

## Proposed Estimation / Calculation Methods for Local Governments



No.	Question	City of Kalamunda Comment
1.	Is the annual Local Government Waste & Recycling Census template an appropriate reporting template?	<p>Generally speaking, the template is an appropriate recording mechanism, however it is noted that the minimum waste categories for recovered materials (Q2) isn't imbedded in the current template (recycling tab) This can be easily fixed. The template will also need to be updated for the intent of Appendix A of the consultation paper (ie capturing tonnages and material mix for both recycling and FOGO waste streams)</p> <p>The City is also concerned that the use of the data by DWER for "My Council" website to essentially create "League Tables" is flawed and in some cases inaccurate. This matter is further discussed in our attachment to this response.</p> <p>Data integrity is critical if the results are reported publicly and used to assess the performance of councils and their communities with their recycling and material recovery efforts</p>
2.	Are the proposed material categories practical and appropriate for local governments?	The City has made the assumption that in a 3 bin residential kerbside system including FOGO bin, that the definition of recovered material (Appendix A of the consultation paper) excludes the red lidded bin which would be either disposed of in landfill or waste to energy plant. In other words, it is believed that DWER are seeking from Councils & Processors, the types of materials recovered from the FOGO and Recycling Bin. On that basis, the proposed minimum waste categories to be reported against are appropriate.
3.	Are the proposed calculation methods to estimate the weight of waste received, disposed and leaving and stockpiled at your site clear? If not, what further clarification is required?	Yes
4.	Are there any barriers that would prevent your organisation from using these calculation methods? If so, what are they and how can they be overcome?	No
5.	Are the proposed default material densities and other default values appropriate for Western Australian Local Governments	All default densities and other default values seem appropriate except for the following:

No.	Question	City of Kalamunda Comment
		<p>The Composition of recycling collections post MRF defaults appear erroneous assuming that the default contamination rate is 45% of recycled collections is including residual that would be landfill or waste to energy disposal. Data from our kerbside recycling collection services indicates the following proportions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paper 35%</li> <li>• Cardboard 15%</li> <li>• Plastic 5%</li> <li>• Glass 28%</li> <li>• Fe Metal 1%</li> <li>• Non Fe Metal 1%</li> <li>• Contamination 15%</li> </ul> <p>The MyCouncil data for the Perth and Peel Regional councils supports a lower default contamination as shown in the City's attachment to this submission. The average recovery rate of 84% with 16% contamination, after the high and low reporting councils are removed from the data.</p>
6.	Are the proposed special provisions for smaller local governments suitable?	No comment