

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

FROM: Head of Natural and Built Environment

REPORT NUMBER: **H75**

TO: STRATEGY COMMITTEE

DATE OF MEETING: 31 July 2008

THIRD HOUSEHOLD WASTE BIN

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To present the final report of the Joint BDC/MSDC Member/Officer Working Group (Appendix 1), appointed in the Autumn of 2007 to investigate the potential for implementing a district wide third household kerbside bin service for compostable waste in BDC and MSDC from 2009/10 on a 'cost neutral' basis and to consider recommendations arising there from.
- 1.2 The Joint Working Group has identified a preferred scheme, but acknowledges that this has significant capital and revenue implications for the Council. It will be for each Council to determine whether or not the scheme should be implemented.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That due to the high revenue costs and the impact on the Council's current financial strategy, the proposed scheme for the collection of kitchen waste is not implemented within the Babergh District, during the financial year 2009/10.

The Committee is able to resolve this matter.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 The estimated capital and annual revenue costs of the scheme are set out in the Working Group report Appendix 1 (Appendix C). Some capital funding has been secured from Suffolk County Council. Despite this, there is still £400,000 to be funded by Babergh through prudential borrowing.
- 3.2 In terms of the estimated net annual revenue costs when the scheme is fully implemented, these were estimated by the Joint Working Group at £250,000 a year for Babergh. Latest information, however, indicates that this needs to be increased quite significantly in order to reflect fuel prices and other costs that were not included in that estimate. Annual borrowing costs on the capital expenditure also needs to be added.
- 3.3 This results in a revised estimated annual revenue cost for the scheme of £458,000 as summarised in the table below:

Table 1. Summary of Preferred Scheme Costs

	£000
Estimated net annual cost – working group report	250
Additional estimated costs	+130
Annual borrowing costs	+ 78
Total net estimated annual revenue cost	458

3.4 The Joint Working Group report refers to projected potential income from other waste activities of £128,000 by 2011/12 and additional recycling performance payments of £145,000 relating to current activity (see Appendix C). The report suggests that, by offsetting these against the third bin scheme, this would reduce the net cost. However, this income would arise whether the new scheme is implemented or not and the additional income will make a significant contribution to the Council's forecast budget gap of £700,000 a year.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

4.1 The Working Group's preferred scheme has implications for the Council's risk themes No.1 – Local Government Review; No. 2 - Shared services; No. 5 – Capacity; No.7 – Financial performance and risk management.

4.2 A full risk log is detailed in Section 10 of Appendix 1.

5. KEY INFORMATION

5.1 The reasons for considering further improvements to waste collection services are summarised as follows:

- The National Waste Strategy¹ aims at reducing waste to landfill;
- The Suffolk Waste Partnership has set targets to recycle/compost 60% of municipal waste by 2015 – currently BDC achieves a figure of 39% for household waste recycling/composting;
- The Government has set allowances for landfilling which, if exceeded will attract penalty payments faced by Suffolk County Council, that could amount to several million pounds per year²;
- Collecting household kitchen food waste, would address one of BDC's priorities outlined in its draft Strategic Plan (2008-2018) for a 'cleaner, greener Babergh' by reducing household waste to landfill and reducing the district's carbon footprint.

5.2 Having considered several options, the Joint Member/Officer Working Group has concluded that if a third household bin service is introduced, it should be dedicated to kitchen food waste (meat included but not garden waste) and collected weekly from householders in containers approximately 25 litres in size (in combination with ~7 litre kitchen caddys), using 'podded' duo vehicles (i.e. collected at the same time as refuse/recycling) in a single pass system to maximise economic and environmental efficiency. Of all the schemes considered, this is the most efficient and effective way of achieving the desired recycling levels. The full detail of these considerations is presented in Appendix 1.

5.3 Whilst the Joint Working Group have recommended a scheme that will make a welcome contribution to increasing household recycling levels, the Council has met and exceeded all current statutory recycling targets and Suffolk County Council has measures in place to fulfil its landfill obligations until 2014.

5.4 As indicated in section 3 of this report, the preferred scheme would have significant financial implications for the Council. The Joint Working Group also found that the preferred scheme was unable to achieve the key requirement of cost neutrality. Having regard to the Council's current financial strategy and other priorities requiring capital funding, it is clear that the Working Group's recommendation presents challenges of affordability and capacity.

¹ Waste Strategy 2007 (www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/strategy/)

² The Future Procurement of Suffolk's Waste Disposal Services. SCC Report 09/10/07

- 5.5 In order to off set these costs, a joint bid for funding was submitted to SCC. Whilst SCC has offered approximately a third of the capital cost of the scheme and enhanced recycling performance payments to off set some of the revenue costs, there still remains a significant deficit.
- 5.6 Both Councils have considered further options tailored around the funding available. However partial schemes would compromise the efficiencies of the Joint contract for refuse collection and may result in the loss of future discounts.

6. CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 Taking into account the council's financial position and other matters, it is concluded that the scheme should not be introduced in 2009/10. The reasons for this conclusion are that:
1. BDC does not currently have the financial resource required to fund the implementation and operation of the scheme;
 2. It may not be prudent to introduce a major new recycling scheme whilst the Suffolk Local Government Review (LGR) is in progress;
 3. The proposed scheme would currently be inconsistent with the approach taken by other Councils in Suffolk;
 4. The statutory recycling/composting target for BDC/Suffolk, for both 2010 and 2015, will be attained regardless of any BDC/MSDC food waste scheme.
 5. The Suffolk Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) target of introducing three-bin waste and recycling (kerbside) services to 80% of households by 2010 is very likely to be achieved across Suffolk anyway (although admittedly not across Babergh).
 6. Suffolk County Council has temporary measures in place to divert 80,000 tonnes of municipal waste from landfill and so meet the statutory LATS target until 2014.

7. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Final Report of Joint BDC/MSDC Member/Officer Waste Working Group – July 2008

8. BACKGROUND PAPERS REFERRED TO:

None.

