

EAST HERTS COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 4 DECEMBER 2007

5. REPORT BY REFUSE AND RECYCLING TASK AND FINISH GROUP

REFUSE AND RECYCLING

WARD (S) AFFECTED: ALL

'D' RECOMMENDATION – that the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group be endorsed by the Committee as follows:

- (A) An Alternate Weekly Collection Waste and Recycling scheme be introduced, subject to B and C.
- (B) Kerbside collection of plastic bottles be introduced on a District wide basis.
- (C) Appropriate infrastructure is in place to permit the roll out of kerbside collection of kitchen waste and card on a District wide basis, combined with garden waste collections, through the provision of a suitable composting plant by Hertfordshire County Council.
- (D) The scheme be implemented in the winter months.
- (E) The Committee endorse the proposal to extend the Refuse and Recycling Contract until May 2011 and that a single contract be let for Refuse, Recycling and Street Cleansing from that date.

1.0 Purpose/Summary of Report

- 1.1 To report the recommendations of the Refuse and Recycling Task and Finish Group.

2.0 Contribution to the Council's Corporate Objectives

- 2.1 Improving the efficiency of the Council's refuse and recycling service contributes to the Corporate Priorities:

“Fit for purpose, services fit for you” - Deliver customer focused services by maintaining and developing a well-managed and publicly accountable organisation.

“Pride in East Herts” - Improve standards of the neighbourhood and environmental management in our towns and villages.

### 3.0 Background

3.1 At the Policy Development Scrutiny Committee on 6 September 2005, it was agreed that a Task and Finish group should be set up to consider the range of options available to the Council for the expansion of recycling services. The Scope of the review was defined as:

“To comment on the specific questions raised for recycling options in the future and to report back recommendations to the Policy Scrutiny Committee on 15 November 2005”

The group considered the following:

1. Whether and how the Council should expand multi-material collections.
2. Whether the Council should expand Green Waste collections.
3. What options the Council should be considering in the future in order to further improve the benefits and efficiency of waste services.

3.2 The Task and Finish group made a report to the Policy Development Scrutiny Committee on 15 November 2005, addressing 1 and 2 above. Their recommendations were endorsed and commended to the Executive in December 2005.

3.3 The Executive agreed all the recommendations and asked that, following the implementation of the recommendations, a further report be brought to Policy Scrutiny Committee to consider how to further improve the benefits and efficiency of waste and recycling services, including options to expand the Green Waste Service, Alternate Weekly Collection schemes and recycling enforcement measures. Minute 469 refers.

- 3.4 The Task and Finish group therefore reconvened in July 2007; the membership was as follows:

Cllrs: P Ballam, J Demonti, R Gilbert, D Hone (Chair), D Peek, N Poulton, P Ruffles, J Warren and M Wood.

The portfolio holder, Cllr Terence Milner also attended meetings.

- 3.5 A further task was added to the terms of reference; "To consider whether the Council should extend or re-tender its Waste and Recycling Contract from August 2009". This request came following a meeting of the Executive on 6 February 2007; Minute 554 refers.

#### 4.0 Refuse and Recycling Services

- 4.1 During the work carried out by the Refuse and Recycling Task and Finish group in 2005, consideration was given to how the Council might further improve the performance and efficiency of recycling services from 2007/08 and beyond.

- 4.2 For example, some councils had introduced measures to encourage and compel residents to recycle more by removing permission to dispose of recyclables in the black bin and enforcing this with the threat of fines; by reducing the size of the black bin or by reducing collection of residual waste from weekly to fortnightly, or alternate weekly collection (AWC).

- 4.3 However, the group felt that it was necessary to put in place kerbside recycling schemes and encourage residents to use them with publicity and advice before considering the introduction of any further measures.

- 4.4 The kerbside collection schemes are now well-embedded and indeed recycling rates rose from 18% in 2004/05 to 26.5% in 2006/07. The brown bin Garden Waste collection scheme for compostable waste is due to be extended to the remaining 15,000 houses in the District from April 2008.

- 4.5 Nevertheless, the council's recycling performance needs to increase yet further due to the increasing: -

- national targets for recycling
- rapidly rising costs of landfill tax and disposal fees
- growing public expectations and demand for recycling services and an increase in the range of materials collected.

