

Confidential Item



Confidential Item

For Council meeting to be held on

Monday 5 September 2022 at 7.00 pm

Refer Item 11.11

Confidential Item

11.11 Kerbside Collection Recyclables

Chief Executive Officer, Paul Di Iulio's Report

Purpose of Report

To consider the responses received from the recent market engagement activities for the receipt and processing of Council's kerbside collection recyclables.

Strategic Plan Link

Focus Area 2.1.3 Reduce emissions locally and regionally, including in partnership with Resilient East

Focus Area 4.4.3 Manage infrastructure that balances the needs for all, including through demonstration projects

Focus Area 5.2.4 Drive innovation, enhancement and efficiency through collaboration

Previous Council / Committee Resolution

At its meeting on 19 July 2022, Council considered a report regarding the outcome of the Expression of Interest process for the Newton Transfer Station and resolved to:

- notify IWS (Integrated Waste Services) that they have been selected as the preferred Registrant pursuant to the Expression of Interest Stage
- enter into exclusive, direct negotiations with IWS for a defined period (approximately 90 days) to establish detailed terms and conditions and enter into an agreement for the lease and development of the land comprising the Project consistent with the key terms and conditions identified in the attached Evaluation Report
 - if the Council is unable to reach an agreement with IWS to realise a satisfactory development outcome for the Project, the Council terminate negotiations with IWS and enter into direct negotiations with Whelan Kartaway for the development and potential lease of the land consistent with the key terms and conditions identified in the attachment
- authorise the Chief Executive Officer to do all things necessary to give effect to the above resolutions of Council.

Background

Pursuant to the abovementioned resolution, the Chief Executive Officer has been in direct negotiations with IWS to establish detailed terms and conditions for the lease and development of the NTS (Newton Transfer Station).

Contemporaneous with these negotiations, the Council through East Waste has undertaken extensive analysis of the recycling processing landscape in Adelaide including going to market on behalf of member Councils to identify options for receipt and processing of recyclables. In undertaking this analysis, East Waste approached and sought prices from the MRFs (Material Recovery Facility) operated by NAWMA (Northern Adelaide Waste Management Authority), CAWRA (Central Adelaide and Recycling Authority) and SRWRA (Southern Region Waste Resource Authority).

On the basis of these investigations, East Waste has recommended that Campbelltown engage CAWRA to receive and process the Council's recyclables on the basis that:

1. transport is a significant factor in determining the most appropriate MRF to engage due to associated financial cost and carbon emission considerations, and
2. transport to CAWRA represents a significant saving over transport to the other MRFs (or their aggregation depots) and despite CAWRA having the highest gate price, the transport saving makes it the best deal from a financial and emissions perspective.

The East Waste table summarising the financial benefits to member Councils is set out below:

Table 1: East Waste offered Recycling Process Fees for a three (3)-year contract

	Gate Rate / tonne (Direct)	Gate Rate/tonne (inc. Bulk Transport)
CAWRA	\$120 ¹	
NAWMA	\$103	\$128.50 ²
SRWRA	\$99	\$128 / \$140 ³

Notes:

1. \$130/tonne if less than 12,000 tonne per annum.
2. East Waste is required to manage the transfer station and transport contract
3. SRWRA have proposed to manage the transport where required. The \$128/tonne option is located at Wingfield and has a 12,000/annum cap. The alternate site is a Plympton North location which offers limited logistical value.

Whilst East Waste identified other reasons for recommending CAWRA, these are not quantified in terms of financial benefit to member Councils. East Waste's analysis is set out in full detail in the letter attached to this report.

Discussion

Staff have reviewed the East Waste letter and notes that the East Waste recommendation does not take account of the circumstances that are specific and unique to Campbelltown, including:

1. Councils' arrangements with IWS with respect to the NTS, including the IWS offer to transport the Council's recyclables from Wingfield (or NTS if practical) to SRWRA for a fixed fee of \$15 per tonne

2. arising from IWS's arrangements with SRWRA, the unsolicited proposal from SRWRA to receive and process the Council's recyclables at a price that is less than the price that SRWRA provided to East Waste as part of its investigations
3. the additional potential saving to the Council should the Council (through East Waste) be able to deposit its recyclables at the NTS rather than Wingfield
4. the significant carbon emissions savings from each of the above initiatives which consolidate activities and/or limits transport times and distances between the respective collection and processing facilities.

