oral Submissions

Page 8

Author	Roderick Boys, Resource Recovery Manager
Authoriser	Adrian Mitchell, Manager, City Operations Geoff Swainson, Manager Transport and Waste Operations David Chick, Chief City Planner

**WELLINGTON REGION WASTE
MANAGEMENT AND MINIMISATION PLAN
HEARINGS SUBCOMMITTEE
6 JUNE 2017**

Draft Waste Minimisation and Management Plan Hearings Subcommittee –
Hearing Schedule

TIME	NAME	ORGANISATION	SUBMISSION #	PAGE #
10.45AM	Robyn Parkinson	Tawa Community Board	78	28
10.55AM	Donna Sherlock	Trustee on behalf of Porirua Harbour Catchment Trust	93	50
11.05AM	Maria van der Meel	The City is Ours	37	2
11.15AM	Hannah Blumhardt		91	39
11.20AM	Jack Marshall	Youth Council	101	55
11.30AM	BUFFER - 5 MIN			
11.35AM	Jess Ducey	Inner City Wellington	92	45
11.45AM	Nada Piatek	Sustainability Trust	56	23
11.55AM	David Ahern	Hydro Waste Recycling NZ Ltd	104	77
12.05PM	LUNCH – 1 HOUR			
1.00PM	Steph Beath	Megavision Ltd t/a Poly Palace	103	70
1.10PM	Te Kawa Robb	Pare Kore	102	62
1.20PM	Sharon Humphreys	PAC.NZ	111	96
1.30PM	Hamish Sisson	Interwaste	46	7
1.40PM	Bernard O'Shaughnessy		54	19

Submitter Details

First Name: **Maria**
Last Name: **van der Meel**
Organisation: **The City is Ours**
Street: **Flat 2, 20 Trent Street**
Suburb: **Island Bay**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6023**
Daytime Phone: **3834993**
Mobile: **027-3226311**
eMail: **leftmyhusband@yahoo.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

Age:

- under 18
 18-29
 30-44
 45-60
 over 60

Gender:

- Male
 Female
 Gender diverse
 Prefer not to say

First time submitting?

- Yes
 No

Proposed primary regional target

Do you support the following target?

Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next ten years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent

to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum by 2026.

- Yes
- No

Proposed regional actions

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

Regional bylaw

Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively.

- Yes
- No

Waste Data Framework

Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals.

- Yes
- No

Engagement and education

Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education.

- Yes
- No

Kerbside collections

Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities.

- Yes
- No

Resource recovery network

Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (*sewage sludge*), and other organic waste.

- Yes

No

Biosolids

Collaborating on options to use biosolids (*sewage sludge*) beneficially.

Yes

No

Shared governance and services

Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region.

Yes

No

Regional resources

Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (*WMMP*), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next *WMMP*, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives.

Yes

No

Working collaboratively

Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (*i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers*).

Yes

No

Lobbying and advocacy

Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life.

Yes

No

Proposed local actions

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (*found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan*)?

- Yes
- No

Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what would you like to see?

Re-engage with a local supplier and assist his compliance for the facilities that used to produce our Wellington City Council rubbish bags when the contract is up for renewal.

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (*pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP*) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as a resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

- Yes
- No

37

Maybe, I need more information

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system? e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

Yes

No

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

Comments

Attached Documents

File
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 2017

Submitter Details

First Name: **Hamish**
Last Name: **Sisson**
Organisation: **Interwaste**
Street: **PO Box 50475**
Suburb: **Porirua**
City: **Porirua**
Country:
PostCode: **5240**
Daytime Phone: **042379687**
Mobile: **0212225493**
eMail: **hamish@interwaste.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

Age:

- under 18
 18-29
 30-44
 45-60
 over 60

Gender:

- Male
 Female
 Gender diverse
 Prefer not to say

First time submitting?

- Yes
 No

Proposed primary regional target

Do you support the following target?

Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next ten years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent to

to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum by 2026.

- Yes
- No

Proposed regional actions

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

Regional bylaw

Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively.

- Yes
- No

Waste Data Framework

Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals.

- Yes
- No

Engagement and education

Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education.

- Yes
- No

Kerbside collections

Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities.

- Yes
- No

Resource recovery network

Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (*sewage sludge*), and other organic waste.

- Yes

No

Biosolids

Collaborating on options to use biosolids (*sewage sludge*) beneficially.

Yes
 No

Shared governance and services

Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region.

Yes
 No

Regional resources

Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (*WMMP*), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next *WMMP*, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives.

Yes
 No

Working collaboratively

Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (*i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers*).

Yes
 No

Lobbying and advocacy

Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life.

Yes
 No

Proposed local actions

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (*found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan*)?

- Yes
- No

Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what would you like to see?
Please refer to enclosed written submission

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (*pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP*) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as a resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?
Refer attached written submission

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

- Yes
- No

46

Maybe, I need more information

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system? e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

Yes

No

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

Comments

Attached Documents

File
Wellington region WMP submission May 2017
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 2017



International Waste Limited
12 Broken Hill Road, Porirua, Wellington 5240
Tel (04) 237 6982 Fax (04) 237 4695 Email: info@interwaste.co.nz
www.interwaste.co.nz

28 April 2017

Porirua City Council South Wairarapa District Council Kapiti Coast District Council Masterton District Council

Wellington City Council

WELLINGTON REGION WASTE MANAGEMENT and MINIMISATION PLAN 2017 - 2023

Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission on the Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimization Plan 2017 – 2023 (the Plan).

International Waste Limited, trading as Interwaste, is New Zealand's only nationwide provider of waste collection, treatment and disposal services to the quarantine and medical waste sectors. Interwaste specializes in this sector and also providing a number of recycling initiatives including recycling dental amalgam, CFLs and fluorescent tubes.

Interwaste provides its services throughout the region and as such is one of the few waste companies that operates in each of the councils' jurisdictions.

Interwaste is fully supportive of the primary regional waste minimization target of reducing the total quantity of waste sent to class 1 landfills from 600 kilograms per person per annum to 400 kilograms per person by 2026. However, Interwaste would challenge the councils in the region to lower the target and make it a more aspirational target such as 300 kilograms per person per annum by 2026.

In general terms Interwaste is also generally supportive of the regional actions identified such as:

- Developing and implementing consistent solid waste bylaws;
- Working together to deliver more consistent and effective forms of regional communication and education;
- Facilitating local councils to determine and optimize collection services and maximize diversion;
- Investigate and if feasible develop a region-wide resource recovery network;
- Collaboration with other organizations on research etc on waste management issues.

There are a number of important waste management trends which the Plan does not address. It is possible that the councils may intend that these issues are dealt with in the proposed solid waste bylaws or as part of the action plans. However, these matters have significant health and safety impacts and as such they should be referred to specifically in either the action plans or the Plan.

The issues which we do not consider are adequately addressed in either the Plan or the

action plans involve the correct disposal of:

- Household Medical Waste;
- Sharps – syringes;
- Pharmaceuticals;
- Mercury, particularly mercury contained in fluorescent tubes and dental amalgam; and
- Sanitary waste.

We also consider that further discussion is required on the level of gate fees and/or waste levies. These are important tools available to the councils to change waste diversion behaviours.

Household Medical Waste

The volume of home healthcare waste currently being generated is considerable and growing. Historically this waste was correctly segregated and collected through DHBs and treated by 3rd party processors due to the patients being treated in hospitals or primary healthcare facilities. However, when this medical waste is generated in the home, the present practice is to dispose of the medical waste in the general refuse.

Interestingly, the patient environment does not change the volume of medical waste generated and based on United States studies a patient in a primary care facility generates about 2-3kgs of medical waste per day.

The current practice of disposing of home healthcare waste through the general waste stream presents considerable health and safety risks through exposing a considerable number of other people in the waste industry (such as staff at transfer stations) to the potentially contaminated medical waste. This practice is also not in accordance with the requirements of The New Zealand Standard for Management of Healthcare Waste 4304:2002 (NZS 4304).

NZS 4304 classifies this type of household medical waste as either infectious waste or controlled waste. The purpose of classifying this type of waste as either infectious waste or controlled waste is to keep such waste out of the general waste stream. This is achieved by NZS 4304 requiring that, among other things, the waste is segregated, correctly identified and stored and contained in suitable containers and therefore treated appropriately by staff in the waste stream and ultimately disposed of correctly. This is to avoid contamination of staff and others in the waste supply chain and ensure appropriate treatment and disposal as required.

The majority of general refuse now passes through a transfer station or recycling facility prior to going to landfill for final disposal. With the medical waste generated in the home not being clearly identified as either infectious or controlled waste (both of which have special treatment and/or disposal methodologies) this waste poses a significant risk to transfer station staff during the segregation of the waste for recycling.

Medical waste generated by homebased healthcare is likely to increase over time as the current trend among medical professionals is to reduce the period of stay of patients in Hospitals and primary care facilities and have patients treated at home.

The councils need to start enforcing correct segregation to protect employees in the waste environment and ensure proper disposal methods are used.

Recommendation:

- Education of the public on the need to effectively segregate;
- Implementation of an appropriate home healthcare collection scheme through DHBs;
- Implementation of bylaws prohibiting generators of this type of waste from disposing of this type of waste to landfill other than in accordance with NZS 4304;
- Better enforcement of compliance with the consent obligations on existing landfills which prohibit this type of waste being disposed of at the general landfill other than in accordance with NZS 4304;
- Better resourcing of enforcement of proposed prohibition.

Sharps

The issue of sharps appearing in the general waste and recycling streams and endangering council staff who work at these facilities is an ongoing one.

Although the occurrence of needle stick injuries amongst staff members at waste transfer stations or recycling facilities is low to medium in frequency the risk of serious infection from a needle stick injury is high.

In 2016 a worker at the transfer station in Taranaki was injured twice with a needle stick injury¹ In Southland needles are also found in recycling materials at a transfer station.² These two reported incidents are just a small sample of the occurrence of these incidents.

Currently the DHBs in the region operate various schemes through community pharmacies to provide sharps collection facilities. However, those schemes could benefit from much greater publicity and being underscored by bylaws prohibiting the disposal of sharps to landfill without appropriate treatment as per NZS 4304.

As the councils in the region seek to increase diversion from landfill then this will directly increase the amount of waste going to recycling facilities and exposing workers involved in recycling and so it becomes more important than ever that there are stricter rules around disposal of sharps to avoid this issue becoming more frequent.

Recommendation:

- Greater education of the public of correct disposal of sharps;
- Implement suitable bylaws to prohibit disposal of medical household waste to landfill; and
- Fund appropriate resourcing to enable effective enforcement of those bylaws.

Pharmaceuticals

The issue of pharmaceutical residues in New Zealand's waterways was identified in an Auckland study³. This is supported by a number of international studies⁴. We understand that a very recent testing program of waste water discharges from DHB facilities in Auckland identified high levels of pharmaceutical residues in that waste water⁵.