CONTACT: Malcolm Firth

Email: malcolm.firth@babergh.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1

Final Report of Joint BDC/MSDC Member/Officer Waste Working Group – July 2008

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to present the findings of the Joint BDC/MSDC Member/Officer Working Group, which was set up in the Autumn of 2007 to investigate the potential for implementing a district wide third household kerbside recycling bin service, for compostable waste in BDC and MSDC from 2009/10 on a near as possible 'cost neutral' basis.

2. Main Findings

- 2.1 The Joint Member/Officer Working Group has concluded that if a third household bin service is introduced, it should be dedicated to kitchen food waste (meat included but not garden waste) and collected weekly from householders in containers approximately 25 litres in size (in combination with ~7litre kitchen caddys), using 'podded' duo vehicles (i.e. collected at the same time as refuse/recycling) in a single pass system to maximise economic and environmental efficiency. Of all the schemes considered, this is the most efficient and effective way of achieving the desired recycling levels.
- 2.2 The main benefits of the scheme outlined in 2.1 above are:
 1. An estimated 7,500 tonnes of food waste would be diverted from landfill. This could prevent the equivalent of 10,500 tonnes of CO₂ emissions per year (equivalent to 3,200 cars taken off the road)¹;
 2. Household recycling/composting rates in MSDC and BDC would rise to ~50% and therefore contribute to the Suffolk target of 60% by 2015; in keeping with Suffolk's ambition of 'Creating the Greenest County'².
 3. The public will view a weekly collection of food waste as 'a better service'³.
- 2.3 In an attempt to make the scheme outlined in 2.1 above 'cost neutral', 100% capital funding has been sought from external sources. To date, £574k has been secured through SCC's Diversion Incentive Fund (DIF), which would cover 42% of the capital funding required for a complete scheme covering both districts. The Working Group has therefore concluded that the scheme can only be operated on a close to cost neutral basis when (subject to Member agreement) income generated from other waste and recycling services and currently 'unbudgeted' recycling performance payments from other recyclables, are used to off set the cost of the scheme.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 The Joint Working Group endorse the content of this report;
- 3.2 The Joint Working Group recommend to their respective Council Executive/Strategy Committee that consideration be given to implementing a weekly collection of kitchen and food waste service, to the format as set out in section 6.3 of this report.

¹ This is based upon 1.4 tonnes of CO₂ equiv. per tonne of food waste and 3.3 tonnes CO₂ emitted per average UK car.

² Suffolk: Creating the Greenest County (www.greensuffolk.org)

³ According to a LJ&P Survey 2007. See section 7.2 of this report.

- 3.3 The Joint Working Group recommend that Officers submit this report as addendum to a separate report to their respective Executive/Strategy Committees by August 2008. The Executive/Strategy Committee reports to identify options with regard to full or partial implementation of the service in both/either district. Further, these reports must recognise the outcome of the Suffolk Local Government Review and any differences in Member priorities in relation to financial management in each Council, given the level of funding support available.

Consideration need also be given to each Council's ability to afford the scheme outlined in section 6.3, taking into account their financial strategy, the impact on Council Tax levels and other competing priorities.

- 3.4 The business of the Joint Working Group is concluded, following approval of recommendation 3.1 above.

4. Joint Working Group Terms of Reference

- 4.1 In March 2005, MSDC's Executive Committee recommended in principal that a kerbside collection of compostable waste be introduced in Mid Suffolk by 2010, to enable the Council to meet its obligations following adoption of the Suffolk Joint Municipal Wastes Management Strategy. On 30th October 2007 BDC's Full Council endorsed the setting up of a Member/Officer Joint Waste Strategy Group "with the intention of recommendations being made to both Babergh and Mid Suffolk early in 2008 on any changes required to arrangements under the Joint Waste Contract operated by the two Councils".

- 4.2 The Joint Contract Management Board made interim arrangements for vehicle provision for the first 2 years of the contract. This involved 10 freighters imported from another contract elsewhere, which at the start of the contract had just two-years remaining of their anticipated life span. It was acknowledged that any major service changes that could influence the choice of the new vehicle format (such as the introduction of a third bin service) would need to be resolved by July 2008, due to the lead in time required to order and build the vehicles.

- 4.3 The Joint Working Group held its first meeting on 19th November 2007 at which the terms of reference of the group was established. This was to:

"To investigate the potential for implementing a kerbside collection of compostable kitchen waste in both Districts on a 'cost neutral' basis."

- 4.4 The Joint Working Group consisted of:

Clive Arthey	BDC Member (Chairperson of Group)
Bryn Hurren	BDC Member
Leonard Johnson	BDC Member
Peter Jones	BDC Member
Humphrey Todd	BDC Member
Roy Barker	MSDC Member
Diana Kearsley	MSDC Member
Martin Redbond	MSDC Member
Andrew Stringer	MSDC Member
Frank Whittle	MSDC Member
Chris Fry	MSDC Officer
Paul Lewis	MSDC Officer
Peter Garnett	BDC Officer
Jonas Grist	BDC Officer

5. Background Information

- 5.1 Councils across England and Wales are under increasing pressure to reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste (BMW) going to landfill. This is as a result of the negative environmental impacts of landfill, particularly escaping methane on climate change. As a result of the Landfill Regulations 2004, the Government has established a mechanism through the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS), to impose a £150 levy on every tonne of biodegradable waste sent to landfill in excess of a stated allocation, unless tradable permits are purchased instead. The Waste Strategy 2007 for England⁴, sets targets for the diversion of household waste from landfill. These are outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Household Waste & Recycling Rates/Projections Across Suffolk

	National Waste Strategy (2007) Recycling/Compost Target for Household Waste	Suffolk JMWMS Recycling /Compost Visionary Target for Municipal Waste	Projected Recycling/ Composting Rate for Household Waste across Suffolk	Projected BDC/MSDC combined Recycling/ Composting Rate for Household Waste without food waste collection
2010	40%	-	46%	38%
2015	45%	60%	To be determined	To be determined