Council's NTS is a unique asset which Council can use to save costs, reduce emissions and improve services to its Community. There are a number of variables to be considered by the Council when assessing East Waste's recommended deal against the deal available to Council arising from the abovementioned unique circumstances. These variables are considered in four separate scenarios, detailed below:

Scenario 1 – EW achieves 12,000T minimum tonnes to CAWRA, Council transports recyclables to Wingfield – Year 1

	Gate rate	Bulk transport cost to processing facility	Gate/tonne incl bulk transport
SRWRA	\$93	\$15	\$108
CAWRA	\$120	Nil	\$120

Scenario 2 – EW does not achieve 12,000T minimum tonnes to CAWRA, Council transports recyclables to Wingfield – Year 1

	Gate rate	Bulk transport cost to processing facility	Gate/tonne incl bulk transport
SRWRA	\$93	\$15	\$108
CAWRA	\$130	Nil	\$130

Scenario 3 – EW achieves 12,000T minimum tonnes to CAWRA, Council transports recyclables to Newton – Year 1

	Gate rate	Transport differential – NTS v CAWRA	Bulk transport cost to processing facility	Gate/tonne incl bulk transport
SRWRA	\$93	(\$6)	\$15	\$102
CAWRA	\$120	Nil	Nil	\$128

Scenario 4 – EW does not achieve 12,000T minimum tonnes to CAWRA, Council transports recyclables to Newton – Year 1

	Gate rate	Transport differential – NTS v CAWRA	Bulk transport cost to processing facility	Gate/tonne incl bulk transport
SRWRA	\$93	(\$6)	\$15	\$102
CAWRA	\$130	Nil	Nil	\$130

In each of the above scenarios, Council is better off financially taking its recyclables to SRWRA by virtue of the unique circumstances applying to Council compared with other member East Waste Councils. Based on Council's annual anticipated volume of 4,000 tonnes of recyclables, the annual financial differential ranges between \$48,000 and \$112,000.

There is also a significant benefit in terms of emissions reduction by virtue of the transport savings, particularly if Council is able to work with IWS for its recyclables to be transported to Newton and not a third party MRF or consolidation site (which the Council will be exploring with IWS under the new arrangements for the NTS).

In short, there are material financial and environmental sustainability benefits over the next 3 years arising from Council electing to take the IWS/SRWRA deal ahead of the CAWRA deal. The above analysis is of course subject to the detailed terms and conditions under the SRWRA contract versus the CAWRA contract (in each case for receipt and processing of recyclables) although an initial review of the two contracts has identified that any differences are non-material in financial terms.

With regard to the contractual term proposed under both contracts, the CAWRA deal has a minimum term of 3 years, whereas the SRWRA deal has a minimum term of 9 years. While there are advantages and disadvantages of long term versus short term contracts, Council has substantially mitigated the key risk associated with a long term SRWRA deal (being that new technology emerges that results in a substantially better market price being available) by requiring that SRWRA agree to Council's standard 'alternate technology price match or terminate' clause.

The above analysis also assumes the ongoing unique offer of IWS to transport Council's recyclables from Wingfield to SRWRA for a flat fee of \$15 per tonne. This will be a condition of Council's ongoing engagement of both SRWRA (under the recyclables contract) and IWS (under the NTS lease). In other words, Council will negotiate the contracts to ensure the arrangements with SRWRA and IWS are interdependent (ie if one contract falls over, so will the other giving Council the right to go back out to market to seek an alternative deal for where it's recyclables are taken).

Summary

The new leasing arrangements for the NTS have presented a wider opportunity for Council to reduce both the transportation costs and the emissions associated with its collection and processing activities. While the option recommended by East Waste will be of benefit to some of its member Councils, it does not take account of circumstances that are specific and unique to Campbelltown. The options for Council are best summarised as follows:

Option 1 – East Waste Recommendation	Option 2 – Council's Recommendation
CAWRA - 4,000T @ \$120/t	SRWRA – 4,000T @ \$108/t
Total Cost = \$480,000	Total Cost = \$432,000
(Total Cost if CAWRA @ \$130/t) = \$520,000	

The financial savings from Option 2 compared with Option 1 range from \$48,000 to \$88,000.

Over and above these savings, by virtue of Council's new arrangements for the NTS, the Council:

- will receive \$60,000 per annum lease fee from IWS in respect of the NTS
- will achieve further savings as a result of IWS' ability to receive Council's kerbside green organics at NTS rather than Wingfield, which is estimated to equate to a saving of \$23,400 to Council arising from reduced transport for East Waste collection vehicles
- is exploring further savings should IWS be able to receive Council's kerbside recyclables at NTS rather than Wingfield, which is estimated to equate to an additional saving of \$23,400 to Council arising from reduced transport for East Waste collection vehicles
- is optimising existing IWS/SRWRA logistics arrangements and reducing East Waste transport requirements to reduce carbon emissions.