¹ NZ Herald article 8 June 2016

² Southland Times 17 January 2017

³ Pharmaceutical Residues in the Auckland Estuarine Environment, Auckland Council Technical Report, January 2013

⁴ Pharmaceutical Pollution in the Environment: Issues for Australia, New Zealand and Pacific Island countries May 2015 prepared by the National Toxics Network

⁵ Per comms

Pharmaceuticals and medicines can contaminate the environment when discharged down sinks, toilets drains or in landfills. The active ingredients end up in our waterways and ultimately in the water we drink and the fish that we eat. Studies from the United States have shown that pharmaceuticals have been detected in the environment and can lead to negative effects on wildlife. Pharmaceutical residues have been found in sewage effluent, surface and drinking water⁶.

A major contributor to the cause of pharmaceutical residues in waterways is the current practice of disposing of pharmaceuticals through dilution with water and disposal to either trade waste water or sewer. Dilution is an established practice for disposal of small amounts of medical and pharmaceutical waste by hospitals, respite careers, home carers, pharmacies and homes.

In addition to the impact of pharmaceutical residues in waterways, the increase in prescription means that there is a higher prevalence of pharmaceuticals in the home. This in turn increases the risk of possible unintentional poisoning of children through accessing these unwanted or unneeded pharmaceuticals. Medication and drugs are the most common agents involved in childhood poisoning, followed by household chemicals and cleaners⁷.

The trend of increased home based healthcare and the reduction in length of stays at hospitals and other facilities is likely to increase the occurrence of pharmaceutical residues in the waterways and pharmaceuticals in homes increasing the risk of poisonings unless the current common inadequate disposal practices are stopped.

At present there are no incinerators in New Zealand for the treatment of pharmaceutical waste. Pharmaceutical waste which is sent to an industry participant for disposal is currently disposed of by steam sterilization and following sterilization the non-hazardous waste is disposed of to a Grade 1 landfill by way of deep burial. This process is accepted as world's best practice.⁸

The only concern with regard to processing pharmaceutical waste using sterilization and deep burial is that some active ingredients may not be neutralized at sterilization temperatures (135 degrees) and therefore the residues need to be contained in Grade 1 landfills where all leachate from the landfill is contained and treated. This is far preferable than the pharmaceutical waste being disposed of to sewer where the active ingredients may enter the waterways.

However, use of an incinerator for disposal of pharmaceuticals would both reduce the volume of waste significantly and negate this risk. The current planning regime does not allow the construction of a suitable small high temperature incinerators in New Zealand.

Recommendation:

- Ensure appropriate disposal methods are available in the region which are subsidized by the councils (as Councils currently do with the disposal of a number of hazardous substances);
- Education of the wider public on the availability of these disposal methods;
- Implement suitable bylaws to prohibit disposal of pharmaceuticals to landfill, trade waste

⁶ Braund R, Peake BM, Tong AYC. Disposal practices for unused medications in New Zealand community pharmacies. *Journal of Primary Health Care* Vol 3 (3) 2011.

⁷ Child Safety: Poisoning (2015). Retrieved from <http://howto.yellow.co.nz/parenting/children-parenting-2/child/safety/>

⁸ Industry Code of Practice for the Management of Biohazardous Waste 7th edition, July 2014

- or sewer; and
- Change the planning regime to allow for a suitable high temperature low volume (much smaller than traditional sized) incinerator to be built in an appropriate location in the region

Mercury

Mercury is a highly toxic substance which when present in the environment can accumulate in organisms⁹ and the methylmercury then builds up in the food stream and in humans as they age.

In New Zealand two pathways for mercury to find its way into our environment are through the incorrect disposal of mercury contained in dental amalgam and mercury contained in CFL lamps and florescent tubes. Fluorescent tubes and other mercury containing wastes (such as amalgam) are hazardous wastes and are listed in the New Zealand Waste List.

According to MfE's Waste Acceptance Criteria for Class A Landfills the contents [mercury] of the tubes [fluorescent tubes] should be removed by an approved operator prior to landfill.

Dental amalgam is invariably disposed of by dentists through dilution and disposal to trade waste or sewer. Whereas fluorescent tubes and CFLs are invariably disposed of to landfill.

Both of these disposal pathways result in potential infection of the environment, waterways and potentially the food chain. They also increase the risk of staff in the waste industry having high levels of exposure to mercury.

Interwaste provides a zero to landfill recycling service for CFLs and fluorescent tubes and not only does this support the region's councils' waste minimization strategy it also protects the environment from mercury contamination. Interwaste also provides a service to remove the mercury from the dental amalgam for reuse.

Recommendation:

- Education of the wider public on the availability of correct disposal methods for dental amalgam, fluorescent tubes and CFLs;
- Implement suitable bylaws prohibiting:
 - the disposal of dental amalgam to sewer or waste water; and
 - the landfilling of fluorescent tubes and CFLs; and
- Fund appropriate resourcing to enable effective enforcement of the waste bylaws.

Sanitary Waste

Sanitary Waste is currently 6% of the waste sent to landfill.¹⁰

NZS 4304 lists sanitary pads and disposable napkins (i.e. incontinence pads) as controlled waste and as indicated above requires it to be segregated and treated differently to general waste or recyclable waste. In the region there are very few generators of such controlled waste (such as rest homes) that dispose of this type of waste as controlled waste and hence in accordance with the requirements of NZS 4304.

⁹ www.greenfacts.org/en/mercury

¹⁰ Figure 4 General Waste to Class1 landfill (excluding clean fill). Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017-2023

With New Zealand's aging population¹¹ the number of retirement villages and rest homes will increase in the region and this issue will grow with the staff employed in the waste sector continuing to be exposed to increasing volumes of potentially infectious waste that are not treated by the waste generators correctly as required by NZS 43204.

Recommendation:

- Implement suitable bylaws to prohibit disposal of sanitary waste and incontinence products to landfill other than in accordance with the requirements of NZS 4304;
- Education of generators of sanitary and incontinence waste of the requirements of disposal in accordance with NZS 4304;
- Better enforcement of compliance with the consent obligations on existing landfills which prohibit this type of waste being disposed of too general landfill other than in accordance with NZS 4304; and
- Fund appropriate resourcing to enable the enforcement of the waste bylaws.

Landfill Gate Fees and/or Levies

One of the primary tools in the hands of the councils to change current waste practices is to increase gate fees or other charges on landfills or impose new or increase existing waste levies. Overseas there is ample evidence to show that an increase in landfill gate fees or levies changes behavior in relation to waste disposal practices. Levies drive recycling by increasing the opportunity cost of landfill and providing funds for grants for recycling¹²

At present throughout New Zealand landfill gate fees and levies are low when compared to the cost of diverting waste through recycling. If the councils in the region wish to encourage diversion of waste from landfill then they need to increase the cost of disposal of waste to landfill to a level comparable to the cost of recycling of the waste streams that are not currently diverted.

An example is sanitary waste (discussed above). To make recycling of sanitary waste cost effective the landfill gate fees and/or levies need to be increased to a minimum of \$250/tonne. Gate fees or levies of \$250/tonne will also encourage innovation and the development of greater diversion of a wider variety of waste products through either reuse or recycling.

At present with landfill gate fees as low as \$80/tonne this means that a variety of products that can be recycled are not because it is uneconomic.

Recommendation:

- Increase gate fees of council owned landfills to \$250/tonne and/or on other landfills impose levies to increase total cost to \$250/tonne.

¹¹ Page 19, Wellington Regional Waste Assessment 2016

¹² MRA Consulting Group, State of Waste 2016 – Current and Future Australia Trends, April 2016

**WELLINGTON REGION WASTE
MANAGEMENT AND MINIMISATION PLAN
HEARINGS SUBCOMMITTEE
6 JUNE 2017**

**Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council**
Me Heke Ki Pōneke

We would welcome the opportunity to speak to this submission at the appropriate time and we look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely
International Waste Limited



Hamish Sisson
Director

**Joint Wellington Region Waste
Management and Minimisation Plan**

Absolutely Positively **54**
Wellington City Council
Me Heke Ki Pōneke

All councils in the Wellington region have developed a new draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP), and are consulting on it over the next few months. The aim is to reduce the amount of waste produced, to better reuse resources, and to recycle more.

The plan outlines the actions each council will take around waste management, and sets a primary waste reduction target for the region - to reduce the total quantity of waste sent to landfills by a third over the next 10 years.

You can find more information on our local actions and read the draft plan at wgtregionwasteplan.govt.nz

We want to hear your views on the Joint Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. You can answer these questions online at wgtregionwasteplan.govt.nz, email your thoughts to wasteplan@wcc.govt.nz or post this form to us (no stamp needed). **Tell us what you think by 5pm, 19 May 2017.**

Privacy statement - what we do with your personal information

All submissions (including name and contact details) are provided in their entirety to elected members and made available to the public at our office and on our website. Your personal contact information will also be used for the administration of the consultation process including informing you of the outcome of the consultation. All information collected will be held by Wellington City Council, 101 Wakefield Street, Wellington, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Your details

First name*:	BERNARD	Last name*:	O'SHAUGHNESSY
Postal address*:	139(a) Daniell St. NEW TOWN		
Email:	BERNARDFREE13 @ G-mail . com		
You are making this submission:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> as an individual			
<input type="checkbox"/> on behalf of an organisation. Your organisation's name:			
Age: → (why?)			
<input type="checkbox"/> under 18 <input type="checkbox"/> 18-29 <input type="checkbox"/> 30-44			
<input type="checkbox"/> 45-60 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> over 60			
Gender: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender diverse <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say		First time submitting? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
I would like to make an oral submission to the Councillors <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
If yes, please give your phone number so that a submission time can be arranged*:			
Text only: 021-0623275 021-0623275			

↳ I object to this question.

*mandatory field

Item 2.1 Attachment 1

**Joint Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan
consultation questions**

Do you support the following target?

Proposed primary regional target	Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next 10 years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent to municipal (class 1) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum by 2026. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
----------------------------------	--

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

1. Regional bylaw	Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Waste Data Framework	Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3. Engagement and education	Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. Kerbside collections	Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
5. Resource recovery network	Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network - including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (sewage sludge), and other organic waste. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6. Biosolids	Collaborating on options to use biosolids (sewage sludge) beneficially. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>Be like farmers - drop it in RIVERS</i>
7. Shared governance and services	Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
8. Regional resources	Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next WMMP, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
9. Working collaboratively	Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
10. Lobbying and advocacy	Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>make Supermarkets pay!</i>

Proposed local actions

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional-scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, what would you like to see? <i>a) better kerbside collections b) Take all beer/wine bottles back to supermarkets.</i>

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as a resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

Yes No Maybe, I need more information

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?

well, the BCA, or RRF, or
business case must be put to us.

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

Yes No Maybe, I need more information

Just one collection? like in the old days.

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system?

e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

Yes No

You don't need further INVESTIGATION - you already know everything.

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

YES: heaps (pun) of rubbish (pun) comments.
but/and, I will attach my comments,
equally so, I will attend "smokes &
mirrors" at council meeting
Plus I will show & tell innovative
forward thinking strategies to take us
up & away to 2050. OMA - RIP.