- 5.2 The BDC/MSDC partnership is currently meeting all of its statutory obligations with respect to recycling and composting. However the BDC/MSDC Partnership and the other District Councils of Suffolk are members of the Suffolk Waste Partnership (SWP). All Councils have formerly adopted the Suffolk Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy⁵ (JMWMS) that aims to prioritise the 'waste hierarchy' by implementing the principles, in priority, of Reduce, Reuse, Recycle, and Recover (Fundamentally, this means that we should take as much out of the waste stream as we can before incineration, not least because per tonne it is cheaper to do so). The JMWMS aims to reduce waste to landfill and recycle/compost at least 60% of Suffolk's municipal waste, by 2015.
- 5.3 Despite the great improvements that the SWP has made in recycling/composting household waste, Suffolk expects to face a significant impact from the LATS when fines/cost of permits, could amount to more than £2 million⁶. Urgent action is required not least because there are no new municipal landfill sites in Suffolk and all existing sites will be full by 2015. The JMWMS Policy 7 also states that Suffolk authorities will seek to introduce a three-bin collection system from the kerbside of at least 80% of households in Suffolk by 2010 (black bin residual waste; dry recycling bin; organic waste).
- 5.4 In 2006/7 BDC and MSDC recycled/composted 36.5% and 36.8% of household waste respectively. Table 2 below summarises the performance of other Suffolk Councils, together with information on which of these already have a district wide third bin. Whilst it is very likely that Suffolk as a whole will reach the Government's Waste Strategy target of 45% recycling/composting by 2015, it is highly unlikely that the Babergh and Mid Suffolk district will be able to attain the target, unless new recycling schemes are introduced.

⁴ Waste Strategy 2007 (www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/strategy/)

⁵ The Suffolk Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (www.suffolkrecycling.org.uk/Content.asp?PID=14&SID=1)

⁶ The Future Procurement of Suffolk's Waste Disposal Services. SCC Report 09/10/07

Table 2 Household Waste & Recycling Rates Across Suffolk 2006/7

Confirmed 2006/7 Recycling & Composting Rate for Household Waste	%	District Wide 3rd Bin in Place
Babergh DC	36.5	No
Forest Heath DC	46.0	Yes
Ipswich BC	36.8	Yes
Mid Suffolk DC	36.8	No
St Edmundsbury DC	50.0	Yes
Suffolk Coastal DC	38.3	Yes
Waveney DC	48.4	Yes
Suffolk County Council (HWRCs)	48.9	-
<i>Suffolk Total</i>	<i>43.5</i>	<i>-</i>

6. Options Considered & The Preferred Scheme

6.1 The Joint Working Group considered several options available to address the issues outlined in sections 5.1 to 5.4. In doing so Officers and Members undertook a site visit to a pilot scheme being operated by Waveney DC dedicated to food waste, as well as seeing the In-vessel composting facility at Parham (in Suffolk Coastal) where the material was processed. Members and Officers also attended industry events and conferences to identify and understand current best practice of organic waste collection amongst other councils across the country. The merits of each option considered by the Group are outlined in Appendix A, but in summary the options considered were:

1. A garden waste (brown bin) collection scheme (without food)
2. A garden waste (brown bin) collection scheme (with food)
3. A dedicated food waste collection scheme

6.2 After undertaking this analysis, the Joint Working Group then considered the type of vehicles and the types of containers that would be best suited to collecting the material. The merits of each option are outlined in Appendix B but in summary the vehicle options considered were:

1. Podded vehicles
2. Min light shuttle trucks
3. Stillage vehicles

6.3 Based on the options outlined in 6.1 and 6.2 above, the Joint Working Group concluded that if a third household bin service is introduced, it should be dedicated for kitchen food waste (meat included but not garden waste) and collected weekly from householders in containers approximately 25 litres in size (in combination with ~7litre caddy bins), using 'podded' duo vehicles (i.e. collected at the same time as refuse/recycling) in a single pass system to maximise economic and environmental efficiency. The following is a brief description of the preferred scheme:

- Weekly Collection of kitchen waste, using almost the same size vehicle fleet than at present and using small collection bins (approximately 25 litres in volume and dimensions: h: 50cm, d: 30cm, w: 30cm – see photo in Appendix B). Each household would also be supplied with a kitchen 'caddy' to collect the food waste within their home. This would measure ~7 litres in volume and could be positioned on top of a kitchen work surface).

- The scheme could divert at least 7,500 tonnes per year of biodegradable food waste (not garden) from landfill across BDC and MSDC. This would result in a combined BDC and MSDC household recycling/composting rate of ~50% (currently 37% for 2006/7). After discussions with SCC and third parties, it has been established that the collected food waste could be processed at the composting facility at Stanton in Suffolk, where excess capacity is available.
- By diverting food waste from landfill, this scheme would have significant climate change benefits, by preventing the equivalent of 10,500 tonnes of CO² emissions per year (equivalent to 3,200 cars off the road)⁷. Reducing carbon dioxide emissions in Suffolk is in keeping with Suffolk's ambition of 'Creating the Greenest County'.

7. Background Information on Food Waste

- 7.1 Now that residents are readily sorting their recyclables and BDC and MSDC both collect about 80% of glass through 'bring sites', the biggest single component left in the black residual bin is biodegradable waste. Most of this is waste food and other organic material arising from the kitchen. This accounts for about 40% of the weight of the black bin contents, so it is the most efficient and effective part of the waste stream to target. Based on industry recognised figures and individual waste analysis undertaken in MSDC and BDC, there is estimated to be a total of 15,300 tonnes of food waste in residual waste bins across MSDC and BDC. The experience of other Councils across England that operate food waste collections (e.g. in Somerset) indicate that well operated schemes can expect to collect 50% of this food waste (using a conservative estimate) after allowing for realistic participation and capture rates.
- 7.2 In October 2007 Linda Jones & Partners undertook market research on behalf of the Suffolk Waste Partnership. The survey covered many aspects of waste management and in particular it sought the views from the public on the introduction of a food waste only collection scheme using 25 litre bins and 7 litre caddys. The results found that 71% of respondents thought they were 'certain' or 'very likely' to participate and that 74% thought the scheme would be 'very' or 'quite' practical. The survey also found two-thirds agreed that this would provide a better service. Just over a half opted for the 7 litre kitchen caddy, and 60% said that they would be willing to purchase the starch bags. The LJ&P report concludes, "On the basis of past results we have seen, this suggests that this scheme would be viable to introduce in the Babergh and Mid Suffolk districts."
- 7.3 BDC and MSDC together with our partners in the Suffolk Waste Partnership already actively promote the message of waste avoidance and waste minimisation through 'smart shopping' and home composting. In 2007/8 alone, over 2,000 home composting bins were sold in the MSDC and BDC area. This work was backed up in the Autumn of 2007 when The Government's own Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) launched a national publicity campaign on the theme of food waste reduction. Food waste is thought to amount to 5.3 million tonnes in the national household waste stream. WRAP estimate that on average, every household in the country throws £250-400 worth of food into the dustbin (half of which is perfectly edible)⁸. This represents a fifth of all household waste collected at the kerbside.