The abovementioned arrangements improve services, reduce carbon emissions and achieve greater value for money for Council. Therefore, it is recommended that Council select Option 2 and enter into the contract with SRWRA on the basis of the key terms and interdependent arrangements with IWS set out in this report.

Social Implications

There are no social implications in relation to this report however the new, integrated IWS operation of the NTS is anticipated to maintain and potentially improve services to the Community from the NTS.

Environmental Implications

Council is optimising the existing IWS/SRWRA logistics arrangements and reducing East Waste transport requirements to reduce carbon emissions (in particular Scope 3 emissions), and Council's carbon footprint whilst supporting one of Council's key Climate Solutions objectives.

Asset Management Implications

There are no asset management implications in relation to this Report, however as a result of exploring the future use of NTS for the receipt of kerbside collected recyclables there may be some asset management implications, such as capital works, although capital works will likely be a matter for IWS as the lessee and operator of the NTS.

Governance / Risk Management

While the SRWRA proposal was received by the Council pursuant to the Council's Guidelines (Unsolicited Proposal Guidelines), the services offered by SRWRA was for the receipt and processing of the Council's kerbside collected recyclables – a matter that has been extensively investigated by the Council facilitated by East Waste.

Given the above, and the fact that the matter is already the subject of an existing procurement process, the Council (as part of its consideration of the SRWRA proposal under Stage 1 of the Guidelines) sought advice from Norman Waterhouse Lawyers. The advice to the Council – having regard to all relevant circumstances, was that the Council should directly engage SRWRA under the Council's Procurement Policy.

The Council directly engaging with SRWRA in relation to the procurement of the services is supported under the Council's Procurement Policy given that:

- There has been open and effective competition for the services via the East Waste market engagement process and that process has established standard market pricing available for standard market situations surrounding the receipt and processing of the Council's Services (kerbside collected recyclables)
- The Council's unique circumstances in owning the NRTS and contracting with IWS for the future management and operation of the NTRS have opened up a unique alternative solution for the Services. IWS's pre-existing relationship with SRWRA around receipt and processing of recyclables has resulted in:
 - (a) SRWRA being able to make a unique offer to the Council for the Services, and
 - (b) IWS being able to make a unique offer to the Council in respect of the transport of the Councils kerbside collected recyclables to SRWRA

the product of which, represents better value for money than the alternatives identified by East Waste through its open market engagement process for standard market situations.

- SRWRA's proposal (combined with the IWS transport proposal) represents a strong financial offer from a suitably qualified provider to the Services as well as an opportunity to engage a recyclables service provider in line with the Council's identified objectives to move towards more environmentally sustainable practices and improve the circular economy whilst reducing the Council's carbon emissions through reduced transport costs.
- Notwithstanding the value of the purchase therefore, the particular circumstances of this procurement activity, the financial and environmental objectives of the Council, the limited market alternatives and a global assessment of the risk profile of the procurement support the Council engaging directly with SRWRA for the Services as contemplated by this Report.

The Council will engage Norman Waterhouse Lawyers to document the interdependent arrangements between the Council and SRWRA and IWS (respectively) to achieve the objectives set out in this Report.

Community Engagement

There has been no consultation with the Community at this time, however it is anticipated that dependent upon the future use and potential redevelopment of the NTS there may be a requirement to undertake a Community consultation process.

Regional Implications

The NTS, in its current form provides a regional facility for households to dispose of unwanted items. It is envisaged that the above outcome of Council's waste management practices may play an even more significant role within the Eastern Region of Adelaide.

Economic Development Implications

There are no economic development implications in relation to this report.

Financial Implications

There are ongoing financial implications from the ongoing rise in costs to collect and process all three Council waste streams (waste, green organics, recyclables). The arrangements proposed in this Report actively seek to mitigate the Council's exposure to such ongoing rises to the extent possible while also achieving other key objectives (eg social and environmental). The proposed interdependent arrangement is likely to save Council approximately \$71,000 per year, which would increase to \$111,000 per year if East Waste fails to deliver a minimum of 12,000 tonnes to CAWRA.

Furthermore, the range in savings will increase to between \$94,000 and \$134,000 if the recyclables could also be delivered to NTS.