----- 1st fold here - fasten here once folded -----

----- 2nd fold here -----

CSWCCJ003172

Free Post Authority Number 2199

**Absolutely Positively
Wellington City Council**
Me Heke Ki Pōneke



FREEPOST 2199
Waste Operations [120.1039.6356]
Wellington City Council
PO Box 2199
Wellington 6140

Submitter Details

First Name: **Nada**
Last Name: **Piatek**
Organisation: **Sustainability Trust**
On behalf of: **Sustainability Trust**
Street: **2 Forresters Lane**
Suburb: **Wellington**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6011**
Daytime Phone: **43850500**
Mobile: **43850500**
eMail: **nada@sustaintrust.org.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

Age:

- under 18
 18-29
 30-44
 45-60
 over 60

Gender:

- Male
 Female
 Gender diverse
 Prefer not to say

First time submitting?

- Yes
 No

Proposed primary regional target

Do you support the following target?

56

Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next ten years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum by 2026.

- Yes
 No

Proposed regional actions

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

Regional bylaw

Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively.

- Yes
 No

Waste Data Framework

Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals.

- Yes
 No

Engagement and education

Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education.

- Yes
 No

Kerbside collections

Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities.

- Yes
 No

Resource recovery network

Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (*sewage sludge*), and other organic waste.

24

- Yes
 No

Biosolids

Collaborating on options to use biosolids (*sewage sludge*) beneficially.

- Yes
 No

Shared governance and services

Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region.

- Yes
 No

Regional resources

Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (*WMMP*), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next *WMMP*, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives.

- Yes
 No

Working collaboratively

Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (*i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers*).

- Yes
 No

Lobbying and advocacy

Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life.

- Yes
 No

Proposed local actions

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (*found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan*)?

- Yes
- No

Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what would you like to see?

The WMMP stops short of addressing single short-duration use plastic, for event catering etc, specifically. While reviewing by-laws are mentioned, Sustainability Trust feels that this is low hanging fruit and should be explicitly included in the plan.

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (*pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP*) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as a resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?

The current lack of consistency between council areas is a grave weakness for all areas. The current situation where waste is transported from one region to another based on costs undermines management strategies and a collaborative and consistent approach will go a long way towards encouraging improved waste management behaviours, in particular for businesses.

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system? e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

- Yes
- No

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

Comments

Sustainability Trust is broadly in support of the WMMP. We believe it is pivotally important that the region develop a consistent approach to waste minimisation. As educators in this space we are faced daily with the inconsistency of the infrastructure in place across the region and the frustration and disengagement that this creates. In a commercial realm, this is particularly noteworthy in regards to the variance of business case proposals that businesses consider - in some regions there is a strong business case to disincentivise businesses from doing the right thing with their recycling, and this really needs to progress forward to facilitate behaviour change. Sustainability Trust is strongly in favour of organic kerbside collection. Whilst we are advocates for home composting options we don't really see this as a community-wide solution, and this is particularly the case with CBD dwellers and small (non-food related) businesses. Given the significant proportion of food waste, we feel that this is one of the most impactful solutions that the council can put in place. The success of the Kai-Cycle model and public interest surveys conducted by the likes of Fairfax media (showing more than 3/4s of the public support kerbside organics collection) would suggest really good public engagement in such an initiative. Our work in this area has shown us anecdotally that in business and city-dweller situations, people want to do the right thing, but the infrastructure doesn't support this. We believe that this would be embraced widely by the Wellington public. We also note that increased kerbside collection will go some way to resolving the problematic PLA/coffee cup issue as the breakdown of these marginally-compostable products can be improved with a greater proportion of actual organic matter. The one area in which we feel that the WMMP does not go far enough to address specifically, is the mandatory control of single use plastics. Given the tragedy of the plastics overtaking our oceans, there is very little justification to continue to support the use of single use plastics at all, and we feel that it is a lost opportunity for the WMMP to not address this issue directly. While this issue could arguably be covered with the support of 'product stewardship', we believe that this is a weak approach that is lacking in leadership. If economic implications are so overwhelming that they are to put the WCC off addressing single use plastic use in all situations, we feel that as a minimum these should be specifically banned in regards to food servery (at events and suchlike) where the plastics do not contribute to the longevity of the food that they are packaging.

Attached Documents

File
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 2017

Submitter Details

First Name: **Robyn**
Last Name: **Parkinson**
Organisation: **Tawa Community Board**
Street: **31 Collins Avenue**
Suburb: **Tawa**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **5028**
Mobile: **0278058334**
eMail: **rparkinson.nz@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

Age:

- under 18
 18-29
 30-44
 45-60
 over 60

Gender:

- Male
 Female
 Gender diverse
 Prefer not to say

First time submitting?

- Yes
 No

Proposed primary regional target

Do you support the following target?

Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next ten years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum **28**

2026.

- Yes
- No

Proposed regional actions

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

Regional bylaw

Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively.

- Yes
- No

Waste Data Framework

Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals.

- Yes
- No

Engagement and education

Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education.

- Yes
- No

Kerbside collections

Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities.

- Yes
- No

Resource recovery network

Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (*sewage sludge*), and other organic waste.

- Yes
- No

Biosolids

Collaborating on options to use biosolids (*sewage sludge*) beneficially.

- Yes
 No

Shared governance and services

Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region.

- Yes
 No

Regional resources

Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (*WMMP*), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next *WMMP*, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives.

- Yes
 No

Working collaboratively

Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (*i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers*).

- Yes
 No

Lobbying and advocacy

Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life.

- Yes
 No

Proposed local actions

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (*found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan*)?

- Yes
- No

Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what would you like to see?
Please refer to attached written submission.

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (*pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP*) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as a resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?
Please refer to attached written submission.

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

78

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system? e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

- Yes
- No

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

Comments
Please refer to attached written submission.

Attached Documents

File
WMMP submission by TCB May 2017
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 2017

Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017

Submission by Tawa Community Board to Wellington City Council
15 May 2017

Introduction

The Tawa Community Board is a Community Board under the Local Government Act and Wellington City Council with elected members representing the northernmost suburbs of Wellington City comprising Tawa, Takapu Valley and Grenada North.

We welcome the opportunity to provide a submission on the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017. We wish to make an oral submission to the Councillors.

Tawa is noted for its strong sense of community, and its high regard for the natural environment, shown by the high level of active support recently shown in the acquisition of the Forest of Tane.

The Tawa Community Board endorses the three goals - Waste-free: Working together: Benefit our communities - as values that reflect those of our community.

Proposed primary regional target

Tawa Community Board supports the target to reduce waste sent to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600 kg per person per annum to 400 kg per person per annum by 2026.

We note that the proposed target is less likely to be achieved by Tawa residents without territorial councils working together, in particular.

Southern Landfill is a 25 kilometre, over 40 minute drive, from Tawa. Tawa residents tend to use the closer Spicer Landfill and its associated recycling / diversion facilities. Any kerbside collection would also seem to be more efficiently processed by whichever facility is geographically closest, rather than according to territorial authority divisions.

Proposed regional actions

The Board supports the proposed regional actions.

We welcome more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management.

We note in particular, concern from Tawa residents expressed to the Board regarding the following waste items. We expect greater collaboration would greatly encourage local residents to reduce waste of these kinds that requires specialised recycling:

- Household batteries: the option to drop these at Southern Landfill is of little use to Tawa residents. The Porirua City Council website for Spicer Landfill is difficult to find information on and does not appear to address the issue of household batteries.
- Polystyrene. The closure of Poly Palace at Spicer Landfill has left residents with nowhere to send this waste other than landfill.

We note that the Greater Wellington Regional Council website directory still lists Poly Palace in its recycling directory [<http://www.gw.govt.nz/Polystyrene>] and has not responded to an online feedback by a Tawa resident last year. This is a good example of the need to properly resource and manage a regional directory to ensure that it stays up to date and accurate.

- Energy-saving light bulbs that contain mercury: as for batteries, the Southern Landfill is not an optimal solution for Tawa residents. Information on alternative drop-off sites is difficult to obtain.

For some of these items the Board may be able to facilitate local initiatives to address these specific waste problems. However they are examples of the kind of improvements hoped for in future under a more regional approach to waste reduction.

Proposed local actions by Wellington City Council

More comprehensive kerbside collections

The Board carried out a poll on the Neighbourly website to ask Tawa residents their views. Over one week, 181 votes and comments from more than 10 residents were received (total Tawa Neighbourly membership is currently 3550 residents). The poll was repeated on a Saturday morning outside Tawa New World by two Tawa Community Board members [69 total votes, including 5 from residents of surrounding suburbs] for a total of 250 votes. Comments were also received on the Board's Facebook page.

The poll asked the following : [Neighbourly total / street poll]

	[Neighbourly total / street poll]
Would a Council green bin reduce your trash?	[181 / 69 total votes]
• Yes, our house would use a green waste bin	[67.4% / 56.5%]
• We'd use a small food waste bin, not a green bin	[5% / 0%]
• We have no room for any more bins	[2.2% / 3%]
• We already compost most or all our green and food waste	[21% / 24.6%]
• We already pay for a green bin service	[2.8% / 7.2%]
• We would not use a green bin for other reasons	[1.7% / 7.2%]

Comments generally were in strong support of having an organic waste kerbside collection.

A notable proportion (around 20%) of Tawa residents reported that they already compost 'most or all' of their organic waste. The Board notes however that the continuing trend to reduced section sizes by infill and new development may reduce the ability or desire of householders to carry out home composting, thus increasing the need for a kerbside collection in future.

Several residents who compost at home went on to comment that they supported, and some would also use, a green bin service. For example, one resident commented that green bins would be useful for organic material that home composters find difficult to manage, such as Tradescantia.

The Board also notes evidence of a strong desire by residents and businesses to have the ability to make more sustainable use of their food waste.

Tawa Community Garden reports that several residents have approached them over the last 18 months wanting to provide food waste to their compost bins, as well as a local catering business. The Community Garden lacks the capacity to deal with this. The local business resorted to a commercial option for diverting its food waste. Recently, even a major hotel in the CBD approached the Garden for diversion of their coffee grounds waste (the Garden declined as it already diverts approximately 45 kg of used grounds per week from a local cafe).

Tawa Community Board, 15 May 2017

page 3

35

18

A small number of resident expressed concerns around the kerbside collection idea, even though largely supportive of the idea in principle.

Concerns noted were:

- the safety issues of existing bins (such as the need for clips);
- the number of existing bins and their impact on pedestrian safety;
- the impact of reduced organic waste on sludge levels, and therefore, landfill odour;
- cost.

Summary

From the responses received, Tawa residents strongly support a green bin kerbside collection and would reduce their landfill waste as a result.

We also note with interest that a large private sector firm is moving towards the first electric-powered pickup truck in New Zealand (<https://youtu.be/UZh-uEkrVag>), and suggest that the Wellington City Council consider such options.

Tawa as a community would support, and benefit from, a more integrated and well-resourced regional approach to waste minimisation and management.

Robyn Parkinson, Member, Tawa Community Board

rparkinson.nz@gmail.com
027 8058334

For the Tawa Community Board:

Richard Herbert (Chair)
Margaret Lucas (Deputy Chair)
Graeme Hansen
Jack Marshall
Liz Langham
Robyn Parkinson
Councillor Malcolm Sparrow
Councillor Jill Day

Tawa Community Board, 15 May 2017

page 4

36

18

Appendix: Comments received

Comments in favour of an organic waste kerbside collection:

"We do regular trips to green waste disposal area at the dump. We would absolutely use it!"