⁷ This is based upon 1.4 tonnes of CO₂ equiv. per tonne of food waste and 3.3 tonnes CO₂ emitted per average UK car.

⁸ Analysis by WRAP based on Defra's Expenditure & Food Survey 2004 / 5 and Exodus Diary Research: Kitchen Diary Top Line Results Based on 284 Diaries. Further detail is available from [WRAP \(www.wrap.org.uk\)](http://www.wrap.org.uk)

7.4 Collecting household kitchen food waste, would address one of BDC's priorities outlined in its draft Strategic Plan (2008-2018) for a 'cleaner, greener Babergh' by reducing household waste to landfill and reducing the district's carbon footprint. It would also address MSDC's Corporate Priority of reducing waste to landfill. Reducing waste and increasing recycling/composting is also in keeping with Suffolk's ambition of 'Creating the Greenest County'⁹.

8. Financial Implications

8.1 A summary of the potential capital and revenue position associated with the recommended scheme is shown in Table 3 below. Appendix C details how total scheme income and costs are derived. Costs quoted below are based on prices submitted by Serco as part of the original procurement of the Joint BDC/MSDC refuse/recycling collection contract in 2007. In summary the full scheme's capital cost would be £1,378k and annual revenue cost £500k.

Table 3 Potential Revenue and Capital Position Associated with the Recommended Scheme

	Full Scheme £000	Individual (50/50) BDC or MSDC Share £000
<u>Capital</u>		
Vehicles (cost of 20 pods & 2 whole additional vehicles with pods)	896	448
Bins	432	216
Bulking/Transfer Facility	50	25
Total Capital Cost of the Scheme	1,378	689
<u>Revenue</u>		
Estimated net annual running costs:		
Contractor costs	550	275
Waste Treatment costs	320	160
Scheme set up costs (Average over 7 yrs.)	40	20
	<i>910</i>	<i>455</i>
Additional Recycling Performance Payments (RPP) for the food waste collected	-410	-205
Potential Additional Annual Revenue Cost of Scheme	500	250

8.2 In an attempt to make the scheme outlined in 6.3 above 'cost neutral', 100% capital funding was sought from external sources. To date, £574k has been secured through SCC's Diversion Incentive Fund (DIF) to fund the additional cost of duo vehicles for approximately half the BDC/MSDC fleet and approximately half the food waste bins and caddys. This would allow approximately 36,000 households to receive the service. The background to the DIF process and the resultant outcome are detailed in Appendix D.

⁹ Suffolk: Creating the Greenest County (www.greensuffolk.org)

8.3 In a further attempt to make the scheme outlined in 6.3 above 'cost neutral', income generated from other waste and recycling services (current and future) and unbudgeted recycling performance payments from other recyclables were considered. This income is summarised below in Table 4 together with the impact it would have on the overall cost of the scheme, taking into account the £574k from the SCC DIF. The detail as to how this income is derived is set out in Appendix C under the 'most likely' scenario.

8.4 In summary and subject to Member approval, by using income generated from other waste and recycling services (current and future) and unbudgeted recycling performance payments from other recyclables, the proposed scheme can be operated on a net additional annual revenue cost of £67k.

Table 4 Impact of Other Income on the Cost of the Recommended Scheme

	Total Scheme £000	Split 50/50 £000
Potential Additional Annual Revenue Cost of Scheme (Table 3)	500	250
Cost of financing remainder of Capital after £574k DIF capital funding (at 14%)	113	56
<i>Total</i>	<i>613</i>	<i>306</i>
Less:		
Enhanced RPP for existing recycling activities (above budgeted levels)	-290	-145
Commercial Waste Income & Other Surplus Making Services (most likely scenario of 3 scenarios)	-256	-128
	<i>-546</i>	<i>-273</i>
Net Additional Scheme Revenue Cost	67	33

9. Proposed Service Structure

9.1 For the scheme to be operational across all of both districts, 20 vehicles and 2 spare vehicles (22 in total) would be required. Currently there are 20 vehicles in the fleet. It is proposed that the scheme be implemented in a phased approach over 3 years from 2009 onwards. The £574k made available from the DIF would be used to implement the scheme in year 1, covering 10 of the rounds. Should further capital funding become available beyond 2009 and after the Suffolk Local Government Review this could fund the phased implementation of the scheme in Years 2 and 3 with a further 6 and 4 rounds respectively.

9.2 Promotion and publicity would also be targeted using a phased approach and directed locally at those parts of each district that would imminently receive the service. Road shows and community events would be hosted similar to the phased introduction of the co-mingled dry recycling bin. On the advice of Waveney DC, publicity iconography would tie into the national WRAP recycling campaign (i.e. the green swoosh) to ensure maximum recognition and effect.

9.3 The Joint Working Group also considered the merits of supplying householders with a continuous free supply of biodegradable liners to be used with the kitchen caddys. After taking advice from Officers and talking to Members and Officers at Waveney DC it was decided that the financial cost of supplying sacks (approximately £300k per year across both Council's) could not be justified. Instead it was felt far preferable that householders should be given a free one off introductory roll of liners at the start of the scheme, but then to require them to either use newspaper or purchase liners from local retail outlets.