Recommendation

That Council:

- **having regard to the Council's unique circumstances arising from its ownership of the Newton Transfer Station and proposed arrangements with IWS (Integrated Waste Services) for the operation of the same, enter into contractual arrangements with SRWRA (Southern Region Waste Resource Authority) for the receipt and processing of Council's kerbside collection recyclables**
 - **ensure that the contractual arrangements with IWS and SRWRA are interdependent as set out in this Report**
 - **authorise the Chief Executive Officer to do all things necessary to give effect to the above resolutions of Council.**
-

17 August 2022

Mr Paul Di Iulio
Chief Executive Officer
Campbelltown City Council
PO Box 1
CAMPBELLTOWN SA 5074
(sent via email: pdiulio@campbelltown.sa.gov.au)

Dear Paul,

CONFIDENTIAL: East Waste Recycling Agreement

East Waste over the past four months has undertaken an extensive analysis of the recycling processing landscape within Adelaide and we are now in a position to make a formal offer, and request for Member Council's to commit their recycling tonnes to East Waste for the next three (3) years.

East Waste collected tonnes are currently processed by Northern Adelaide Waste Management Authority (NAWMA), with the contract expiring on 30 September 2022. In order to secure a three (3) year agreement(s) commencing 1 October 2022, we request Council signs the attached Recycling Agreement, committing Campbelltown City Council tonnes to East Waste, prior to the commencement of the Caretaker period on 6 September 2022.

Administration believe there are five (5) key considerations in assessing the suitability of a Material Recovery Facility (MRF) which are:

1. Transport
2. Financial (price)
3. Processing Parameters & Capacity
4. Circular Economy
5. Relationship

Upfront it is important to note that Administration are of the view that all three (3) Adelaide-based MRFs (Central Adelaide Waste Management Authority (CAWRA), NAWMA, and Southern Region Waste Resources Authority (SRWRA)) are more than capable of undertaking the processing of East Waste's recycling tonnes. CAWRA and SRWRA through the most recent procurement process have highlighted strong aspects and the value of their operations, while NAWMA has demonstrated over the past four (4) years their ability, support in assisting East Waste and to partnering to achieve positive results at a highly competitive rate.

A high-level overview of each Organisation and the recycling offering provided is contained within Tables 1-3 on the following pages.

Table 1: Overview of CAWRA Recycling Offering

Strengths	Risks/Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visy as processing partner most experienced in Australia. • Newest MRF in South Australia. • Capacity to take all tonnes (currently running at 50%). • No additional transport required. • Fixed price with clear increases. • Generous contamination - up to 20% allowed (all EW Councils meet this) and commitment to work with EW if rate exceeds this. • 225kg/m³ compaction rate. • Strong circular economy approach including advanced Member Council 'buy-back' program. • Visy as Operating partner are largest buyer of fibre in Australia. Provides greater certainty in face of export bans. • Fibre guaranteed to be processed beyond export bans. • Glass (with exception of fines) recycled back into bottle here in Adelaide. • Strong reporting proposed. • Strong link with local industry and re-processors. • Option for soft plastics trial. • Opportunity for strong education integration. • Current service provider for City of Unley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAWRA still young organisation – track record unproven. • No independent audits of MRF outputs have been undertaken/verified. • Highest Gate rate. • Seeking to use their own Recycling Processing Agreement (requires legal review). • Visy as processing partner have history of being strong negotiators (contract would be with CAWRA).

Table 2: Overview of NAWMA Recycling Offering

Strengths	Risks/Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longest running MRF in Adelaide. • East Waste has strong operational relationship. • Proven performance in managing East Waste's tonnes (excluding Unley). • Assisted East Waste significantly in past when faced with SKM issue. • History of investing in MRF upgrades and improvements. • Plans for a paper polishing plant to deliver improved contamination rates and meet proposed COAG export requirements (no firm timeframes). • Current process working well. • Fixed price with clear increases. • Strong link with local industry and re-processors. • Solid circular economy approach, albeit focused only on glass sand until this point. • Acceptable contamination and compaction rates, albeit not as high as other offerings. • Improved educational opportunities available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum capacity of 18,000 tonnes/annum (+/- 15%). • Commodities trader. • East Waste required to manage transfer station and bulk transport contracts. • Timing and success of paper polishing plant unknown. • Annual price review contains three separate components - CPI, waste levy component and transport.