"We would definitely use this."

"Yes bins [are] an excellent idea"

"Absolutely"

"Brilliant idea"

"It would be great to create something of practical value from something of negative value, if we can manage that by separation. Before we had plastics and electronic waste, rubbish dumps became fertile areas. By disposing of mixed waste, we just end up with large contaminated areas; it would be great to reduce this problem while producing useful byproducts."

"Green waste bins sound a good idea - how and when would they be collected? Presumably they would be like the current wheelie bins."

"Chch has red yellow and green ones. I think it would be great idea for wellington."

"Absolutely, we have a compost bin but as you know we can't put everything in it. Would the green bin take everything, like bones, potato skins (as they grow out of your compost bin other wise) fish, egg shells, as those are the things that go in our rubbish at this stage to avoid attracting rodents to the property."

"No room at my flat... but I support it in principle"

"That is great idea. However our family is on the next level. We turn all of our green waste into rich compost that feeds our little garden. We have half of the supermarket bag of waste and a bit of recyclables".

" I would find a green bin useful. Have a very small garden and even if I made compost have no where to use it."

"We already compost all of our food waste and part of this waste goes into our worm farm. All of our compost goes back on the garden and the worm farm liquid is diluted and sloshed around the plants. I do think it is a good idea for the WCC to consider some sort of organic (food waste) collection. The type of collection is done in some towns and cities in England using plastic buckets (about 20L)and they are put on the curb on the same day as other recycling. It is the PCC and WCC interests to reduce the amount of stuff dumped as planning and establishing new landfills will cost millions. And of course no one wants a new landfill anywhere near their house."

Tawa Community Board, 15 May 2017

page 5

37

18

Comments largely in favour, but with concerns or issues noted:

"As long as it was a wheelie type bin rather than an open small green bin like the ones for glass."

"I'm half in favour and half not. We compost all our vege food scraps. We pay to dispose of other green waste (tree cuttings etc) ourself - and a lot of that would not fit in a bin - a completely full caged trailer last weekend.

I am also concerned about yet another bin on the footpath. I look out my window some days and there are bins for Africa - the WCC bins and then the private bins etc - often just blowing in the wind. I would rather the council first considered clips for existing wheelie bins so the contents stay secure."

"...waste management at landfills is a tricky business as many of us who have been affected by landfill odours know. Less waste at the landfill means lower waste:sludge ratio (sludge is the by-product from the waste water treatment plant). If the waste:sludge ratio drops other problems begin.

So reducing the amount of green waste is good, however it is only good if sludge issues are being addressed at the same time."

"Would it cost extra?"

Comments not in favour of organic kerbside collection:

"How about a simple No...Bins for Africa. Iv'e got some they could have. Whens the collection date?"

Tawa Community Board, 15 May 2017

page 6

38

18

Submitter Details

First Name: **Hannah**
Last Name: **Blumhardt**
Street: **143A Upland Road**
Suburb: **Kelburn**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6012**
eMail: **blumhardt.hannah@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

Age:

- under 18
 18-29
 30-44
 45-60
 over 60

Gender:

- Male
 Female
 Gender diverse
 Prefer not to say

First time submitting?

- Yes
 No

Proposed primary regional target

Do you support the following target?

Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next ten years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum by 2026.

- Yes
 No
-

Proposed regional actions

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

Regional bylaw

Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively.

- Yes
 No
-

Waste Data Framework

Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals.

- Yes
 No
-

Engagement and education

Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education.

- Yes
 No
-

Kerbside collections

Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities.

- Yes
 No
-

Resource recovery network

Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (*sewage sludge*), and other organic waste.

- Yes
 No
-

Biosolids

Collaborating on options to use biosolids (*sewage sludge*) beneficially.

- Yes
- No

Shared governance and services

Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region.

- Yes
- No

Regional resources

Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (*WMMP*), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next *WMMP*, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives.

- Yes
- No

Working collaboratively

Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (*i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers*).

- Yes
- No

Lobbying and advocacy

Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life.

- Yes
- No

Proposed local actions

91

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (*found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan*)?

- Yes
- No

Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what would you like to see?

Organic kerbside collection would be truly excellent. I think it's really distressing we don't have this already! It would be nice to see some council initiatives to support home composting as well (for example, free workshops, programme of turning discarded palettes into composts etc.), or boost the capacity of local organisations who are doing this already but perhaps could do with greater scale and outreach. More information about what happens to recycling, particularly plastic recycling, would be welcome. It is so hard to find transparent, clear information about this and it's a real barrier to people seeing the need to move their behaviour up the waste hierarchy (i.e. towards refuse/reduce/reuse). I like the idea of regulations and bylaws to support new developments to have mandated recycling areas. I also really support lobbying and advocacy for product stewardship schemes. It would be great to see more bylaws that incentivise businesses to reduce waste and a greater levy on waste because it's not effectively priced at the moment. More support for businesses that help consumers to reduce waste too, so not just looking at the waste the business produces, but also how much 'unseen' waste they pass on to consumers. So finding ways to support zero waste supermarkets or takeaway outlets that have a responsible approach to the packaging they pass on to consumers. Supporting businesses and initiatives to repair and repurpose things (so resource recovery) but also repair of electronics for the consumer, so that they don't get discarded in the first place. Communicating with the public about places in Wellington where they can go to get electronics repaired. Some sort of 'waste hierarchy site map' or other user friendly resource that gives people key locations where they can go and get things repaired, buy things in bulk, share resources (toolbanks/libraries) etc. There is a lot going on in Wellington but a shared resource produced by council could really help people. Also more regulation or management of the pollution/run-off from the landfill. There must be more that can be done about the stream running into Owhiro Bay, as well as better monitoring and mitigation strategies. I'd like to see more direct addressing of how to reduce plastic waste. Not simply recycling. This is not dealt with head-on in the plan, which I understand is focused on food waste. However, plastic waste and food waste present very different challenges and have very different impacts on the environment and in landfill, and both need to be considered. I like the waste exchange idea - more learning of industrial symbiosis initiatives that happen overseas would be good, and more incentives for businesses to adopt these approaches. Can Council do more research into untapped opportunities in the region for waste exchange, rather than leaving to business to work out opportunities?

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (*pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP*) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as ⁴²

resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?

Sounds good in theory but need to see how it works in practice and that the combined services does not simply favour bigger contracts that drown out smaller, local initiatives. If the councils can collaborate to increase the ability to support local projects, this would be great. But if it leads to simply offering a large population base to a large business so that they offer more competitive pricing, I do not necessarily support this if it means less optimal services from a sustainability, whole-of-community perspective (but perhaps cheaper and faster). I'm not saying this is what council intends to do, but there's space for that in the plan because the actions are so broadly framed. I'm a bit concerned that a lot of the waste contractors, for example, recyclers, do not always recycle, or they sell waste overseas because it's cheaper and produces a profit, whereas it could be recovered in NZ. It would be great to avoid this kind of thing and rather see the councils combine funds and effort to collaborate with community groups that are doing great things (for example, in WCC KaiCycle is doing fantastic stuff when it comes to food waste - how can they be supported or their model upscaled? The model may be slightly more expensive or inefficient than a company that comes in a truck and picks up kerbside waste and then takes it to the commercial compost - perhaps - but the food waste they collect gets composted and supports community gardens that then get passed on to Kaibosh for redistribution. There are cost savings there that are hard to quantify but would be worth the extra time and funds (if there are any) for what they give back to the community).

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system? e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

- Yes
- No

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

Comments

I think all the action points sound great but they need to be fleshed out to truly understand what they entail. The form makes it hard to give nuanced responses. It's hard to say 'yes' or 'no' to most of them when your response to the question is actually 'it depends...'. This is understandable at this stage of the process, but I'm simply suggesting that a 'yes'/'no' submission form for such broadly 43

91

shaped plans will definitely shoehorn responses towards favourable responses, with a lack of nuance. So multichoice responses need to be taken with a grain of salt. So I would like to see all these plans carried forward, but with much more detail provided in future and the public given the opportunity to consult again on the concrete plans. I don't think a further consultation on funding alone is sufficient. I do think the focus on cutting food waste is a great focus. This will be made or broken on the basis of whether there is some system of expanding kerbside collection for organics. This will be exposed to public comment on funding, and I can see it getting watered down at this point. There needs to be direct focus on plastic waste too, to give the plan more comprehensive scope. Food waste is an easy win, but it doesn't address the unique issues presented by plastic waste. Both are important.

Attached Documents

File
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 2017

Submitter Details

First Name: **Jess**
Last Name: **Ducey**
On behalf of: **Inner City Wellington**
Street: **Flat 25, Robert Hannah Centre, 5 Eva Street**
Suburb: **Te Aro**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6011**
eMail: **jducey@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

Age:

- under 18
 18-29
 30-44
 45-60
 over 60

Gender:

- Male
 Female
 Gender diverse
 Prefer not to say

First time submitting?

- Yes
 No

Proposed primary regional target

Do you support the following target?

Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next ten years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum by 2026.

45

- Yes
- No

Proposed regional actions

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

Regional bylaw

Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively.

- Yes
- No

Waste Data Framework

Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals.

- Yes
- No

Engagement and education

Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education.

- Yes
- No

Kerbside collections

Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities.

- Yes
- No

Resource recovery network

Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (*sewage sludge*), and other organic waste.

- Yes
- No

Biosolids

Collaborating on options to use biosolids (*sewage sludge*) beneficially.

- Yes
- No

Shared governance and services

Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region.

- Yes
- No

Regional resources

Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (*WMMP*), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next *WMMP*, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives.

- Yes
- No

Working collaboratively

Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (*i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers*).

- Yes
- No

Lobbying and advocacy

Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life.

- Yes
- No

Proposed local actions

97

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (*found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan*)?

- Yes
 No

Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan?

- Yes
 No

If yes, what would you like to see?

Inner City Wellington would like to see specific considerations of inner city needs, particularly residential, including: - Inclusion of inner city residential services in feasibility studies and any expansion of kerbside services. Some body corps have taken matters into their own hands to organise private collection services and it is important that they are included in any research to improve services. As more apartments are built in the inner city, individual kerbside collection will become increasingly unfeasible. The ICA would like to see consideration given to the costs incurred by apartment owners and body corps, particularly if changes to services are rates-funded but inaccessible to apartment dwellers. - Clarification of expectations for old buildings in the event of new regulations (e.g. to provide in-building recycling facilities). ICW would not be inclined to support the imposition of further costs on existing buildings to meet new requirements when they may not have space to make any further adjustments without taking private property. Changes to regulations should also include incentivising existing buildings to make these changes. Any changes should also be set in the District Plan so that new buildings are required to include appropriate facilities. - Encouragement of partnership and cooperation between residential and commercial users in the inner city. Inner city residents have small individual volumes and many lack private transport, so ICW would like to ensure that they are not forgotten or ignored in changes to services. Kerbside services and/or centralised, easily accessible drop off points are important to ensuring the city offers a wide range of options to make it easy for residents to reduce their waste. - Support for community initiatives already underway to reduce waste (e.g. reusable bags, plastic reduction, composting, event waste minimisation, etc)

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (*pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP*) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as a resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

- Yes
 No
 Maybe, I need more information

48

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?
ICW is particularly interested in promoting and expanding individual/residential composting and other solutions to minimising organic waste.