10. Risk Assessment

10.1 The following is a risk assessment of not implementing the scheme in 2009/10:

Risk Description	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation measures	Residual Risk
MSDC/BDC will not meet its commitments to its Partners in the Suffolk Waste Partnership to Recycle/Compost 60% of Municipal waste by 2015 and introduce a third bin to 80% of households by 2010	High	Low in short term, but potentially high in medium term, in terms of landfill costs	Few. Any attempts to target other recyclables is unlikely to increase the recycling by more than 1%	High
Suffolk as a whole may not divert sufficient biodegradable waste from landfill to avoid high costs from landfill/LATS	Medium	High in terms of landfill costs/LATS	Few within the control of BDC and MSDC	Medium

10.2 The following is a summary of the inherent risk of implementing the scheme itself:

Risk Description	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation measures	Residual Risk
Lack of support from the Public	Low	High	Recent results of the LJ&P attitude survey commissioned by the SWP in both Councils was extremely positive	Low
Low participation rate	Low	High	Conservative approach taken, using data from WRAP trial case studies and fully implemented schemes in other Councils	Low
Projected Income from other waste related services is less than predicted	Low	Medium	Projected income levels are based on conservative estimates	Low
Risks related to use of podded vehicles	Low	Medium	Thorough modelling of existing round weights has determined the appropriate size and proportion of the podded vehicles required	Low

11. Conclusions

- 11.1 The Joint Member/Officer Working Group has concluded that if a third household bin service is introduced, it should be dedicated to kitchen food waste (meat included but not garden waste) and collected weekly from householders in containers approximately 25 litres in size (in combination with ~7litre kitchen caddys), using 'podded' duo vehicles (i.e. collected at the same time as refuse/recycling) in a single pass system to maximise economic and environmental efficiency.
- 11.2 The main benefits of the scheme outlined in 11.1 above are:
1. An estimated 7,500 tonnes of food waste would be diverted from landfill. This could prevent the equivalent of 10,500 tonnes of CO₂ emissions per year (equivalent to 3,200 cars off the road)¹⁰;
 2. Household recycling/composting rates in MSDC and BDC would rise to ~50% and therefore contribute to the Suffolk target of 60% by 2015; in keeping with Suffolk's ambition of 'Creating the Greenest County'.
 3. The public will view a weekly collection of food waste as 'a better service'¹¹.
- 11.3 In an attempt to make the scheme outlined in 11.1 above 'cost neutral', 100% capital funding has been sought from external sources. To date, £574k has been secured through SCC's Diversion Incentive Fund (DIF), which would cover 42% of the capital funding required for a complete scheme covering both districts. The Working Group has therefore concluded that the scheme can only be operated on a close to cost neutral basis when (subject to Member agreement) income generated from other waste and recycling services and currently 'unbudgeted' recycling performance payments from other recyclables, are used to off set the cost of the scheme.

¹⁰ This is based upon 1.4 tonnes of CO₂ equiv. per tonne of food waste and 3.3 tonnes CO₂ emitted per average UK car.

¹¹ According to a LJ&P Survey 2007. See section 7.2 of this report.

Appendix A

Options considered by the Joint working Group

Table 1 Advantages/Disadvantages of Collecting **Garden Waste Only** District Wide

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Likely to be popular with the public, especially those with large gardens; 2. Collecting it fortnightly is proven to be acceptable with the public; 3. Receives a higher subsidy from SCC through recycling payments. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requires dedicated vehicles, so can not collect with general refuse; 2. May discourage home composting which is more environmentally friendly; 3. Generates high tonnages and so expensive to collect and process (~£2.4m in capital; £1.1m in revenue for BDC alone).; 4. Loss of income from subscription only scheme (Currently a combined £338k in MSDC/BDC); 5. Does not reduce large quantities of food waste currently in the black bin, so less effective at reducing tonnages to landfill; 6. Small properties may not be able to accommodate another wheeled bin; 7. Significantly increases the total amount of waste collected.

Table 2 Advantages/Disadvantages of Collecting **Garden Waste and Kitchen Waste** District Wide

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Likely to be popular with the public, especially those with large gardens; 2. Collecting it fortnightly is proven to be acceptable with the public; 3. Receives a higher subsidy from SCC through recycling payments. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requires dedicated vehicles, so can not collect with general refuse; 2. May discourage home composting which is more environmentally friendly; 3. Generates high tonnages and so expensive to collect and particularly expensive to process as all waste must be treated to a high standard to for Bio Hazard reasons (~£2.4m in capital; £1.1m in revenue for BDC alone); 4. Loss of income from subscription only scheme (Currently a combined £338k in MSDC/BDC); 5. Small properties may not be able to accommodate another wheeled bin; 6. Fortnightly collection makes scheme confusing for public to use for food waste disposal so risk of low capture rate for food waste; 7. Significantly increases the total amount of waste collected.

Table 3 Advantages/Disadvantages of Collecting **Kitchen Waste Only** District Wide

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can be collected on the same vehicle as refuse and recycling, therefore no extra vehicle passes needed ; 2. If collected on separate vehicles, can be co collected with other new recyclate materials e.g. glass, batteries etc. thus offsetting the cost of these additional services ; 3. Targets 2nd largest material type in the waste stream, thus maximum opportunity to reduce waste to landfill; 4. Does not discourage home composting of garden waste which is more environmentally friendly than off site treatment; 5. When offered on a weekly basis, would also address current concerns over fortnightly collection of residual (black bin) waste; 6. Involves no loss of income from subscription only garden waste scheme (Currently a combined £338k in MSDC/BDC). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requires a high quality on going communications campaign to get good participation levels and no contamination; 2. Impractical to offer on anything other than weekly frequency because of potential confusion by householders over which bin to use. 3. Lower tonnage means significantly lower recycling performance payments to support the service.

Appendix B

Collection Method Options Considered

1.1 On the basis of having identified kitchen waste as the most effective target for separate kerbside collection, 3 collection options have been evaluated:

1. Podded vehicle

This option would replace the existing RCV fleet with 'split bodied' podded vehicles that have two separate compartments. The vehicle would collect dry recyclables in the larger compartment and food waste in the front smaller compartment. The following week the same vehicle would collect residual waste in the larger compartment and food waste in the smaller front compartment. Because the capacity of the vehicles is reduced, an additional two RCVs would need to be added to the total BDC/MSDC fleet to compensate. A photograph of this type of vehicle is shown in Appendix D2.

