

Briefing Note: Options for Collection of Recyclable Materials and Residual Waste*Revised 8 June 2010 to include new option 6**Revised September 2010 to fit Cabinet template***Executive Summary**Purpose

To provide information on the costs and performance standards of a range of options for the collection of recyclable materials and residual waste and to seek agreement on options which would form the basis of the proposed consultation exercise.

Summary of Options

The table below contains a high level summary of the projected performance levels and costs (settled state costs for 2014/15 excluding capital).

Options for Collection		Recycling 2014/15 %	Costs 2014/15 £m
1.	Existing service	40.47	26.9
2.	Return to weekly collection with charged green waste	34.94	29.8
3.	Extend AWC to whole county with charged green waste	42.83	25.0
4.	Extend AWC and free green waste to whole county	48.69	26.0
5.	Extend AWC, charged green waste and free plastic bottles and card to whole county	43.98	26.2
6.	Extend AWC, free green waste and free plastic bottles and card to whole county	50.49	27.8
7.	Extend AWC to whole county with charged green waste, free plastic bottles and card and weekly food waste	53.70	32.4

These costs do not reflect the capital investment required to deliver each option or any short term increases in revenue where recycling collections are implemented prior to the expansion of AWC and the delivery of associated savings. The detail of these costs is set out in the Tables at the end of the main briefing note.

Decision Required and Next Steps

- (i) A preferred set of options to be presented to the public should be agreed by the end of May
- (ii) Consultation should start in June and finish at the end of August
- (iii) Analysis and reporting of consultation results to Cabinet should be completed during September
- (iv) Cabinet approval of favoured option in October
- (v) Allocation of budgets and ordering of additional vehicles and receptacles to commence October 2010
- (vi) Education and information campaign and service preparations start late 2010
- (vii) Implementation from June 2011 (depending upon the chosen option).

Tracy Carter
June 2010

Briefing Note : Options for Collection of Recyclable Materials and Residual Waste

Revised 8th June 2010 to include new option 6

Purpose

1. This briefing paper presents a wide range of options for harmonisation of Wiltshire's waste collection and recycling services, together with cost, performance and other implications necessary for decision making. It outlines the best available data to show the resources that would be required by the Waste Service should these service enhancements be included within the public consultation, and subsequently selected for implementation from 2011-12.

Background

2. The harmonisation of waste collection services will affect progress towards the objectives set out in Wiltshire's Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy. This was adopted in 2006 by the previous local authorities and inherited by Wiltshire Council. The Strategy sets out targets for diverting waste from landfill, based on each level of the "waste hierarchy". For example there are targets to increase recycling to 40% by 2010/11 and 50% by 2020, supported by targets to provide kerbside recycling to the great majority of residents by 2011 and the conversion of residual waste collections to Alternate Weekly Collection (AWC) by the same date. The latter target has been partially achieved, and will now be subject to the forthcoming Council decision on waste collection and recycling services. The Council and its predecessor waste disposal authority have also pursued a strategy target of diverting additional waste from landfill by securing energy from waste capacity. One contract (the Lakeside / Hills contract) commenced in 2009. A second contract, for a mechanical and biological treatment (MBT) plant at Westbury is in the late stages of negotiation. Any decision on waste collection and recycling services needs to take account of the adopted strategy and the progress made in its implementation.
3. The One Council bid document 'next steps' contained commitments to harmonise waste collection and recycling arrangements across Wiltshire. Potential cost savings from the integration of the former district operated services were identified, with the commitment that these would be reinvested in the form of service enhancements.
4. Full Council authorised a review of Waste Collection at its meeting of 16 June 2009. This was progressed by Environment Select Committee and an appointed Waste Task Group throughout late 2009 and early 2010. A number of options were identified, evaluated, and reported to Environment Select Committee on 12 January 2010. This work was not however concluded due to the introduction of a Minority Report, produced and supported by Committee Members, and further option development work was commissioned from Officers. These options were presented for a consultation exercise originally due to commence in January 2010, but postponed due to a lack of national policy direction ahead of the general election.
5. Performance information for the current service is set out in the table below.

Measure		Performance 2009/10	Est. Performance Quartile*	Direction of Travel
NI191	Waste per household after recycling	644 kg	2	Reducing (positive)
NI192	Household waste recycled or composted	40.5%	2	Steady improvement since 2002/03 (25%). Further improvement depends upon collection service decisions 2010/11
NI193	Municipal Waste sent to landfill	48.8%	2	Reducing. Strong further improvement 2010-11
Customer Satisfaction:				
PV **	Household Refuse Collection	81.5%		
	Kerbside Collection of Recycling	69.5%		
	Recycling Centres and Waste Disposal	77%		

* Compared with all unitary and waste disposal authorities. Based on 2008/09 data (the most recent available) and performance improvements 2009/10.

** PV = People's Voice Survey, November 2009: Percentage "very satisfied" or "satisfied"

Link to Corporate Objectives and the Transformation Programme

6. The Corporate Plan (2010 – 2014) contains commitments to:

- Reduce our environmental impact, and
- Focus on our customers

Implementing AWC would make a significant contribution to achieving the first of these objectives and would enable us to harmonise the standard of service we deliver to our customers. A number of the options identified here will result in a net reduction in our environmental impact by increasing recycling and consequently reducing the volume of waste sent to landfill. The planned consultation will focus on our customers by asking them for their views on the option(s) selected for inclusion.

7. The Harmonisation of Waste Collection Services Project is incorporated into the Corporate Transformation Programme.

Options Considered

8. These are set out in full in Tables 1- 5 which are attached as appendices to this paper. Table 1 provides a brief summary of the key services to be provided under each option. Table 2 provides a high level summary of the cost and performance implications of the different options. Tables 3, 4 and 5 illustrate, respectively, costs, performance implications, key risks and other relevant considerations – particularly the environmental impact of each proposal – in more detail.