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system? e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

- Yes
- No

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

Comments

Inner City Wellington generally supports the draft WMMP as it is aligned with our strategic plan, which supports the UNDP Sustainable Development Goals, particularly Goal 12 - Responsible Consumption and Production. Specific consideration to how the differing needs of the inner city will be addressed in future policies and changes to services is required in the next stage of this process. Our membership looks forward to working with Council to implement waste-minimisation programmes in our city.

Attached Documents

File
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 2017

93

Submitter Details

First Name: **Donna**
Last Name: **Sherlock**
Organisation: **Ivy bank farm**
On behalf of: **Also as Trustee on behalf Te awarua o Porirua Harbout catchment trust**
Street: **110 Rowells Road**
Suburb: **Glenside**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6037**
Daytime Phone: **0211629704**
Mobile: **0211629704**
eMail: **okar09@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

Age:

- under 18
 18-29
 30-44
 45-60
 over 60

Gender:

- Male
 Female
 Gender diverse
 Prefer not to say

First time submitting?

- Yes
 No

Proposed primary regional target

Do you support the following target?

50

Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next ten years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum by 2026.

- Yes
- No

Proposed regional actions

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

Regional bylaw

Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively.

- Yes
- No

Waste Data Framework

Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals.

- Yes
- No

Engagement and education

Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education.

- Yes
- No

Kerbside collections

Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities.

- Yes
- No

Resource recovery network

Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (*sewage sludge*), and other organic waste.

- Yes
 No

Biosolids

Collaborating on options to use biosolids (*sewage sludge*) beneficially.

- Yes
 No

Shared governance and services

Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region.

- Yes
 No

Regional resources

Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (*WMMP*), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next *WMMP*, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives.

- Yes
 No

Working collaboratively

Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (*i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers*).

- Yes
 No

Lobbying and advocacy

Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life.

- Yes
 No

Proposed local actions

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (*found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan*)?

- Yes
 No

Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan?

- Yes
 No

If yes, what would you like to see?

You are doing a good job within the best interests of Wellington's city and environs. Keep up the good work!

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (*pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP*) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as a resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

- Yes
 No
 Maybe, I need more information

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?

Shared JV fleet for kerbside service delivery to maximise utilisation of appropriate collection vehicle on Wellington's hilly and narrow roads. Wheelie bins utilisation should be invested in more thoroughly (locking lids) and prioritisation for kerbside application. I think the promoted use of recycling bags are a factor of the decline in recycling from household waste. C&D waste - Wellington city region should own/control the receipt and reuse of this material, and not leave it to market forces which has a local history of poor environmental outcomes. More should be done in this area and at high priority. Realise the true value/cost of this material through the mass of control and development. C&D byproducts are a major contributing factor to Wellington city's overall economic development and enterprise.

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws ⁵³

93

away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system? e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

- Yes
- No

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

Comments

Tyres and e waste still compromising the environment for Wellington City and harbours. Not enough being done to encourage responsible disposal and material impact considerations.

Attached Documents

File
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 2017

Submitter Details

First Name: **Jack**
Last Name: **Marshall**
Organisation: **Wellington City Youth Council**
On behalf of: **Wellington City Youth Council**
Street: **101 Wakefield Street**
Suburb: **Wellington Central**
City: **Wellington**
Country:
PostCode: **6011**
Daytime Phone: **042324206**
Mobile: **0211866186**
eMail: **jackmarshallnz@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

Age:

- under 18
 18-29
 30-44
 45-60
 over 60

Gender:

- Male
 Female
 Gender diverse
 Prefer not to say

First time submitting?

- Yes
 No

Proposed primary regional target

Do you support the following target?

101

Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next ten years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum by 2026.

- Yes
- No

Proposed regional actions

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

Regional bylaw

Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively.

- Yes
- No

Waste Data Framework

Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals.

- Yes
- No

Engagement and education

Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education.

- Yes
- No

Kerbside collections

Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities.

- Yes
- No

Resource recovery network

Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (*sewage sludge*), and other organic waste.

56

- Yes
 No

Biosolids

Collaborating on options to use biosolids (*sewage sludge*) beneficially.

- Yes
 No

Shared governance and services

Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region.

- Yes
 No

Regional resources

Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (*WMMP*), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next *WMMP*, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives.

- Yes
 No

Working collaboratively

Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (*i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers*).

- Yes
 No

Lobbying and advocacy

Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life.

- Yes
 No

Proposed local actions

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (*found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan*)?

- Yes
- No

Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what would you like to see?

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (*pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP*) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as a resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

101

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system? e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

- Yes
- No

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

Comments

Attached Documents

File
Youth Council Submission
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 2017

The Youth Council welcomes the opportunity to submit on the Council's Waste Management policy. We are broadly in favour of the policy, and believe the goal of reducing the city's waste significantly is highly important for Wellington's future.

The Youth Council wishes to comment on a few specific issues: the collaboration of Greater Wellington Councils on this issue, payment, whether the Council should add food waste or green waste recycling collection systems, and how to ensure high uptake for any additional recycling services offered by the Council.

We would also welcome the opportunity to present an oral submission to the Council.

1. Collaboration of Councils

The Youth Council is strongly in favour of Councils coming together on this issue, and applauds the Councils involved with the current policy for their collaborative work so far. We are in favour of Councils tackling more problems collectively in the future, and is in line with the Local Government Agreement 2016-2019 that sought an increase in shared services.

We believe a collaborative approach throughout Wellington is cheaper, easier for people to understand, and the most sensible way of approaching the issue given that waste does not respect territorial boundaries.

2. Payment System

We believe the best payment system would fund most of the system via rates. This is because a heavy user-pays system would discourage people from using the additional recycling service in the first place, and a large amount of uptake for this kind of recycling is what will help Wellington's waste problem, and achieve the Council's worthy goal of diverting waste from landfills. A monetary cost would only hinder this.

3. Food Waste or Green Waste

We are in favour of a more comprehensive kerbside recycling collection system, but believe that the system chosen by the Council should be food waste collection, not green waste.

All households generate food waste, but not all households generate additional green waste. This is particularly true of those who live in apartments in the central city, many of whom are students or other young people. As many households as possible need to be able to take advantage of any new recycling system if the system is paid or partially paid by rates.

Wellington generally will benefit from having food scraps diverted from the sewerage system and recycled. Controlling the amount of Wellington sewerage can largely be achieved by

offering food waste recycling, and will achieve the flow-on benefits to all of Wellington through lower proportions of sewerage to waste, and less landfill generally.

Green waste recycling, on the other hand, will mostly be a convenience for certain households without a large additional flow-on impact for Wellingtonians generally, especially given that people with large amounts of green waste are able to recycle them currently.

3. Uptake of New System

Whichever system the Council chooses to implement, it will only be beneficial and have the desired impact if a large number of Wellingtonians correctly use it. We believe that the majority of Wellingtonians will want to recycle and divert their waste from the landfill, but are hindered by lack of knowledge of what can be recycled, and will be put off by any inconvenience to them.

The Youth Council recommends that the Council invest in a large public education campaign to ensure public knowledge as to why any additional recycling system has been added and what it can be used for.

The public is likely to support the Council's goal of diverting their waste from the landfill. If Council is able to explain that composting food scraps is significantly better than putting them down the sink or in the bin, many will do so if they understand the system.

We believe Council should be clear to people about when they can expect the new recycling bins to arrive, why it is important to use the new recycling bins, and give very clear information about what can and cannot be recycled. This could come in the form of a detailed pamphlet that households are asked to maintain, but we recommend that Council also presents the most important information in a way that is easy for households to view. A large fridge magnet, for instance, with common household items that can and cannot be put into the new bin, would be a good way of communicating the information in a way that is easy for people to refer to when needed. Council could also add stickers to the top of the bin lid that would remind people of certain items that they cannot put in the bin.

Without very clear and easily viewable information provided, the system is unlikely to be useful even if people wish to use it. We do not want to see a situation similar to the previous recycling bins provided in the city which were tainted by some people throwing away waste that was not supposed to be in those bins. Very clear education can avoid those problems.

Conclusion

Overall, the Youth Council supports the Waste Management Policy, and welcomes the regional collaboration efforts of the policy. We feel that given sufficient public education and new initiatives in the policy, Wellington can meet the goal of reducing waste to landfill in the next ten years.

102

Submitter Details

First Name: **Te Kawa**
Last Name: **Robb**
Organisation: **Para Kore**
On behalf of: **Para Kore**
Street: **19A Manukau Road**
Suburb: **Raglan**
City: **Raglan**
Country:
PostCode: **3225**
Mobile: **021 2659446**
eMail: **teupoko.parakore@gmail.com**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

Age:

- under 18
 18-29
 30-44
 45-60
 over 60

Gender:

- Male
 Female
 Gender diverse
 Prefer not to say

First time submitting?

- Yes
 No

Proposed primary regional target

Do you support the following target?

Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next ten years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent

62

to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum by 2026.

- Yes
- No

Proposed regional actions

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

Regional bylaw

Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively.

- Yes
- No

Waste Data Framework

Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals.

- Yes
- No

Engagement and education

Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education.

- Yes
- No

Kerbside collections

Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities.

- Yes
- No

Resource recovery network

Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (*sewage sludge*), and other organic waste.

- Yes

No

Biosolids

Collaborating on options to use biosolids (*sewage sludge*) beneficially.

Yes

No

Shared governance and services

Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region.

Yes

No

Regional resources

Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (*WMMP*), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next *WMMP*, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives.

Yes

No

Working collaboratively

Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (*i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers*).

Yes

No

Lobbying and advocacy

Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life.

Yes

No

Proposed local actions

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (*found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan*)?

- Yes
- No

Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what would you like to see?
Please refer to Supporting Documents attached.

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (*pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP*) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as a resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?
Yes, increased collaboration between councils AND iwi and community organisations already providing services around waste minimisation and management.

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

- Yes

107

- No
- Maybe, I need more information

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system? e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

- Yes
- No

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

Comments

Attached Documents

File
SubmissionWellingtonCouncils
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 2017

SUBMISSION TO: Wellington City Council

*SUBMISSION FROM: Te Kawa Robb: Kaiārahi Para Kore, Te Upoko o Te Ika.
teupoko.parakore@gmail.com*

YES PARA KORE WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO THEIR SUBMISSION:

*Riro Taonga Mai, Hoki Taonga Atu
We receive valuable resources from Papatūānuku, we return valuable resources to her*

We are making this submission on behalf of Para Kore Marae Incorporated. Para Kore is all about Zero Waste on marae and within Māori communities. In 2009, we started with a pilot project of three marae. We are now supporting over 180 marae, kura, kōhanga reo and community groups across Aotearoa to reduce waste through refuse, reduce, reuse, recycling and composting.

It is encouraging to see that all eight Councils in the Wellington region are working together with a vision of 'Waste Free, together'.