2. Light Shuttle Mini Tipper Truck

Mini tipper trucks are dedicated to collecting just one type of material. Due to their size they can operate quickly and efficiently and are particularly suited at negotiating small rural roads and dense residential areas. An example of this type of vehicle is shown in Appendix D2. General waste and dry recyclables would continue to be collected on a fleet of standard RCVs, so the tipper trucks would introduce an additional weekly vehicle pass as compared with the current situation.

3. Stillage Vehicles

Stillage recycling vehicles have been configured to allow food waste to be collected alongside other recyclable items such as glass, textiles, and small waste electrical items. An example of this type of vehicle is shown in Appendix D2. General waste and dry recyclables would continue to be collected on the existing fleet of RCVs, so the stillage vehicles would introduce an additional weekly vehicle pass as compared with the current situation.

1.2 Table 4 below lists the relative merits of these options. Based on cost and impact on carbon footprint, the following option rankings have been derived:

Podded Vehicle	1 (preferred option)
Light Shuttle Mini Tipper Truck	2
Stillage Vehicle	3

Table 4 Advantages/Disadvantages of Each Collection Option

Advantages	Disadvantages
<p>Podded Vehicle</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Single pass collection system 2. Minimal impact on carbon footprint of collection service (1 extra vehicle in contract area). 3. Remains coupled with main waste collection operation, therefore no confusion on collection day / times etc. <p>Light Shuttle Mini Tipper Truck</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Small and compact vehicle, thus able to operate quickly and efficiently along small rural roads and in dense residential areas 2. Tried and tested technology 3. Spare vehicles are less costly to purchase 4. No need to estimate appropriate split in compartment sizes <p>Stillage Vehicles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stillage vehicles allow other recyclable items to be collected at the same time e.g. glass, batteries, textiles, small WEEE. This option could be considered to 'future proof' against a desire to collect additional recyclables. 2. Tried and tested technology 3. Spare vehicles are less costly to purchase 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High cost of 'spare' vehicles 2. Height needed to empty bins into pod. 3. Additional loader needed per round. 4. Little experience of operating these vehicles on kitchen waste. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total fleet size increases significantly from 20 vehicles to 32 vehicles. Additional costs associated with staffing and vehicle operating/maintenance costs 2. An additional vehicle pass results in additional carbon emissions and thus greater 'carbon footprint'. 3. By decoupling food waste collection from general waste/recycling, collection days/times are susceptible to change. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total fleet size increases significantly from 20 vehicles to 32 vehicles. Additional costs associated with staffing and vehicle operating/maintenance costs 2. An additional vehicle pass results in additional carbon emissions and thus greater 'carbon footprint'. 3. By decoupling food waste collection from general waste/recycling, collection days/times are susceptible to change.

Appendix B (cont.)

An Example of a Single-pass Split Bodied Podded Vehicle:



An Example of a Light Shuttle Tipper Truck emptying into an RCV below:



An Example of a Stillage Vehicle and 25 litre food waste collection bin (in brown) below:



Appendix C Full Scheme Costs/Income of Weekly Food Waste Collection

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Assumptions:												
Potential Food/Kitchen Waste (kgs/HH/week)	Potential Annual Arisings (tonnes) (A x 52 x 76)	Capture Rate %	Tonnes @ Capture rate (B/C%)	Participation Rate %	Tonnes per annum (D/E%)	Tonnes/round/annum (F/H)	Number Rounds	Tonnes per collection day per round (G/52/5)				
	3.87	15,300	70	10,710	70	7,497	376	20	1.44			
Income:												
	Estimated Total Kitchen Waste Collected (tonnes)	Number Rounds	Landfill Disposal Rate Per Tonne Indexed at 3.5% per annum	Landfill Tax (£/tonne)	Landfill Cost (D x E)	Recycling Payment Rate/tonne	Total Recycling Payment per annum for BDC & MSDC (B x G)	MSDC or BDC's 50:50 share of Recycling Credit Income £000s (H/2)				
	2009/2010	3,374	10.00	21.42	40	207,200	49.76	167,865	84			
	2010/2011	5,397	16.00	22.17	48	378,707	52.76	284,746	142			
	2011/2012	7,497	20.00	22.95	49.68	544,444	54.76	410,511	205			
	2012/2013	7,497	20.00	23.75	51.42	563,500	54.76	410,511	205			
	2013/2014	7,497	20.00	24.58	53.22	583,222	54.76	410,511	205			
	2014/2015	7,497	20.00	25.44	55.08	603,636	54.76	410,511	205			
	2015/2016	7,497	20.00	26.33	57.01	624,762	54.76	410,511	205			
Revenue Costs												
	Transfer/Treatment Cost per tonne	Transfer/Treatment Cost Per Annum	Annual Rate per Loader (£22k Indexed at 3.5% per annum)	BDC/MSDC Additional Loader Costs (Yr 1:10; Yr 2:16; Yr 3:	Annual Rate per Driver Indexed at 3.5% per annum	MSDC/BDC Additional Driver Costs (2 additional drivers in	Scheme Set up & Promotion Costs (£1/Hldy/Project mgt costs (Yr 1: £30k; Yr 2: £20k Yr 3: £20k) / Starter pack of liners (£1/Hldy/Bin delivery Costs (Yr1: £30k; Yr2: £20; Yr3: £10k)	BDC/MSDC Additional Revenue Costs (C+E+G)	Total Recycling Payment per annum to BDC/MSDC (H above)	MSDC/BDC Expenditure less Revenue (J-I)	Costs Less Annual Overall Landfill Saving Subsidy from SCC (K+I above)	MSDC or BDC 50:50 Share of Revenue Costs £000s (I/2)
	2009/2010	40.00	134,940	22,000	220,000	-	132,000	486,940	167,865	-319,075	-279,740	243
	2010/2011	41.40	223,436	22,770	364,320	25,000	50,000	83,200	637,756	-353,010	-259,048	319
	2011/2012	42.85	321,220	23,567	471,339	25,875	77,625	58,800	870,184	-459,673	-325,740	435
	2012/2013	44.35	332,462	24,392	487,836	26,781	80,342	-	900,640	-490,129	-337,140	450
	2013/2014	45.90	344,099	25,246	504,910	27,718	83,154	-	932,163	-521,651	-348,940	466
	2014/2015	47.51	356,142	26,129	522,582	28,688	86,064	-	964,788	-554,277	-361,153	482
	2015/2016	49.17	368,607	27,044	540,872	29,692	89,076	-	996,556	-588,045	-373,794	499
	Total							274,000				
Capital Costs:												
	Number of Caddies Required	Estimated Cost per unit	Cost of caddies (B x C)	Number Food/Kitchen Waste Pods Required	Cost of Pods @ £28k each (E x £28k)	Number Additional Vehicles Required	Cost of Additional Vehicles @ £168k (incl. pods) (G x £168)	Transfer Station @ £50k	Total Capital Requirement per Annum BDC & MSDC (D+F+H+I)	Total MSDC or BDC 50:50 share of Capital Requirement per Annum £000s (J/2)		
	2009/2010	36,000	6	216,000	10	280,000	1	168,000	50,000	714,000	357	
	2010/2011	21,600	6	129,600	6	168,000	1	168,000	-	465,600	233	
	2011/2012	14,400	6	86,400	4	112,000	-	-	198,400	99		
	Total:	72,000		432,000		560,000	2	336,000	50,000	1,378,000	689	