4.6 The Task and Finish group considered the following options:

- “Do nothing” – what happens if we do not increase our recycling performance
- Education and communication and its impact on recycling performance
- Enforcement of recycling policy
- Increasing the range of materials recycled
- Reducing the capacity for residual (black) bin waste by:
  - Introducing smaller bins
  - Fortnightly collection of residual waste, alternating with brown bin collection of garden waste, kitchen waste and card.

The group’s findings were as follows:

#### “Do Nothing” Option

4.7 The group considered the impact on Council Tax payers of retaining recycling systems at their current levels. The Council is currently achieving approximately 30% of household waste recycled. This is through all collections systems, kerbside collection and recycling banks, but excluded the waste collected by the County Council at Household Waste Recycling Centers.

4.8 The group noted that the costs of landfill are set to rise significantly, following the Government’s decision to raise landfill tax by £8 every year from April 2008. Landfill tax is currently charged at £24 per tonne and will increase to £56 per tonne in 2011/12.

4.9 In addition, the Government has introduced the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS). This basically sets targets for local authorities to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill each year based upon 2005/06 levels.

Should local authorities fail to achieve these levels, they must purchase allowances from other local authorities with “spare” capacity. The value of these allowances will depend upon demand and supply. Failure to achieve the target or purchase adequate allowances could result in a fine of £150 per tonne. Accordingly, the Hertfordshire Waste Partnership has set a target to achieve a 50% recycling rate and to reduce the amount of residual waste going to landfill to 285 kg per capita across the 11 authorities by 2012.

- 4.10 Based on 2006/7 levels 55,000 tonne of household waste were collected in the district. East Herts is currently recycling approximately 30% of its waste. Assuming waste levels remain the same then the growing additional cost of not achieving the 50% recycling rate over the next four years will be 11,000 tonne per annum (20% of 55,000) multiplied by an additional £8 per tonne each year as follows:

2008/09 11,000 tonne x £8 = £88,000

2009/10 11,000 tonne x £16 = £176,000

2010/2011 11,000 tonne x £24 = £264,000

2011/2012 11,000 tonne x £32 = £352,000

Additional Cost over the next 4 years £880,000

These figures do not take account of any additional costs arising from LATS.

- 4.11 Currently disposal costs for Household Waste are paid for by Hertfordshire County Council (although still funded by the Council Tax payer). However, the Hertfordshire Waste Partnership has agreed to a ground breaking scheme that would transfer the savings from reducing the amount of material sent to landfill to District Councils. The final formula has yet to be agreed, however, this could generate significant additional income for this Council.

## Education and Communication Option

- 4.12 The group identified a need to raise public awareness of the 39 Bring Sites around the District; these are located where people might naturally be, such as supermarkets and community centres. They provide facilities to recycle paper, glass, textiles, cans and seven sites have plastic banks.
- 4.13 The group asked that officers continue with the work to ensure that residents receive clear advice about what can and cannot be put in various kerbside collection bins and Bring Sites. Lack of certainty can result in more going into the residual waste bin. This is especially important in the complex area of plastics.
- 4.14 Communication with ethnic minority communities presents a challenge; for example, some languages do not have a word for recycling. The group was pleased to find that the Council's community development officers are currently working on this issue with the area's growing Polish and Portuguese communities.
- 4.15 Currently resident's participation in kerbside collection stands at 64.5% and capture rates (the proportion of recyclable materials that they actually put in the green box) at 63%. A recent campaign to encourage more recycling increased this by only 1.2% and 1% respectively. One of the conclusions drawn from this exercise was that it was more successful in persuading existing recyclers to recycle more, than in getting non-recyclers to change their behaviour. A reasonable maximum achievable performance would be 80% and 90% respectively. This can only be achieved with systems that limit resident's residual waste capacity, incentivising the non-recyclers.
- 4.16 Examples of Waste Aware and East Herts Council education and publicity schemes include:
- Quarterly articles on recycling issues in Link Magazine
  - Radio, cinema and local media advertisements, press releases, competitions
  - Real nappy cash back schemes
  - Subsidised home composters

