

Domestic waste management charges - Discussion Paper

Submission date: 20 October 2020, 10:58AM

Receipt number: 92

Related form version: 5

Question	Response
Feedback and Submission Form	
Industry	Local Government
Review	Review of domestic waste management service charges
Document Reference	c1e253a1-4210-41d3-97de-3be8f315fce7
1. Are there concerns with the prices councils charge for domestic waste management services? Why/why not?	<p>Cost recovery for services provided in relation to kerbside waste processing should be clearly explained to residents. The lack of knowing how Waste Management is performed in each LG seems to always be the underlying cause as to why people might feel the need to complain. Councils are obliged to be transparent in this space and a lot Councils do not do this very well.</p> <p>The "user pay" motto should be explained to residents, especially since commodity markets have been distributed by China's national sword policy. COAG also have a role to play in this and information is not made available directly to key stakeholders, instead it is expected LG's to communicate this. Well that's the issue, as LG are always tarnished with the "here we go, another rate increase" brush.</p>

<p>2. If there are concerns, how should IPART respond? For example, if IPART was to regulate or provide greater oversight of these charges, what approach would be the most appropriate? Why?</p>	<p>DWM charges can be separated into 4 main distinct groups;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Waste Collections 2. Waste Processing 3. Rehabilitation Cost 4. Waste Management Cost <p>I see IPART's role as a medium that provided guidance in regards to the attributes that affect groups #1 , #2 and #4. Focusing on what the cost recovery for each one of these groups should be will be a great reference for LG to use when preparing DWM charges for the following year. Example, you have two LG's within 200km from each other, one is recovering 70% of their recycling processing cost and the other LG is recovering 100% of their recycling processing cost from residents. There should be clear guidelines as to what these cost recoveries should be as the messaging in this space is different in each LG area. IPART should also recommended strategy for what period of time should be considered as normal for aligning cost recovery. Example 3 or 5 year transition phase.</p> <p>Rehabilitation cost (#3) is something that IPART should not get involved with as each LG have different attributes that could affect these oncosts. Available landfill airspace have huge capex impacts on waste divisions and there are only three ways how these costs can be recovered;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DWM charges 2. Gate Fees 3. Interest on Waste reserves. <p>It would be unrealistic to recommend a unilateral approach in this space, due to an array of matters that affect these costs. #4 could be regulated due to very similar structures at each LG, however there is different operating models for landfills. These models would need to be clearly understood prior to recommending cost recovery percentages. Examples are: Self run landfills, Contracted Landfills and Partially contracted landfills.</p>
---	---

3. Would an online centralised database of all NSW councils' domestic waste charges allowing councils and ratepayers to compare charges across comparable councils for equivalent services (eg, kerbside collection), and/or a set of principles to guide councils in pricing domestic waste charges, be helpful? Why/why not?	Yes for items #1,#2 and #3 as stated above. There are justified reasons why capex cost could be higher in regional landfills in NSW compared to Sydney. If these reasons can't be tabled or explained in the online platform then this will become a residential witch hunt on LG's trying their best to implement waste management best practices.
4. Do you have any other comments on councils' domestic waste management charges?	I believe the IPART audit looking into DWM charges could bring about a regional waste levy that would make capital available for rural and regional LG's who do not have the means to implement best practices waste practices. 100% cost recovery is simply not an option for many LG's due to a variety of reasons. Access to a self imposed regional waste levy regulated as part of landfill rehabilitation provisions could bring into play significant cash injection into rural and regional LG's waste management divisions.
5. Which Council do your comments relate to?	Tamworth Regional Council
Your submission for this review:	
If you have attachments you would like to include with your submission, please attach them below.	
Your Details	
Are you an individual or organisation?	Organisation
If you would like your submission or your name to remain confidential please indicate below.	Publish - my submission and name can be published (not contact details or email address) on the IPART website
First Name	Morné
Last Name	Hattingh
Organisation Name	Tamworth Regional Council
Position	Manager Waste & Resource Recovery
Email	
IPART's Submission Policy	I have read & accept IPART's Submission Policy