Also great to see that you have clearly identified as important regional actions:

9.4 Deliver enhanced regional engagement, communications, and education

Para Kore delivers waste minimisation education and training on marae to create behaviour change that diverts waste from landfills, reduces plastic litter and reduces water and air pollution. Para Kore is a community-based, Māori organisation grounded in the framework of kaupapa and tikanga Māori. We have developed a suite of high-quality workshops that produce substantial waste minimisation outcomes and address environmental degradation. Para Kore has also established a national office and set up systems and processes to remotely manage its geographically dispersed regional operations. Para Kore currently has a contractor, Te Kawa Robb delivering the Para Kore programme in Te Upoko o te Ika. This project is supported financially by all of the Greater Wellington councils.

Para Kore commends the delivery and enhancement of engagement, communication and education around waste minimisation.

9.6 Investigate and if feasible, develop a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids, and other organic waste

A network of resource recovery centres provides many benefits for the local community as proven examples around the country have shown us. The Raglan Resource Recovery Centre operated by Xtreme Zero Waste has shown that even with a small populations and small towns you can make a real difference in terms of normalising reuse of materials. This efficient Centre brings in and spends over 1.2 million dollars each year spending more than \$600k on local

wages and over \$200k with local businesses. Auckland Council has partnered with community groups and with iwi to set up community recycling centres and *Para Kore encourages the Wellington region to do the same*. If Para Kore can in any help we would love to support this kind of development. Para Kore works with people that experience or are affected by poverty issues. The experience with Resource Recovery Centres is that they provide opportunity for low income families to access resources such as household goods, clothing, footwear etc which contribute to the well-being of the family.

Organic Waste

With some of our marae we see diversion rates of over 80%. Mostly due to food, dirty paper and green waste being composted or being fed to animals or worms. Regional options and infrastructure for these materials (food, dirty paper and green waste) are vital to decrease the volumes of valuable organic materials going to landfill, from households, businesses and events. Para Kore supports kerbside food waste collections.

We suggest the following wording: Investigate and develop a region-wide resource recovery network – including community recycling centres (with metal and wood yards), facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids, and other organic waste

9.7 R.LM3 COLLABORATE The councils will work collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system.

Para Kore believes that only with a mix of education, regulation and market can widespread behaviour change be achieved that results in more materials being kept longer within the economy thereby resulting in more jobs, stronger local economies, a more resourceful society and less harm to Papatūānuku. We strongly support mandatory product stewardship for some products, especially drinking containers (CDL), tyres, hazardous waste and electronic waste.

9.7 R.LM4 LOBBY The councils of the region will work together to lobby for product stewardship for possible priority products such as, but not limited to e-waste, tyres and plastic bags.

Solutions for electronic waste, tyres and plastic bags are key issues that many regions and countries around the world are already tackling. Modbury in England was one of the first towns to ban the plastic bag in Britain in 2007 where 13 million plastic bags were given away every year. We see these as important 'turning points' in people's commitment to reducing their personal waste. We also note that user pays is a common principle applied in our lives -

excluding waste disposal. Companies can package their products in the packaging of their choice, make products which harm the environment or are problematic for other reasons and yet there is no incentive or expectation that they need to take responsibility including financial for what they have created. We strongly support mandatory product stewardship for some products, especially drinking containers (CDL), tyres, hazardous waste and electronic waste. (repeating just to emphasis the point)

Specific recommendations for the Draft Wellington Region Waste Minimisation Plan

1. We recommend that your plan acknowledges tangata whenua as kaitiaki of the land and waterways and the special interest Māori have in protecting the environment from pollution from landfills and littering for future generations. We also recommend that when further waste plans are submitted that local iwi and hapū are included in the consultation process (2.0 What we have considered).
2. More priority for organic waste diversion. The biggest opportunity to improve diversion rate 22.4% (not including items such as dirty paper which can be composted) should be the first action on your list. Para Kore supports kerbside food waste collections.
3. We humbly submit that Para Kore is noted as a proposed initiative (even as just an example) for all councils within the Greater Wellington Region.

103

Submitter Details

First Name: **Steph**
Last Name: **Beath**
Organisation: **Megavision Ltd t/a Poly Palace**
On behalf of: **Richard Moore, Director**
Street: **212 Ohiro Road**
Suburb: **Brooklyn**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **6021**
Mobile: **027 245 5859**
eMail: **steph@comsen.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Agent Details

Agent Name: Steph Beath
Agent Organisation: Comsen Ltd

Submission

Age:

- under 18
 18-29
 30-44
 45-60
 over 60

Gender:

- Male
 Female
 Gender diverse
 Prefer not to say

First time submitting?

- Yes
 No

Proposed primary regional target

70

Do you support the following target?

Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next ten years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum by 2026.

- Yes
 No

Proposed regional actions

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

Regional bylaw

Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively.

- Yes
 No

Waste Data Framework

Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals.

- Yes
 No

Engagement and education

Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education.

- Yes
 No

Kerbside collections

Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities.

- Yes
 No

Resource recovery network

Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (*sewage sludge*), and other 71

103

organic waste.

- Yes
 No

Biosolids

Collaborating on options to use biosolids (*sewage sludge*) beneficially.

- Yes
 No

Shared governance and services

Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region.

- Yes
 No

Regional resources

Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (*WMMP*), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next *WMMP*, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives.

- Yes
 No

Working collaboratively

Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (*i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers*).

- Yes
 No

Lobbying and advocacy

Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life.

72

- Yes
 No

Proposed local actions

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (*found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan*)?

- Yes
 No

Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan?

- Yes
 No

If yes, what would you like to see?

Possibly - depending on the responses to the questions we've raised in the attached document.

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (*pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP*) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as a resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

- Yes
 No
 Maybe, I need more information

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?

We would like to see a considered and joined-up approach to recycling waste polystyrene in the Wellington Region.

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

103

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system? e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

- Yes
- No

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

Comments

We have included an attachment that holds our questions and comments in relation to the draft plan.

Attached Documents

File
WMMP submission
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 2017

13 May 2017

Wellington Region Waste Management
and Minimisation Plan Joint Committee
c/- Wellington City Council
101 Wakefield St,
Wellington 6011



Submission on the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

As New Zealand's most successful polystyrene reuse business and based in Porirua, Poly Palace has a keen interest in the successful implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan for the Wellington region.

We are delighted to be supporting the overall vision of working together as a region to become waste free and the statement "Waste Free, Together - for people, environment, and economy" in a very tangible sense every day.

Although we support the intention in all aspects of the draft plan, we have a number of questions that relate to the way in which the plan tangibly addresses its intent. We have seen the outcomes of the previous plan in which a number of the same targets were adopted by the City Councils and several councils adopted targets to be 'zero-waste' to landfill by 2015. Our over-arching question is, **what is it about this plan that will ensure it achieves a better result than that achieved by the last one?**

Our questions/concerns:

- **How will this plan ensure diversion becomes an important and serious aspect of 'running the landfill'?**
 - It is our experience that in the current state, Landfill Contractors such as Envirowaste are focused on 'running the landfill' rather than in actively diverting waste to recyclers as a primary activity in the manner of a transfer station, even when an obvious local commercial opportunity exists.
- **How does this plan ensure the various councils are held to account for their efforts that work both towards and/or against this vision?**
 - For example, if it is possible to divert materials from the landfill for reuse or recycling, what checks and measures are in place to ensure Councils are doing their utmost to leverage the opportunities presented to them – especially for materials that currently generate revenue as landfill.
 - If funding is cut from businesses that are meeting aspirational targets and provided to businesses that are not, which behaviours are the councils hoping to encourage?
- Poly Palace does not change the properties of polystyrene but instead provides the waste material back into the market for a profit – it sits in the 'reuse' category – **can Poly Palace rely on this plan to prioritise or give an advantage to those businesses who 'reuse' over those who 'recycle'?**
- Given the Wellington Region's unique capacity to reuse and recycle polystyrene, **what is the criteria that would lift polystyrene to be considered a priority product for lobbying and advocacy?**
 - Is polystyrene at a disadvantage due to the commercial success of recycling it in this region?

MegaVision Limited, 275 Waiohine Gorge Road, RD1, Carterton 5791, New Zealand
Zero Waste – everything Megavision does is a living example of Reduce, Reuse, Recycle.

75

- Soft plastics are already listed as a priority product however public soft plastics have not yet been integrated into the 3 year trial the Packaging Forum are running funded by the Waste Management Fund. **Where does this plan ensure Local Government activities are joined-up with Central Government activities?**
- If these goals are long term and aspirational, **is the Committee interested in achieving early success stories to build public confidence in the vision**, and if so where is this reflected in the Plan?
 - We would like to register our interest in creating early success for councils to accelerate waste minimisation through removal of polystyrene from the waste stream.
- This plan appears to focus predominantly on public education and **we wonder why the Committee believes this is the most important aspect to focus on at this time?** With citizens already demanding better recycling options from their councils – does the Committee believe that the Councils are prepared for the outcome that further education will create?

Overall, we believe that landfill fees in the Wellington Region are currently unreasonably cheap by comparison to those of facilities serving similar urban centers nationally, and the accessibility of landfills due to our compact geography further encourages waste disposal as a cheap and easy option. We believe low cost and high accessibility has led to increased competition between landfills for the waste stream which has further reduced the cost to landfill. This is a fundamental driver behind reduced council performance in achieving waste diversion targets and the poor recycling performance in the Wellington Region compared with other urban centers. In every area that transfer stations have replaced landfills, there has also been an uplift in recycling and we wish to understand how the proposed draft plan addresses the underlying drivers of recycling behaviour beyond a further increase in education efforts. We wish to understand if the financial viability of landfills is acting as an opposing force to the goals of waste minimisation and if so, does the Committee have a plan to transition away from this conflict?

Warm regards,



Steph Beath on behalf of
Richard Moore,
Director

104

Submitter Details

First Name: **David**
Last Name: **Ahearn**
Organisation: **Hydro Waste Recycling New Zealand Limited**
Street: **10 Raiha St**
Suburb: **Porirua**
City: **Wellington**
Country: **New Zealand**
PostCode: **5022**
Daytime Phone: **027 451 0306**
Mobile: **027 451 0306**
eMail: **Jimmy@hwrnz.co.nz**

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
 I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

- Submitter
 Agent
 Both

Submission

Age:

- under 18
 18-29
 30-44
 45-60
 over 60

Gender:

- Male
 Female
 Gender diverse
 Prefer not to say

First time submitting?

- Yes
 No

Proposed primary regional target

Do you support the following target?

Reducing waste to landfill by a third over the next ten years. More specifically, to reduce waste sent

77

104

to municipal (*class 1*) landfills from 600kg per person per annum to 400kg per person per annum by 2026.

- Yes
- No

Proposed regional actions

Do you support the following proposed regional actions?

Regional bylaw

Investigating and, if feasible, developing, implementing and overseeing monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw to help manage waste collection more effectively.

- Yes
- No

Waste Data Framework

Implementing the National Waste Data Framework and utilising the framework to help reach our goals.

- Yes
- No

Engagement and education

Delivering enhanced regional engagement, communications and education.