- Collection calendars
  - Doorstep residents surveys
  - School plays and competitions
  - School Key Stage 2 Education Packs
- 4.17 East Herts publicity material has been used by WRAP (Waste and Resources Action Programme, - the Government's advisory body on recycling matters) as a model of good practice.
- 4.18 The group noted that there are many misconceptions among residents about new initiatives to encourage recycling as a result of recent stories in the national media. This includes concerns about "pay as you throw", smaller bins and fortnightly collections. The wide base of evidence does not support many of the cited problems. Whichever system is chosen, a significant public engagement programme will be required to understand and address residents concerns and ensure that they can receive individual advice if needed.

#### Compulsory Recycling and Enforcement Option

- 4.19 The group noted that some council's have introduced compulsory recycling schemes, whereby residents must place all specified recyclable materials in an approved container and may not place them in the residual waste bin / sack. If residents do not comply their waste may not be collected, or warnings and ultimately fines are imposed.
- 4.20 Under Section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 waste collection authorities may require residents to use specific receptacles for waste which is to be recycled and waste which is not to be recycled. The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 has enabled authorities to issue Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN) for offences in relation to waste receptacles rather than having to take offenders to the magistrate's court. East Herts has adopted this legislation and set the FPN level at £110, reduced to £75 if paid within 10 days. The intention when this was adopted was for use against residents who continually leave their waste containers on the highway.

- 4.21 The majority of authorities that are doing some enforcement concentrate on the right recyclable material being placed in the right container, i.e. unwanted materials being placed in recycling boxes or where multiple recycling containers are used putting material in the wrong box or bin. Fewer enforce on recyclables being in the residual waste container. Of the c.150 authorities that have enforcement policies only 7 have a compulsory recycling policy and these are all London boroughs.
- 4.22 There have been no successful prosecutions relating to compulsory recycling in England to date. One by Exeter City Council, regarding contamination of a recycling container, was lost in court, although Swansea has had two successful prosecutions to date. These relate to the wrong recyclable being placed in the wrong container.
- 4.23 Enforcing recycling will maximise the efficiency of current services. London Borough of Barnet was the first to introduce these measures, and saw an increase from 16.7% in 2003/04 to 27.5% 3 years later. Although Barnet showed a healthy improvement in recycling performance this was from a relatively low base, with a weekly collection service of 8 different recyclable materials and weekly garden and kitchen waste service. There is insufficient evidence to enable a prediction of the effect within East Herts, having already achieved 26.5% combined recycling/composting rate for 2006/07.
- 4.24 Defra guidance recommends that a period of publicity and promotion is undertaken and that initially, as the purpose of enforcement is to improve recycling performance rather than issue a number of FPN's that a series of warnings are given, prior to an FPN being issued. Following this process it could take 12 months before any FPN's were issued.
- 4.25 An effective compulsory recycling enforcement programme would require two additional Area Environment Inspectors, with support vehicles on a fixed term two-year contract, additional temporary call handling staff and a major publicity and promotion programme. The implementation costs are estimated at £214,000 in the first year and £64,000 in the second year. These figures do not include the cost of any



additional legal services support to undertake prosecutions. The Task and Finish Group concluded that compulsory recycling would be unlikely to achieve high recycling rates and is difficult to police effectively. It also encourages a negative perception about recycling among people who are already separating their waste and could impact on resident's long-term commitment.

#### Smaller bins for residual (non-recycling) waste

- 4.26 Providing residents with smaller bins, 140 litres rather than 240 litres, whilst continuing with a weekly residual waste service, would limit the amount of residual waste residents can dispose of through our collection service. This will incentivise residents to utilise recycling and composting services making these services more productive and cost effective. Less capacity for waste would also encourage residents to actively think about reducing the amount of waste they produce in the first place.
- 4.27 For small bins to be accepted by residents, collection of a good range of recyclable materials, including plastic bottles, cardboard and provision of kitchen waste collections would be desirable.
- 4.28 A number of authorities employ bins of less than 240 litres. The leading exponent of this method is Three Rivers District Council. It provides weekly collection of a 140 litre refuse bin with no side waste, fortnightly collection of paper, plastic bottles, glass and cans and a fortnightly 240 litre wheeled bin for garden and kitchen waste and card.
- 4.29 Three Rivers Council has a recycling rate of 44%, and is the only authority in the country's "top 20" recyclers who are not using alternate weekly collections for residual waste. The recycling rates for other authorities on smaller bins ranges from 21.5 (Ribble Valley) to 38.7 (Watford) and averages 33.8%.
- 4.30 It has been estimated that the effect of introducing 140 Litre bins to East Herts could raise the recycling rate to 43%, with kerbside collection of plastic bottles and enforcement.