Appendix C – Breakdown of Income from Surplus making Waste Services and Enhanced Recycling Performance Payments (RPP)

The Joint Member Working Group has suggested that (subject to Member approval) income used from surplus making waste services in both Babergh and Mid Suffolk, could be ring fenced into a single budget, in order to offset the overall increased revenue costs. These are summarised in the table below.

Most Likely Case	Additional Revenue from Increasing Cost of Garden Waste Service in Babergh by £10 for 7500 Subscribers. Additional subscribers Increasing at 500 new customers per annum to max 8000. Indexed at 3.5%	MSDC Surplus Revenue Expectations from Garden Waste Service Indexed at 3.5%	Annual Revenue from sacks indexed at 3.5% (£1 profit per roll of sacks)	Estimated Additional Revenue from introduction of Trade waste and Recycling Service in Mid Suffolk. Indexed at 3.5%	Surplus Revenue from implementing trade waste and recycling service in Babergh	Total Combined MSDC/BDC Estimated Revenue Surplus	MSDC/BDC's 50:50 Share of Total Estimated Revenue Surplus	MSDC Unbudgeted Recycling Performance Payment	BDC Unbudgeted Recycling Performance Payment based on £41 /tonne budgeted rate across 14,000 tonnes of other recyclables	Total MSDC & BDC Unbudgeted Recycling Performance Payment	MSDC/BDC's 50:50 Share of Total Unbudgeted Income
2009/2010	75,000	18,965	19,656	-20,529	7,500	100,592	50,296	45,150	122,640	167,790	83,895
2010/2011	82,800	68,765	31,450	6,758	15,000	204,773	102,386	76,650	164,640	241,290	120,645
2011/2012	85,698	73,226	39,312	35,118	22,500	255,854	127,927	97,650	192,640	290,290	145,145
2012/2013	88,697	75,602	39,312	61,805	30,000	295,416	147,708	97,650	192,640	290,290	145,145
2013/2014	91,802	77,005	39,312	86,957	37,500	332,576	166,288	97,650	192,640	290,290	145,145
2014/2015	95,015	80,352	39,312	110,592	45,000	370,271	185,135	97,650	192,640	290,290	145,145
2015/2016	98,340	81,631	39,312	114,462	52,500	386,245	193,123	97,650	192,640	290,290	145,145

Best Case	Additional Revenue from Increasing Cost of Garden Waste Service in Babergh by £10 for 7500 Subscribers. Additional subscribers Increasing at 500 new customers per annum to max 8000. Indexed at 3.5%	MSDC Surplus Revenue Expectations from Garden Waste Service Indexed at 3.5%	Annual Revenue from sacks indexed at 3.5% (£2 profit per roll of sacks)	Estimated Additional Revenue from introduction of Trade waste and Recycling Service in Mid Suffolk. Indexed at 3.5%	Surplus Revenue from implementing trade waste and recycling service in Babergh	Babergh's 50:50 Share of Total Estimated Revenue Surplus
2009/2010	75,000	-500	39,312	-88,000	10,000	17,906
2010/2011	82,800	29,500	65,101	-41,000	20,000	78,200
2011/2012	85,698	60,000	84,224	42,000	30,000	150,961
2012/2013	88,697	91,500	87,172	188,000	40,000	247,685
2013/2014	91,802	95,400	90,223	222,000	50,000	274,712
2014/2015	95,015	97,100	93,381	258,000	60,000	301,748
2015/2016	98,340	97,100	96,649	296,000	70,000	329,045
Worst Case	Additional Revenue from Increasing Cost of Garden Waste Service in Babergh by £10 Reduces Customer Numbers by 10% to 6,875. Indexed at 3.5%	MSDC Surplus Revenue Expectations from Garden Waste Service Indexed at 3.5%	Annual Revenue from sacks indexed at 3.5% (£0.25 profit per roll of sacks)	Estimated Additional Revenue from introduction of Trade waste and Recycling Service in Mid Suffolk. Indexed at 3.5%	Surplus Revenue from implementing trade waste and recycling service in Babergh	Babergh's 50:50 Share of Total Estimated Revenue Surplus
2009/2010	50,000	-500	4,914	-88,000	0	-16,793
2010/2011	51,750	29,500	8,138	-41,000	0	24,194
2011/2012	53,561	60,000	10,528	10,500	0	67,295
2012/2013	55,436	60,000	10,896	47,000	0	86,666
2013/2014	57,376	60,000	11,278	55,500	0	92,077
2014/2015	59,384	60,000	11,673	64,500	0	97,778
2015/2016	61,463	60,000	12,081	74,000	0	103,772

Appendix D The Diversion Incentive Fund (DIF)