- Yes
- No

Kerbside collections

Facilitating local councils to determine and, where feasible, implement the best kerbside collection systems possible that maximise diversion and are cost-effective to communities.

- Yes
- No

Resource recovery network

Investigating and, if feasible, developing a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids (*sewage sludge*), and other organic waste.

- Yes

78

No

Biosolids

Collaborating on options to use biosolids (*sewage sludge*) beneficially.

Yes
 No

Shared governance and services

Promoting, investigating and, where appropriate and cost-effective, supporting the establishment of shared governance and service delivery arrangements, where such arrangements have the potential to enhance the efficiency of waste management and minimisation initiatives in the region.

Yes
 No

Regional resources

Funding regional resources for the implementation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (*WMMP*), e.g. staff and research, funding the development of the next *WMMP*, or investing in shared infrastructure or initiatives.

Yes
 No

Working collaboratively

Working collaboratively with local government organisations, non-government organisations and other key stakeholders to undertake research and actions to advance solutions to waste management issues such as, but not limited to, e-waste, plastic bags, and the need for a container deposit system (*i.e. a refund is paid for returning used beverage containers*).

Yes
 No

Lobbying and advocacy

Working together to lobby for product stewardship and for possible priority products such as, but not limited to, e-waste, tyres and plastic bags. For instance, this could mean a manufacturer that sells an item is responsible for taking the item back and reusing/recycling the materials it's made from when it reaches the end of its life.

Yes
 No

Proposed local actions

Wellington City Council's 37 local actions are intended to replicate at a local level and/or complement regional scale actions. The actions include: regulatory measures, communication activities, working with schools and marae, encouraging household composting, increasing kerbside recycling tonnages, and supporting waste minimisation at events.

There are also actions that enable investigations and if feasible improvements to kerbside collection systems and other waste infrastructure with the overall aim to reduce waste to landfill by a third.

Do you support Wellington City's local action plan (*found on pages 101-112 of the draft plan*)?

- Yes
- No

Is there anything else you would like to see happen in Wellington City's local action plan?

- Yes
- No

If yes, what would you like to see?

The regional and local "Shared governance and service delivery" actions (*pages 33 and 114 of the WMMP*) could see increased collaboration between councils to provide regional facilities such as a resource recovery network, for diverting more resources from landfill and managing waste.

Would you like to see more collaboration between the region's local councils around waste minimisation and management?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

If yes or maybe, is there anything in particular you would like to see?

The Wellington region waste assessment shows that the typical Wellington region resident throws away up to twice as much rubbish and recycles as little as half the amount of residents in other New Zealand cities. These cities often have a more comprehensive range of rates-funded kerbside services as opposed to predominantly user-pays services. These kerbside services can include rates-funded waste, recycling, food waste and/or green waste.

Do you think we should have a more comprehensive kerbside collection?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe, I need more information

104

Would you support further investigation to find the fairest and most efficient way to fund such a system? e.g. rates funded, user-pays, or a mix of the two.

- Yes
- No

Do you have any other comments on the draft WMMP?

Comments

Please refer to attached submission and note Environmental Consultant Report to follow as discussed Roderick Boyes. Thank you.

Attached Documents

File
HWRNZ WMMP Submission Final
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 2017

Submission

by

Hydro Waste Recycling New Zealand Limited



to the

Wellington City Council

on the

Draft Wellington Region Waste Management
and Minimisation Plan (WMMP)

19 May 2017 - 2023

Index

1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Hydro Excavation and Waste	4/5
3.0	Hydro Waste Recycling New Zealand Limited	6
4.0	Submission Limitations & References	7/8
5.0	WMMP Regulatory Measures – Solid Waste Bylaws	9/13
6.0	Region-wide Resource Recovery Network	14

HWRNZ Submission

Draft WMMP 2017-2023

2

83

1.0 Introduction

Hydro Waste Recycling New Zealand Limited (HWRNZ) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Wellington Region Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017

HWRNZ notes that the Plan seeks feedback on the following areas

- whether you agree with the primary regional waste reduction target
- what you think about the proposed regional actions
- whether you support your local council's action plan.

Hydro Waste recycling wishes to be given the opportunity to present our submission in person.

Our Contact

David H. Ahearn (referred to as Jimmy)

Hydro Waste Recycling New Zealand Limited

Email: jimmy@hwrnz.co.nz

Phone: 027 451 0306

2.0 Hydro Excavation and Waste

Hydro Excavation, uses high pressure water to liquefy the ground or sub surface, which is then vacuum extracted into the specialised trucks, to expose service cables, pipes, fibre optic channels so they can be visually sighted in a safe manner. This system is more precise than mechanical digging with an excavator and significantly faster than hand digging.

Due to the precise nature of the Hydro Excavation system significant process efficiency for infrastructure and construction projects has been achieved; as soil is removed immediately after it is loosened allowing services to be identified without the risks of impact, cutting or bending associated with mechanical or hand excavation.

From a health & safety aspect the Hydro Excavation process also provides significant benefit, as operators are also positioned away from the services, this significantly improves operator safety and reduces the risk of harm in instances of an electrical flash-over, gas or liquid leak.

Given the significant efficiency benefits of the Hydro Excavation process, the mitigation of health risks and the financial costs involved with service outages, Hydro Excavation is now typically a core requirement of all major infrastructure and construction projects throughout the Wellington region and New Zealand.

The Hydro Excavation industry provides a 24/7 business supporting the major infrastructure and construction companies throughout the greater Wellington region. With the recent legislative changes and enhanced focus on health and safety in the workplace, together with the proven efficiencies of the Hydro Excavation process, the industry in the Wellington region alone is growing at a rate of 15% per annum.

Disposal of waste is driven by the changing nature of the economy (new products/processes etc.). Hydro waste is a relatively new growth industry key drivers in the sector for the Wellington region are:-

- UFB rollout (and subsequent ongoing maintenance work as required to ensure fibre sub-surface not damaged)
- Roothing infrastructure (including Transmission Gully)
- Construction works (including earthquake affected buildings)

The hydro waste excavation process generates non toxic hydro waste made up of water, mud and gravel from the infrastructure and construction industries. Our main concern is the volume of water contributes to landfill leachate (refer to environmental consultant).

Based on review of 2 years landfill invoicing approximately **10,500,000** litres (**19,950 tonnes**) of Hydro-Excavation waste is being created by the three major Hydro Excavation companies, however there are 10 other companies currently operating in the Wellington region. It is estimated that **95%** of this waste is going straight to landfills and being buried unprocessed.

Although the Hydro-Excavation waste itself, is not considered toxic or hazardous, it is the liquid nature of the waste and how this contributes to a process called leachate that is causing some real environmental concerns in our local community.

3.0 Hydro Waste Recycling New Zealand Limited

Hydro Waste Recycling NZ Limited (HWRNZL) was established as a company early 2017 following 3 years of R&D has resulted in the commissioning of a prototype hydro waste recycling plant.

While the benefits of the Hydro Excavation process are proven, the HWRNZ team have become increasingly concerned that the current process for disposing of the hydro waste is not environmentally sustainable. Additionally, the current hydro waste disposal process does not align with the intention of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008, the New Zealand Waste Strategy 2010, developed by The Ministry for the Environment and the subsequent Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, 2011- 2017, and current draft WMMP 2017-2023 prepared by the councils of the Wellington region.

For the past three years the HWRNZ team have committed significant financial and man-power investment into researching and developing a system that could achieve improved environmental outcomes. The goal for the HWRNZ team has been to design and construct a recycling system that will be able to effectively separate Hydro Excavation waste back to its original dry materials whilst extracting and capturing the water content, thereby achieving a sustainable environmental solution for the disposal of hydro waste.

4.0 Submission Limitations & References

HWRNZ is not responding fully to the proposed plan our intended role is to be constructive towards ensuring that the implementation of the Waste Minimisation Plan results in the best possible outcomes for government, local bodies, business and the general public, and achieves the objectives of the Act in the most cost-effective and efficient manner.

Section 1.4.3 of the recent Waste Assessment conducted as part of the review of the WMMP 2010-2016 states, "Consideration of Solid, Liquid and Gaseous Wastes In line with the Councils' previous joint WMMP, this Waste Assessment is focused on solid waste that is disposed of to land or diverted from land disposal. The guidance provided by the Ministry for the Environment on preparing Waste Management and Minimisation Plans states that: "Councils need to determine the scope of their WMMP in terms of which wastes and diverted materials are to be considered within the plan".

"The guidance further suggests that liquid or gaseous wastes that are directly managed by a TA, or are disposed of to landfill, should be seriously considered for inclusion in a WMMP." For the hydro excavation industry two key considerations are liquid waste and saturated soils and clays. Given the hydro excavation industry services Wellington region infrastructure and construction we believe it deserves attention.

The waste assessment report further states "In practical terms, the lack of precise data about disposal of waste to Class 2-4 landfills makes it impossible to reliably monitor any changes over time in the disposal of major waste streams, such as construction and demolition waste.

It has been estimated that a total of 889,303 tonnes of solid waste were disposed of to land in Wellington region in 2015. Waste disposed of at Class 2-4 landfills comprised nearly 60% of the total, and was equivalent to more than 1 tonne per person in 2015.

Class 2–4 landfills mostly just take inert material like soil and rock, from roading and construction projects. They aren't allowed to take any odourous or hazardous waste. Class 2 landfills can take some construction waste like wood, plastic or glass, while Class 4 landfills are essentially only allowed to take soil and rock etc.

Section 9 of the Waste assessment states "Disposal of unknown quantities of waste to Class 2-4 landfills - While the data on Class 2-4 landfills that is available to the Councils is very limited, it is likely that considerable quantities of recoverable materials are disposed of to these facilities."

Our particular concern is regulatory measures and corresponding flow on effect on the WMMP. There is a gap as liquid waste is not defined and this liquid waste contributes to the process known as leachate yet there is no definition of liquid waste.

Disposal of waste is driven by the changing nature of the economy (new products/processes etc.). Hydro waste is a relatively new growth industry key drivers in the sector for the Wellington region are

- UFB rollout (and ongoing maintenance)
- Roading infrastructure
- Construction works and earthquake affected buildings

HWRNZ fully supports the need for waste minimisation through treatment, recovery, recycling and reduction. The ability to divert solid waste away from landfilling is a precondition to meeting the WMMP targets. The ability to divert water away from landfilling mitigates the risk of leachate.

HWRNZ supports industry driven solutions to reduce waste. People within the industry in conjunction with landfill operators together will make rationale decisions in respect of collection, sorting, reduction and disposal.

HWRNZ support the principles of waste minimisation but we are only addressing our own area of expertise.

5.0 WMMP Regulatory Measures – Solid Waste Bylaws

“The solid waste bylaws have potential to be aligned for greater effectiveness and efficiency, particularly around definitions, operator licensing, and data collection.”