- 4.31 A disadvantage of smaller, 140L bins collected weekly compared with 240L bins collected fortnightly is that residents are not encouraged to put kitchen waste in their Brown Bin every other week. The amount of kitchen waste that will be collected, especially cooked food waste, will be markedly less than under an alternate weekly scheme and therefore more biodegradable waste would be sent to landfill. Also, Revenue costs for collecting residual waste are higher as more collections per property are required to collect the same amount of waste.
- 4.32 Additional Revenue costs of a smaller bin scheme, assuming plastic bottle collection was added to the kerbside service to enable residents to deal with the volume of their waste, would be in the region of £107,000 per annum.
- 4.33 The implementation costs of this option would be the same as Alternative Weekly Collection, i.e. £214,000 in the first year only.
- 4.34 The scheme would need to be carefully policed to prevent abuse, e.g. by presenting more than one bin or putting out “side waste” next to the bin.
- 4.35 Capital cost of providing 140 litre bins, delivering them to each household would be in the region of £665,000. This does not allow for the collection and disposal costs of the old 240L bins. It would also be desirable to provide residents with additional recycling boxes and kitchen caddies.
- 4.36 All authorities that have adopted smaller bins have converted to them from a sack collection. Officer’s research and use of a number of databases cannot find any evidence of an authority moving from 240 Litre bins to smaller ones.
- 4.37 The group concluded that this option would be difficult and costly to implement in East Herts.

#### Alternate Weekly Collection Option

- 4.38 In this service configuration residents are still provided with a weekly collection service but they are asked to separate their recyclable and compostable waste from the residual

fraction and the different fractions are collected on alternating weeks. Generally, the residual waste is collected one week and the compostable element is collected the next.

- 4.39 This service method is designed to encourage participation in recycling and composting by restricting the extent to which recyclable/compostable waste can be put in the residual waste bin by reducing its frequency of collection rather than its size.
- 4.40 The group considered a document produced by the Government body WRAP which provides guidance for local authorities considering AWC and details some experiences of other local authorities.
- 4.41 AWC schemes are being implemented by around 180 councils nationally and are considered by many as providing the greatest value for money for waste and recycling collection. Of the top 20 highest recycling performers nationally, 19 are using this method and only one, Three Rivers Council, who are 20th, are using smaller 140 litre wheeled bins.
- 4.42 Neighbouring councils, Dacorum, Hertsmere, North Herts, Uttlesford, Epping Forest, and South Cambridgeshire have all implemented AWC and St Albans in planning to do so next year.
- 4.43 Experience from elsewhere indicates that such schemes have to be very carefully planned and implemented to help residents to apply the new ways of presenting their waste.
- 4.44 The Task and Finish group visited Hertsmere Borough Council where AWC was introduced in November 2006. The council had wished to improve recycling performance but without increased cost.
- 4.45 They identified that removing food waste from the waste stream was the key; (East Herts, kitchen waste represents 36.7% of black bin waste). They therefore expanded their brown bin scheme to all households.

4.46 At the same time, they introduced AWC to maximise the take-up of the brown bin scheme and to deliver the service within the existing collection resources.

4.47 The group was offered several tips that Hertsmere had learned through experience:

- It is best to make any change in one go, not pilots or phases. This optimises resources such as communications
- January is the best time to introduce AWC as the weather is colder; residents develop new recycling habits at a time when forgetting which bin to put food waste in matters least.
- Additional staff resources are required to deal with the extra telephone enquiries and to give advice on the ground to deal with residents' problems in person
- You cannot do too much education and consultation - focus groups provide an opportunity to give full information about why the change is needed and to dispel myths
- Member training is essential so that they can help residents by answering their questions
- Be prepared to respond quickly to 'negative' articles about AWC in the local media to balance the issue – the positive benefits of AWC and the reasons behind its introduction can often be overlooked or left out of an article completely in favour of ill-informed anti-AWC coverage.