Table 3: Overview of SRWRA Recycling Offering

Strengths	Risks/Considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biggest MRF in South Australia. • 50/50 Joint Venture with Re.Group (Largest Recycling processor in Australia). • Successfully running for 12 months with independently audited results. • Lowest (commercial) gate rate. • Acceptable transport option from Wingfield location for up to 12,000 tonnes/annum. • Ability to directly tip ~5,000 tonnes without the need for bulk transport. • Commercial cardboard can be received as separate item (increased cost) – limited value for EW. • 225kg/m³ compaction rate - \$20/tonne if exceeded (low concern). • Strong circular economy approach. Vision for a circular economy precinct surrounding MRF. • Site already utilises number of environmentally sustainable approaches. • Glass sand available now to Member Councils through third parties. • Monthly reporting available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bulk hauling required for all but ~5,000tonnes. • Value Share proposition (quasi-Rise & Fall Model). • Contamination set at 15% with \$2.75/1% increase over and above. Some Member Councils will not meet. • No bottle-to-bottle recycling with glass – all glass down-cycled to glass sand. • Re.Group is a trader of commodities. • Seeking to use their own Recycling Processing Agreement (requires legal review).

Transport Considerations

Transport is a significant factor in determining the most appropriate MRF. East Waste is highly attuned to minimising collection (and importantly associated with recycling) disposal travel costs. Under the current contract this has been achieved through aggregation of the material at Wingfield for bulk transport to NAWMA's MRF at Edinburgh. Simply, for processing at NAWMA it is cheaper to aggregate for bulk haulage at Wingfield rather than deliver direct. This however adds significant cost to the processing fee.

CAWRA's geographical location (<5km from the East Waste depot) provides favourable transport benefits as no aggregation of material is required and no additional collection and disposal time (Common Fleet Charge) will result. While the absence of an additional transport fee is the most compelling reason, simplifying the logistics chain saves East Waste resourcing/administrative time and retains collected material in its highest state which helps to ensure more material is processed. The value this provides should not be underestimated in the overall consideration.

CAWRA have the most expensive gate rate, yet the absence of additional transport provides a Year One (1) saving of at least \$8/tonne over the other MRFs. This is a straight financial saving and does not take into consideration environmental and carbon savings as a result of reduced transport.

Financial Considerations

A pricing overview is provided in Table 4. CAWRA and SRWRA have advised they can receive and process all East Waste tonnes should they be on offer, commencing 1 October 2022. NAWMA has a capacity for approximately 60% of East Waste's total tonnes.

Table 4: East Waste offered Recycling Process Fees for a three(3)-year contract

	Gate Rate/tonne (Direct)	Gate Rate/tonne (inc. Bulk Transport)
CAWRA	\$120 ¹	
NAWMA	\$103	\$128.50 ²
SRWRA	\$99	\$128 / \$140 ³

Notes:

1. \$130/tonne if less than 12,000 tonne per annum.
2. East Waste is required to manage the transfer station and transport contract
3. SRWRA have proposed to manage the transport where required. The \$128/tonne option is located at Wingfield and has a 12,000/annum cap. The alternate site is a Plympton North location which offers limited logistical value.

Circular Economy

All MRFs are actively partaking in circular economy activities, with variations in their approach. This three (3) year contract will take East Waste through to 30 September 2025, which is after the rolling 'waste' export bans are fully implemented in 2024. Paper and cardboard (fibre) comprise approximately 50% (by weight) of the yellow bin and approximately 80% of material historically exported. The 'bans' on glass, tyres and plastic have already come into force, with paper and cardboard set to commence on 1 July 2024. It is important to note that it is not a strict ban rather a tighter control on what can be exported. Paper and cardboard that is sorted to one type with low contamination levels will still be able exported. Australia currently has a significant oversupply of recycled paper and cardboard; that is we do not have sufficient reprocessing capacity onshore to reprocess all the fibre generated. MRFs will either need to process to a point where they can continue to trade overseas or find markets locally.

VISY, which is CAWRA's processing partner are the largest onshore fibre re-processor in Australia and a Recycling Processing Agreement through CAWRA would guarantee fibre is processed locally. SRWRA have advised they are meeting export ban targets already, albeit are committed to onshore trading. NAWMA are not currently meeting the targets but have received State and Federal funding and are committed to the installation of a paper polishing plant, which they claim will exceed the export targets and allow them to continue trading offshore.