- 1.1 During the period that the Joint Working Group has been in operation, Suffolk County Council set up a Diversion Incentive Fund (DIF), which was open to all Suffolk authorities signed up to a Suffolk Waste Management Memorandum of Understanding. SCC invited bids for capital monies, with the aim of increasing recycling and composting performance across the county, beyond that committed in each authorities Recycling Plan. The total sum available in the DIF was £1.5m. However, during discussions prior to the Joint Working Group submitting a bid, SCC Officers suggested that additional capital monies could be available, subject to SCC receiving further capital monies from DEFRA. The additional capital is expected to arise from a £1.2m capital fund that has recently replaced the Suffolk Waste and Performance Efficiency Grant (WPEG).
- 1.2 The Joint Working Group approved Officers to submit a joint bid for £1.732 million capital funding to the DIF scheme, based upon implementation of a weekly collection of food waste in both districts, over a three-year period. In addition, the Joint Working Group required Officers to open discussions with SCC in regard sharing the additional savings SCC would make on the landfill costs that would be avoided, by diverting food waste from being landfilled. The bid to the DIF fund was submitted, subject to each of the partner authorities obtaining its Members approval to implement the scheme, should SCC award the funding.
- 1.3 The bid was designed to meet the capital costs to the Councils to implement a weekly collection of food waste from all 80,000 households in Babergh and Mid Suffolk, and aimed to divert 7,500 tonnes of food waste from landfill each year.
- 1.4 SCC Officers rejected the bid, as it was judged “non-compliant” and therefore did not reach the stage where it was considered. After SCC announced its decision, discussions took place with SCC at Director and Portfolio Member level, where it was made clear by SCC that the bid had been rejected as being non-compliant, as it had applied for a sum greater than that in the £1.5million DIF ‘pot’. In addition further grounds for rejecting the bid were that it had included a request to discuss the potential for additional revenue funding – over and above the agreed recycling payment - from the additional savings SCC would make from the diversion of 7,500 tonnes of food waste from landfill each year.
- 1.5 Both Mid Suffolk and Babergh Officers believed that additional financial support over and above the recycling payments received from SCC would be required to make the scheme affordable and meet the criteria set out by Members. This scheme is not adding any additional waste to the waste stream but diverting waste from landfill. In addition the diverted tonnage is relatively small compared to the collection of garden waste and consequently the recycling payments to support the cost of introducing the service are significantly diminished.
- 1.6 The initial bid to SCC was constructed to implement 10 collection rounds in year one, as the vehicles due to be replaced in 2009 could be equipped with the ‘pod’ to enable food waste collection service to be introduced. The initial bid then provided for a further six rounds to be implemented in year two of the service, with implementation of the final six rounds in 2011, each year replacing standard vehicles with vehicles equipped with food waste pods. In years one and two spare vehicles equipped with pod will be required.

- 1.7 During discussions with SCC, it was made apparent that £900k funding from the DIF fund had been awarded to other Suffolk authorities. Babergh and Mid Suffolk were advised to re-submit their bid for the sum remaining available within the DIF Fund. A revised bid was prepared and submitted for £574,000 (see below). SCC has now provisionally agreed to allocate £600k to fund the additional cost of duo vehicles and food waste bins and caddies for approximately half the BDC/MSDC fleet. This would allow all of one district to receive the service or approximately half of each district to receive the service.

Appendix D DIF bid 2 by BDC/MSDC to Suffolk County Council

Item	Assumptions	Year 1					Year 2					Year 3					Total year 4	Total year 5	Total	
		Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Year 1	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Year 2	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Year 3				
Income																				
Fees charged		£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Sale of materials		£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Recycling payments	£43.76 in Yr2, £52.76 in Yr 3, £54.76 in Yr 4, 56.68 in Yr 5	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£41,965	£41,965	£41,965	£41,965	£167,860	£71,190	£71,190	£71,190	£71,190	£284,760	£410,500	£425,000	£1,288,120	
DIF funding	Pods + Caddies	£0	£0	£0	£574,000	£574,000	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£574,000
Other funding		£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Council funding	Capital only	£0	£0	£0	£90,000	£90,000	£220,000	£0	£0	£465,500	£685,500	£0	£0	£0	£198,400	£198,400	£0	£0	£0	£973,900
Total income		£0	£0	£0	£664,000	£664,000	£261,965	£41,965	£41,965	£507,465	£853,360	£71,190	£71,190	£71,190	£269,590	£483,160	£410,500	£425,000	£2,836,020	
Expenditure																				
Vehicles	Pods @ £28k + additional vehicles	£0	£0	£0	£448,000	£448,000	£0	£0	£0	£336,000	£336,000	£0	£0	£0	£112,000	£112,000	£0	£0	£896,000	
Equipment (bins etc)	Caddies @ £6	£0	£0	£0	£216,000	£216,000	£0	£0	£0	£129,500	£129,500	£0	£0	£0	£86,400	£86,400	£0	£0	£431,900	
Plant (specify)	Handstanding and mobile loading conveyor for bulking / transfer	£0	£0	£0	£50,000	£50,000	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£50,000
Gate fees	Transfer & Treatment Costs	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£33,750	£33,750	£33,750	£33,750	£135,000	£55,800	£55,800	£55,800	£55,800	£223,200	£320,500	£331,250	£1,009,950	
Crew costs	Additional Loader per round + 1 additional driver	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£55,000	£55,000	£55,000	£55,000	£220,000	£104,015	£104,015	£104,015	£104,015	£416,060	£551,700	£571,000	£1,758,760	
Management costs	Short term project coordinator	£0	£0	£15,000	£15,000	£30,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£20,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£20,000	£0	£0	£70,000	
Promotion costs	£1 / household	£0	£0	£0	£36,000	£36,000	£0	£0	£0	£21,600	£21,600	£0	£0	£0	£22,400	£22,400	£0	£0	£80,000	
Other costs (specify)	Bin Delivery, Introductory Bin Liners	£0	£0	£0	£66,000	£66,000	£0	£0	£0	£41,600	£41,600	£0	£0	£0	£32,400	£32,400	£0	£0	£140,000	
Total expenditure		£0	£0	£15,000	£831,000	£846,000	£93,750	£93,750	£93,750	£622,450	£903,700	£164,815	£164,815	£164,815	£418,015	£912,460	£872,200	£902,250	£4,436,610	

H:\DOCS\Committee\REPORTS\Strategy\2008\310708-HouseholdWasteBin-App1.doc