4.48 Concerns about AWC tend to be founded on the misconception that food sits rotting for two weeks in the black (residual waste) bin, resulting in a health hazard. Effective communication can allay concerns. Examples of measures that can be taken include:

- Food waste can be put into whichever bin is next due for collection, the black bin or the brown (composting) bin. ***This means that there is still a weekly collection of food waste.***
- Wrapping food waste also helps to minimize concerns about smells and maggots during the hotter summer months.

- There is no evidence that AWC increases rat populations.
- Providing ‘kitchen caddies’ – small bins with biodegradable liners – helps residents separate their food waste.
- Additional ‘Nappy Sacks’ may be provided for families with young children.

4.49 Residents may have concerns about bin capacity, however, it should be noted that until recently many residents had a single black bin collection service only – i.e. 480 litres per fortnight. Under an AWC scheme they would have 590 litres per fortnight as follows:

	<u>Litres per fortnight</u>
Black Bin	240
Brown Bin (garden, food, card)	240
Green Box x 2 (dry recyclables)	110
Total	<u>590</u>

4.50 Larger bins (340L) could be provided for households with more than 5 members living at the property.

4.51 A recent waste analysis conducted shows that 47% of residents are using 50% or less of the capacity of their black bin. These are likely to be the people that already recycle and will not have a capacity issue with AWC.

4.52 The Task and Finish group felt that in order to provide residents with the same total collection capacity, this system should not be introduced until the garden waste service has been extended to all households and an “in-vessel” composting facility, or a transfer station, is available, so that kitchen waste and card can be collected.

4.53 The group also considered whether an AWC scheme could be implemented without introducing the kerbside collection of plastics.

4.54 They found arguments for and against:

<b>Against</b>	<b>For</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• collecting and transporting plastic is costly and environmentally unsound due to their light weight and 'air' content</li> <li>• re-using old plastic uses almost as much energy as using new</li> <li>• it is more environmentally responsible to reduce in the first place</li> <li>• buried plastic does not result in greenhouse gasses, it just stays there</li> <li>• some plastics cannot be economically recycled</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• residents want to recycle plastic. In a recent recycling survey the number one question from East Herts residents was "when can I recycle plastics?"</li> <li>• markets for plastics are developing, as are techniques for processing to allow it to be collected and transported more effectively and cheaply.</li> <li>• plastic accounts for a large volume in residual waste bins - significant if smaller bins or AWC were to be introduced</li> <li>• studies show recycling plastic leads to increased recycling of other materials</li> </ul>

4.55 It was recognised that there are significant additional costs of collecting plastics, even when implemented alongside other measures to reduce the amount of residual waste collected. Plastics are light and full of air and therefore contribute little to the Council's recycling targets.

4.56 Whilst the weight of plastics collected would not be significant the volume reduction in residents black bins would be likely to make an AWC scheme more acceptable. Studies also show that where plastics are collected, the non-recyclable element of the waste becomes the smallest portion and this results in a change in peoples thinking about their waste. The result is that they will recycle more of their other materials - paper, glass and cans and the overall recycling rate increases significantly.

4.57 The reduction in resources required by our contractor to

collect waste under an AWC scheme will result in a saving of £383,000 per annum. This saving could only be realised if the refuse & recycling contract was extended for 21 months, from August 2009 (see below), and green waste collections are extended to include kitchen waste and card. However, if plastic bottles were added to kerbside collections, additional recycling resource would be required to deal with increased volumes. Nonetheless a saving of c. £100,000 per annum could still be achieved.

- 4.58 Capital funding of £307,000 would be required if the Council agreed to provide all residents with a second recycling box and a kitchen caddy. An estimated capital sum of £100,000 would be needed to for equipment to process and bale plastic bottles.
- 4.59 Compostable kitchen caddy sacks and nappy sacks could be provided at cost.
- 4.60 It is estimated that a recycling/composting rate of 47.6% would be achieved through this system.
- 4.61 The group considered that AWC with plastics collection was the option most likely to maximize recycling performance and value for money.