4.1 Regional Regulation WPPM Extract

Reference R.R.1	Develop and implement a regional by law
Description	Investigate and if feasible develop, implement and oversee monitoring and enforcement of the regional bylaw, or a suite of regionally consistent bylaws
Timeframe	Pending development of regional Solid Waste ByLaw
Funding Options	Licensing fess and general rate
Strategic goals and hierarchy position	Objective: to reduce the total quantity of waste to landfill, with an emphasis on wastes that create the most harm Objective: to take actions that will improve information on waste and recovered material activities including both council-contracted and private sector activities Hierarchy level : All levels
Method and contribution to regional targets	Supports initiatives that make direct contribution to targets

Rationale

Each of the territorial authorities within the region currently has its own bylaw and these do not align in many instances. A single regional bylaw will lessen the burden of compliance on waste operators and potentially provide the councils with much improved waste data. A regional solid waste bylaw is planned but this will require resourcing and application at the local level. Action under this heading will give effect to the regional bylaw in our district.

We submit

That the regional regulation measures are too narrow as limited to solid waste.

We would like consideration to be given to expanding regional regulation to include the below factors.

1. Definition Liquid Waste should be included in Regional ByLaws supported by a management plan.

Please note, Liquid Waste is a common term utilised when discussing sewerage plant output and Class 2-4 landfills are not allowed to accept liquid waste from stormwater and sewerage treatment. We are not talking about this type of liquid waste. All documentation presently seems to limit the definition to these fields.

We are referring to non-toxic hydro excavation waste only (as defined below).

The below was on MFE website.

“Bulk liquids are not suitable for disposal to any class of landfill because they:

- increase the volume of leachate generated and requiring treatment and/or disposal
- can result in increased odour nuisance
- can reduce the stability of the refuse mass under certain conditions.

The prohibition of liquid waste requires an appropriate definition and practical test to enable clear, consistent and unequivocal determination of whether or not a waste is suitable for disposal. The following definition of liquid waste is recommended, as it provides a consistent means of determining whether or not a waste is non-liquid and therefore whether it is acceptable for landfill disposal.

For waste to be considered non-liquid it must meet the following requirements:

- a solids content of at least 20% *and* liberate no free liquids when transported; *or*

no free liquids when tested in accordance with the US EPA Paint Filter Liquids Test (US EPA Method 9095A 1996) *and* liberate no free liquids when transported.”

Note, for the Hydro excavation industry in practise we are aware the measure of 20% solids is being applied however we contend that the measurement is valueless as there is currently no way to isolate the material to know the characteristics of waste content in order to test and apply the ratio.

2. Definition non toxic Hydro Excavation Waste

Combination of non toxic liquid (water) and solid (soil, clay, gravel)

3. Definition Processed and Recycled Hydro Excavation Waste

Combination of non toxic liquid (water) and solid waste (soil, clay, gravel) that has been through a physical process to dewater and separate. Resultant output produces recycled water and recovered gravel solid material that maybe reused (e.g. gravel) or disposed to landfill (e.g. dry paste). The treated solid output is classified as solid waste. (Points of reference - Australia Capital Territory/Canberra).

Rationale

Since the Waste Strategy and subsequent legislation was introduced we have observed a potential unintended consequence. The hydro waste excavation industry has been operating in a ‘grey area’ since the introduction of legislation as there is no definition of liquid waste. Waste is a by-product of production and consumption by industry, commerce and households. Once produced it may need management as a waste or it can provide resources as inputs to other activities. Liquid waste is deposited at class 2-4 landfills. It is not defined by regulation and a consequence of that is there is no controls,

monitoring or reporting resulting in the waste being managed inappropriately. Furthermore the regulation addresses matters of today, it is not future focussed on provision of services where waste is treated/processed, and recycled and the classification of by-product out flow. The plan is only reviewed every six years therefore regulation in principle is updated every six years.

The hydro waste excavation process generates hydro waste made up of water, mud and gravel from the infrastructure and construction industries. Our first concern is ambiguity created in the regulatory framework hence the request for clarity. Within this for the hydro excavation industry two key considerations are liquid waste and saturated soils and clays. Given the hydro excavation industry services Wellington region infrastructure and construction we believe it deserves attention. Final concern is the volume of water contributes to landfill leachate (refer to environmental consultant).

There are three large operators in Wellington region each holding approx. one third of the market. Having reviewed two years of landfill receipt we reliably estimate approximately **10,500,000 litres (19,950 tonnes)** of Hydro-Excavation waste is being created by the three major Hydro Excavation companies, however there are 10 other companies currently operating in the Wellington region. It is estimated that **95%** of this waste is going straight to landfills and being buried unprocessed. If we look ahead to the future over the next two years based on known upcoming contracts the quantum is estimated to become 13,000,000 litres (26,000 tonnes).

Although the Hydro-Excavation waste itself, is not considered toxic or hazardous, it is the liquid nature of the waste and how this contributes to a process called leachate that is causing some real environmental concerns in our local community.

“Excessive sediment in watercourses is becoming one of the most significant water pollution issues in the Region having significant adverse effects on natural waters and aquatic ecosystems.

By volume, sediment is the biggest single water pollutant worldwide.”
(Ref: GWRC, WCC Liquid Waste Management Plan Section 3.5)

Our point is if you empty over a million litres of water (already full of silt) a month (13,000,000 litres - 26,000 tonnes pa.) onto a central landfill this has an impact. When you have that volume of fluid going through the landfill it contributes to both silt in our waterways and corresponding effects of erosion through water flows in natural circumstances. When water, silt, soil and gravel are dumped at the tip over the bank the dumping collects fine materials out creating gaps that may lead to erosion. If you also consider that the hydro waste water volume entering the landfill is over suspended solids this also provides a vehicle for toxins created from leachate to join the water flow pathway. In our view there is an issue.

Key Issues

- there are no clear definitions in regulatory framework
- there is uncertainty due to deficiency of information
- there is no systems in place to record where hydro waste comes from
- there is no system in place to separate contents
- there is no system in place to classify separated material looking at characteristics of waste content (rather than basis of source)
- presently not managed in an appropriate manner (in our view)
- limitations on the disposal of hydro waste
- contributing to leachate process
- needs to be mitigated and managed
 - water needs to be recycled
 - gravels need to be reused
 - reduction of quantum entering landfill

Note: Please refer to independent environmental report to follow.

6.0 Region-wide Resource Recovery Network

Reference R.IN.1	Investigate and if feasible develop a region-wide resource recovery network – including facilities for construction and demolition waste, food and/or biosolids and other organic waste
Timeframe	2020
Funding Options	General Rate Targeted Rate User Charges Waste Levy
Strategic goals and hierarchy position	Objective: To increase diversion of waste that is currently disposed of to landfill for reuse, recovery or recycling. Hierarchy level: Reuse, recycling
Method and contribution to regional actions and targets	A fully implemented resource recovery network would divert an estimated 40,000 tonnes per annum from disposal – primarily garden waste and construction and demolition waste

Rationale

Territorial authorities within the region are committed to investigating, and where feasible, developing facilities that can form part of a region-wide resource recovery network. This initiative looks to develop our local transfer stations in line with regional standards to increase the quantity of materials that can be economically recovered for beneficial use.

We agree there is a greater need for reuse and recycling. We also think that GWRC and district councils should engage and collaborate more with industry participants so that they become aware of waste minimisation initiatives by the private sector. Participants have expertise in their specific areas and able to contribute to the supply of solutions to the market. They have already invested significant time and money into R&D.

111



PO BOX 58899
BOTANY
AUCKLAND 2163
17E GREENMOUNT DRIVE
EAST TAMAKI
AUCKLAND 2013
PHONE: 09 271 4044
pac.nz@packaging.org.nz
www.packaging.org.nz

18th May 2017

Wellington City Council

By email: wasteplan@wcc.govt.nz

DRAFT WELLINGTON REGION WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MINIMISATION PLAN

Thank you for giving the Packaging Council (PAC.NZ) the opportunity to make comment on the above draft plan.

The purpose of PAC.NZ is to represent the packaging industry as a key sector in the New Zealand economy, one that improves the utility and safety of products and underpins producers and manufacturers efforts to 'add value' in an export-dependent economy. Independent analysis by KPMG puts the value of the New Zealand packaging industry at \$3.9 billion and Infometrics data shows that over five thousand businesses support 49,000 employees, with the Wellington region being the third largest for business units behind Auckland and the Canterbury region. The packaging industry in New Zealand is constantly innovating to create the features and benefits we demand from packaging such as improved functionality, customer preference, safety, design for dexterity, portion control for health benefits, product wastage prevention and enhanced environmental characteristics including impacts for end-of-life solutions such as lightweighting, design changes to optimise recyclability and material changes.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- 1.1 We support the overall intent of the plan to reduce unnecessary waste to landfill.
- 1.2 We support the intent of the plan for the councils in the Wellington region to potentially work together more, and jointly deliver best practice waste and recycling services with a focus on efficiencies, cost saving and optimisation of the recovery fleet.
- 1.3 We support the intent of the plan to collaborate with other local government organisations, NGOs, and other key stakeholders on undertaking research, lobbying and actions on various waste management issues.

PAC.NZ Submission to Wellington Region WMMP

Page 1
96



SPECIFIC COMMENTS

- 2.1 We are concerned that in your considerations you have not included litter abatement, nor included the Litter Act in your legislative considerations. Litter is a significant social issue and the impact of fugitive materials raises environmental issues for the Wellington region such as plastic in the marine environment. Since the plan draws particular attention to containers and plastic bags which it is acknowledged, when discarded carelessly (littered), present a hazard in the natural environment we find this omission at odds with the intent of the plan *“to deliver more consistent and effective forms of regional communications and education around waste services and waste minimisation, so households and communities are inspired and supported to play their part.”*
- 2.2 We also have concerns that drawing particular attention to specific items in the waste stream, such as containers, plastic bags, e-waste, noting the *“not limited to”* comment, has the potential to create a platform for opportunistic ‘cherry picking’ of specific waste streams, based on ‘popular demand’ rather than evidence-based facts. We would further make the points that the implementation of ad-hoc schemes is potentially resource inefficient across a whole raft of life-cycle environmental indicators and fragmentation of the overall waste and recycling recovery systems compromises the economic value of the entire system which we believe would be contrary to the vision of the councils in the Wellington region to focus on efficiencies, cost savings and optimisation of the recovery fleet.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 A significant opportunity for improving kerbside recycling and avoiding unnecessary waste to landfill lies with the design of the recovery systems. Globally, recovered materials have to compete against the quality and cost of virgin materials. Co-mingled waste streams suffer from unnecessary wastage and associated loss of value due to cross contamination with other recovered materials compromising the cost effectiveness of the overall recovery system.
- 3.2 PAC.NZ and its members share the same objective as the councils in the Wellington region to improve the region’s recovery and recycling systems. So we are particularly pleased to see that this plan is keen to engage across all stakeholders. PAC.NZ advocates for inclusive debate on waste issues across central government, local government, industry and communities, so it can be determined what intervention is required and where, what resources are already in place, provide analytical assessment if these resources are enough, and if not, establish what else is required and from whom. We believe that our position is aligned to the vision in this plan.
- 3.3 We would be happy to speak to our comments should the opportunity arise.

Sharon Humphreys
Executive Director, Packaging Council of New Zealand Inc.