CAWRA currently lead the way with respect to glass recycling with the bulk of their glass being recycled locally through the VISY glass factory here in Adelaide. Retaining glass at its highest value and ensure glass is recycled into glass is key. NAWMA have for some time had a glass improvement line within their MRF, to extract additional glass out of the waste stream and further capture smaller cullet for processing into glass sand. SRWRA currently process all glass into sand which sees the material utilised in construction-based projects. While being recycled and ensuring the material is diverted away from landfill it is a lower value use of the material than returning it into bottles.

Overall, through the integration with VISY, Administration's view is that CAWRA is currently the circular economy leader of the Adelaide MRFs and there appears to be a number of further options in the pipeline with the CAWRA 'buy-back' program.

Recommendation

As can be seen from the preceding pages of information there is no one 'perfect' partner, with all having an array of benefits and (at least some) some associated risk. As stated at the outset, all MRFs are highly capable and align well with the requirements sought by East Waste in a three (3) year contract.

East Waste is able to deliver Campbelltown City Council tonnes directly to CAWRA, which provides a financial and transport benefit over other offerings and coupled with the strength of CAWRAs circular economy approach, a sound offering for the next three years.

With this in mind, we encourage the Campbelltown City Council to commit all kerbside collected co-mingled recyclable material to East Waste for the next three (3) years, via the attached Agreement. This recommendation is based on the assumption of securing commitment from all Member Councils first. East Waste will not enter into any contractual arrangements with processors without first securing tonnes for the duration of the contract. Should one or more Councils choose not to commit, it will alter the tonnes, and possibly, the contracts entered into.

In anticipation of this information being presented to your elected member body for endorsement, please find below a draft confidential recommendation. Please note that East Waste is still in an active and open procurement process so all information, particularly pricing, must be kept confidential.

That following consideration of the results of the procurement processes which have been undertaken by the East Waste Management Authority on behalf of the Constituent Councils of the Authority, the Chief Executive Officer be authorised to sign the attached Kerbside Recycling Commitment Agreement with East Waste which commit the Councils kerbside collected co-mingled recyclable tonnes exclusively to East Waste for the period 1 October 2022 to 30 September 2025.

David Maywald, Manager Business Services or myself are available to attend the Council meeting where this is presented if required.

In the event you do not wish to sign the agreement, the existing temporary contract arrangements ceases on 30 September 2022, and prior to this time, you will need to advise East Waste where you wish your material to be taken.

Many thanks for your patience with East Waste as we have worked through this process. Should you seek any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me on 0417 466 929 or rob@eastwaste.com.

Yours sincerely,



ROB GREGORY

GENERAL MANAGER

**AGREEMENT TO COMMIT KERBSIDE RECYCLABLE MATERIAL TO
EAST WASTE FOR INCLUSION IN AN EAST WASTE AGREEMENT FOR
THE RECEIPT AND PROCESSING OF THAT MATERIAL THROUGH
UNTIL 30 SEPTEMBER 2025**

DATE:

BETWEEN:

EASTERN WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY of 1 Temple Court, Ottoway SA 5013 (“the Authority”)

AND

CAMPBELLTOWN CITY COUNCIL of 172 Montacute Road, Rostrevor SA 5073

- 1 Council is a member of East Waste.
 - 2 East Waste through compliant procurement processes has secured terms for a three (3) year agreement(s) for the receipt and processing of kerbside collected co-mingled recyclable materials on the basis that Council would commit its tonnes to East Waste for inclusion.
 - 3 It is anticipated that East Waste will hold a Recycling Processing Agreement (or the like) with one or more Material Recovery Facilities in order to provide flexibility and deliver an optimal outcome for Council for the duration of the agreement.
 - 4 Council hereby commits all kerbside collected co-mingled recycling tonnes to East Waste from 1 October 2022, through until 30 September 2025, being the date on which the Recycling Processing Agreement term ends.
 - 5 East Waste for its part, commits to appropriately managing all Council kerbside collected co-mingled recycling tonnes through an approved Material Recovery Facility.
 - 6 East Waste will invoice Council monthly for all costs associated with the processing of Council kerbside collected co-mingled recycling tonnes.
-

EXECUTED AS AN AGREEMENT

EXECUTED by EASTERN WASTE
MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
under delegated authority

in the presence of:

)
)
)
)
)

.....
Signature

.....
Signature of Witness

.....
Name

.....
Name of Witness

.....
Position

EXECUTED by CAMPBELLTOWN
CITY COUNCIL
under delegated authority

in the presence of:

)
)
)
)

.....
Signature

.....
Signature of Witness

.....
Name

.....
Name of Witness

.....
Position