#### Extend or re-tender Waste and Recycling Contract

- 4.62 The Task and Finish group also considered whether the Council should extend or re-tender its existing Waste and Recycling Contract. The contract began in August 2002 for a period of seven years with the option of a possible extension for a further three.
- 4.63 The Council has already determined to extend the street cleansing contract so that it will be co-terminus and can be combined with the Refuse and Recycling contract following a Member contract review last year.
- 4.64 The group considered evidence from an independent evaluation of contract performance and value for money, conducted by environmental experts, White, Young, Green

Ltd. This identified that the contractor is performing well and giving good value for money.

- 4.65 Negotiations with the existing contractor indicate that there are significant savings to be made from extending the contract alongside implementing new recycling collection systems. These have been included in the financial implications within the report.
- 4.66 The group therefore recommends that the Refuse and Recycling contract be extended until May 2011, when a combined contract for Refuse, Recycling and Street Cleansing be let.
- 4.67 There is currently no opportunity to combine these contracts with neighbouring councils as their contracts are not coterminous and no one council's depot is adequate. Officers should, however, continue to look for opportunities for joint working in the interests of service performance, resilience and efficiency.

## 5.0 Consultation

- 5.1 No additional public consultation was undertaken as part of the work of this group. There has been significant public consultation undertaken, both nationally and locally, on waste and recycling issues. These included the countywide consultation on the Herts Waste Strategy in 2007, which covered collection systems; the Doorstepping survey conducted this year as well as public satisfaction surveys undertaken by MORI on behalf of East Herts Council and the Hertfordshire Waste Partnership.
- 5.2 East Herts Residents Surveys have shown that residents expect the Council to provide more recycling facilities and this directly affects recorded public satisfaction.
- 5.3 As part of this study, information was collected from a wide range of sources including other local authorities. The group made visits to Hertsmere and Three Rivers District Council's to discuss their different approaches to recycling and waste minimisation.
- 5.4 The Council's existing refuse and recycling contractor has



been involved in the development of alternative options.

- 5.5 The proposals described within this report would require a well-planned communication campaign using local media, Link magazine, road shows, community meetings and focus groups, parish and resident's association newsletters.

## 6.0 Legal Implications

- 6.1 The Council is required under the Household Waste Recycling Act (2003) and Best Value Legislation to achieve statutory targets for recycling and waste reduction and to provide a 'three stream' collection service to all households by 2010.
- 6.2 The Council has signed up to the Hertfordshire Waste Strategy, which aims to achieve a recycling target of 50% by 2012.

## 7.0 Financial Implications

- 7.1 Details of the revenue and capital costs of the options presented in this report are detailed at Appendix A on page 19. The implementation of an Alternate Weekly Collection scheme, with the kerbside collection of plastic bottles (Option 3) would require one off costs in the year of implementation of £214,000. Once implemented the scheme would result in net savings to the Council of c. £102,000 per annum.
- 7.2 Capital costs, assuming additional recycling boxes and kitchen caddies were provided free of charge, would be £407,000.

## 8.0 Human Resource Implications

- 8.1 Service expansions, combined with a requirement to implement the 'livability' agenda and environmental crime enforcement activities have put increasing pressure on service staff. Additional, temporary staff resources would be required to implement some of the options and these are shown in Appendix A. These reflect the additional workload associated with managing implementation, servicing additional customer enquiries and helping residents on the ground. The numbers of staff required have been

established in consultation with council's that have implemented similar schemes.

## 9.0 Risk Management Implications

9.1 Refuse and recycling services have a high public profile and any significant changes need to be adequately resourced and managed sensitively to ensure that residents are fully advised and supported with changes to recycling provision.

9.2 Failure to achieve recycling and waste reduction targets will result in significant additional financial costs in the longer term and may have a negative effect on the Council's independent inspection score.

