

# STAFF REPORT

**TO:** Chairman and Members, Engineering Services Committee

**FROM:** Jeff Cuthbertson

**REFERENCE:**

**DATE:** 13 January 2005

**SUBJECT:** Trial Recycling Stations

---

## PURPOSE

To inform the Engineering Services Committee of the very successful trial recycling stations located at Mapua, Motueka and Takaka and their performance over the Christmas/New Year period. The report also includes the existing station at Wakefield.

## BACKGROUND

Streetsmart were awarded Council's waste collection and recycling contract in October 2004.

As part of that contract, kerbside recycling commenced in Richmond and Brightwater.

Recycling stations were to be established on a trial basis in Mapua, Motueka and Takaka. Recycling stations had already been established at Wakefield and Mariri refuse transfer stations in November 2003 and have operated successfully over the past year.

### Recycling Trial

The trial recycling stations were in place on or about 8 December 2004 in all four centres.

Prior to Christmas the recycling stations needed emptying on about a weekly rotation. This was consistent with what was expected. From approximately 24 December 2004, the frequency of the emptying of the stations increased. It was not envisaged at the start of the trial that the frequency of emptying of the stations would ever be greater than weekly, but the dramatic increase in the usage of these facilities meant that on 28 December 2004 the facilities needed to be emptied daily.

As we now know, this frequency increased to a point that on 2 January 2005 through to 8 January 2005, the facility at Motueka was filling in approximately four hours and resulted in three hours of recyclable material being placed around the outside of the

recycling station. (Refer attached photo). This dramatic usage was not as demanding on all four facilities, but it must be noted that all of the facilities received a dramatic increase in use.

### **Motueka Recycling Station**

This site had the most dramatic usage over the Christmas period. The filling rate at this facility was astronomical. The facility was taking four hours to fill and needed to be emptied twice daily at times.

With the limitation to the site, the traffic issues etc, the site was well maintained considering the usage. Once full, the public showed considerable respect in the way overflow was placed around the facility.

Staff received considerable negative comments about the facility always being full and also received positive comments in that a recycling facility had been provided.

### **Mapua Recycling Station**

This facility also had dramatic usage, although slightly less than Motueka, but the result was the same.

The wet weather at this site also caused an additional problem, in that the grassed area directly in front of the facility broke up with vehicle usage.

As with Motueka, the public showed considerable respect in the way overflow was placed around the facility. Over the main period of Christmas this facility needed emptying on a similar basis to Motueka.

### **Takaka and Wakefield Recycling Facilities Station**

These facilities had regular consistent usage during the Christmas period, but did not need the same frequency of emptying. The Takaka facility was emptied twice per week and Wakefield two or three times per week.

The increased emptying of the Motueka and Mapua facilities resulted in the less used facilities also having overflow problems. This week demand was reduced and Mapua and Motueka are now being emptied once per day.

### **Recyclable Material**

Data on how much material has been recycled through the stations since the beginning of the trial will be presented at the meeting.

### **SUMMARY**

It was proposed at the start of this trial that the trial would be for three months. Prior to the trial ending in early March 2005, Council needs to ensure that whatever facility is put in place for recycling, that facility must be:

- a) large enough to cope with the Christmas increase in population;
- b) able to be frequently emptied and serviced

It should be acknowledged that the public/community have really grasped the recycling proposal with dramatic results. Although there have been a number of negative comments, there have also been a number of positive ones.

The public have shown in the trial to date that they want recycling, will utilise recycling and have shown great restraint in their usage of these limited facilities when they have been overloaded. All and every user of these facilities should be congratulated.

The contractor, Streetsmart Ltd, also needs to be acknowledged. They have taken on an unknown service which has produced dramatic results, well beyond all previous thoughts and expectations, with limited resources, during the busy Christmas period. The facilities were not always maintained to the expectations of some, but maximum endeavours were made by staff.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**That this report be received.**

Jeff Cuthbertson  
Utilities Manager