## Background Papers

- Waste and Recycling Report to Performance Scrutiny 6 September 2005 and 15 November 2005.
- WRAP (Waste and Resources Action Programme) guidance for local authorities considering AWC
- Herts Waste Strategy is at [www.wasteaware.org.uk](http://www.wasteaware.org.uk)

Contact Member: Dorothy Hone – Chair of 'Task and Finish' Group

Contact Officers: Cliff Cardoza – Head of Environmental Services  
Trevor Watkins – Waste Services Manager

### **Refuse and Recycling Service**

#### Option 1 - Compulsory Recycling

	Total (£000)
Revenue Expenditure (one-off)	
Publicity, promotion and project management	100
Additional call handling staff 4 x 6 months	50
Additional Enforcement Staff 2 staff for 2 years	128
<b>Total</b>	<b>278</b>
Revenue Expenditure (ongoing)	
Nil	0
Savings (ongoing)	
Nil	0
Capital Expenditure	
Nil	0
<b>Percentage of Household Waste Recycled</b>	<b>Not known</b>

## Refuse and Recycling Service

Option 2 - Small 140 Litre Bins with Kerbside  
Collection of Plastic Bottles

	Total (£000)
Revenue Expenditure (one-off)	
Publicity, promotion and project management	100
Additional call handling staff 4 x 6 months	50
Additional field staff (recycling advisors) 2 x 12 months	64
<b>Total One Off Expenditure</b>	<b>214</b>
Revenue Expenditure (ongoing)	
Provision of 2 additional recycling rounds (inc. vehicle provision)	231
Modification of existing recycling vehicles	23
Material handling	41
Loss of income from separated can sales	44
<b>Total</b>	<b>339</b>
Savings (ongoing)	
Reduce by 2 residual rounds (labour and running costs)	-156
Additional income from material sales	-60
Income from plastic sales	-16
<b>Total</b>	<b>-232</b>
<b>Total Ongoing Net Expenditure (Budget Growth/Savings)</b>	<b>107</b>
Capital Expenditure	

Provision of second recycling box	197
Provision of materials handling equipment	100
Provision of 'kitchen caddies'	110
Wheeled bin provision	665
<b>Total Capital Expenditure</b>	<b>1072</b>

**Percentage of Household Waste Recycled** **43**

### **Refuse and Recycling Service**

#### **Option 3 - Alternate Weekly Collection with Kerbside Collection of Plastic Bottles**

	Total (£000)
Revenue Expenditure (one-off)	
Publicity, promotion and project management	100
Additional call handling staff 4 x 6 months	50
Additional field staff (recycling advisors) 2 x 12 months	64
<b>Total one Off Expenditure</b>	<b>214</b>
Revenue Expenditure (ongoing)	
Provision of 2 additional recycling rounds (Inc. vehicle provision)	231
Modification of existing recycling vehicles	23
Material handling	41
Loss of income from separated can sales	44
<b>Total</b>	<b>339</b>
Savings (ongoing)	
Reduce by 4 residual rounds (labour and	-332

running costs)	
Additional income from material sales	-85
Income from plastic sales	-24
Total	-441
<b>Total Ongoing Net Expenditure (Budget Growth/Savings)</b>	<b>-102</b>
Capital Expenditure	
Provision of second recycling box	197
Provision of 'kitchen caddies'	110
Total Capital Expenditure	307
<b>Percentage of Household Waste Recycled</b>	<b>47.6</b>

### Refuse and Recycling Service

Option 4 - Alternate Weekly Collection without Kerbside Collection of Plastic Bottles

	Total (£000)
Revenue Expenditure (one-off)	
Publicity, promotion and project management	100
Additional call handling staff 4 x 6 months	50
Additional field staff (recycling advisors) 2 x 12 months	64
<b>Total One Off Expenditure</b>	<b>214</b>
Revenue Expenditure (ongoing)	
Material handling	34

Total	34
Savings (ongoing)	
Reduce by 4 residual rounds (labour and running costs)	-332
Additional income from material sales	-85
Total	-417
<b>Total Ongoing Net Expenditure (Budget Growth/Savings)</b>	<b>-383</b>
Capital Expenditure	
Provision of second recycling box	197
Provision of materials handling equipment	100
Provision of 'kitchen caddies'	110
Total Capital Expenditure	407
<b>Percentage of Household Waste Recycled</b>	<b>47</b>