9. The table below contains a high level summary of the projected performance levels and costs (settled state costs for 2014/15 excluding capital).

Options for Collection		Recycling 2014/15 %	Costs 2014/15 £m
1.	Existing service	40.47	26.9
2.	Return to weekly collection with charged green waste	34.94	29.8
3.	Extend AWC to whole county with charged green waste	42.83	25.1
4.	Extend AWC and free green waste to whole county	48.69	26.0
5.	Extend AWC, charged green waste and free plastic bottles and card to whole county	43.98	26.2
6.	Extend AWC, free green waste and free plastic bottles and card to whole county	51.10	27.8
7.	Extend AWC to whole county with charged green waste, free plastic bottles and card and weekly food waste	53.70	32.4

These costs do not reflect the capital investment required to deliver each option or any short term increases in revenue where recycling collections are implemented prior to the expansion of AWC and the delivery of associated savings. The detail of these costs is set out in Table 3.

Alternate Weekly Collection (or Assorted Weekly Collection) (AWC)

10. The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS), produced in 2006 and agreed by each of the former District Councils and the County Council, contained a commitment to move to Alternate Weekly Collection (AWC) across Wiltshire by 2011. Cost savings delivered by a move to AWC were also included within the One Council bid. Where AWC has been introduced, recycling rates have improved significantly. The east and west areas have local recycling rates normally in excess of 44%, whilst the other areas are at about 26% and 32%. AWC should therefore be included within the package of options to be developed. It should also feature within the options selected for the broad based stakeholder consultation planned to run from June this year.

Augmented and Phased AWC

11. There is a risk that such a proposal may prove unpopular in the north and south of Wiltshire where residual waste is currently collected weekly. It has therefore been suggested that the options package should also identify the implications of introducing enhanced recycling services for residents in advance of any changes to the residual waste collection service.
12. Therefore, some of the options include alternative start dates and phasing. These sub-options would first provide the elements of each package designed to make use of an AWC service easier and boost recycling, and follow up by introducing AWC some months later. During the intervening period, the planned information and education campaign would continue, to ease

the transition. This would serve to change behaviour and practice in advance and, hopefully, illustrate that the impact of moving from weekly to fortnightly collection could be largely mitigated by the provision of suitable facilities to instead send much more waste for recycling.

Weekly Collection

13. This is still in place in two areas of Wiltshire and has support from residents and in parts of the press. In January 2010, Members requested that it be included in the range of options for the consultation on waste collection systems. The implications of adopting this option are discussed below.

Existing Services

14. Existing collection and recycling services are also included as an option. The purpose of this is to provide a basis for comparison with options for change.

Cost implications and potential benefits

15. Table 2 provides a summary of costs and benefits. More specific information is given in Tables 3, 4 and 5.
16. Costs have been provided by the Service and should be viewed as provisional. They are based on a number of forecasts and estimates. However the method and results for determining the costs for most of the options were considered by the Waste Task Group during late 2009. Those options selected for inclusion within the public consultation would be subject to additional verification by Corporate Finance.
17. Costings take account of government information regarding future landfill tax escalation (currently £48 per tonne per year increasing by £8/tonne/year to £80 at 2014/15). In other respects, they are at 2009-10 prices. No future adjustments have been made for inflationary factors. Whilst it is acknowledged that the same analysis carried out in 12 months time may yield different costs, there is a reasonable degree of confidence in the relative differences and conclusions drawn.
18. It is also worth noting that most options see a sharply increased capital outlay during 2011-12 (Table 3). This is due to start up costs. These options would require significant investment in additional vehicles and bins. Also, in some cases, additional waste transfer and/or treatment capacity would be needed. Some allowance is also made for communications campaigns. In the case of Option 7 (AWC plus plastic, card and food waste) there would be a second peak in capital outlay during 2013/14, as food waste collection, transfer and treatment commenced.
19. There is no single option that delivers enhanced performance, reduced carbon footprint and a cost saving (or standstill). Some points are worth noting however.
 - Option 1 (maintain existing service provision) is essentially a non-option. Preserving the status-quo will do nothing to address the inequality of service provision across the county and doesn't begin to address the need to identify One Council related savings that can be reinvested into enhanced recycling services.
 - Options 2, 3 and 4 are predicated on the assumption that kerbside collection of plastic and card in the south would remain in place, but would not be extended to the rest of Wiltshire. Besides increasing recycling in the south area, the collection provides a key role in controlling the calorific value of waste being sent to the Lakeside energy from waste incinerator. However, these options fail to address the need to harmonise service delivery in accordance with our One Council commitment.

- Option 2 (return to weekly collection) would require significantly higher investment than some other options, and costs would be rising steeply due to exposure to Landfill Tax. The Council's carbon footprint and NI 191 and NI 192 performance would deteriorate. Those residents keenly in favour of more recycling would not support this option. The Council may suffer damage to its reputation.
- Option 3 (AWC, including charged green waste) offers what may appear a reasonable spread of benefits. Despite the need for some capital investment, overall costs are somewhat less than Option 1 (existing services). Revenue costs are less and would increase at a slower rate, due largely to savings on Landfill Tax. The Council would also secure a reduced carbon footprint and an increase in two of the three waste related national indicators. However, the option offers nothing to appease those residents who object to moving from a weekly to fortnightly residual waste collection.
- Option 4 (AWC plus free garden waste), 6 (AWC plus free garden waste and free plastic and card) and 7 (AWC plus plastic and card, plus weekly food waste) offer the greatest potential performance increases. However, each will require new treatment facilities and this is reflected in the costings.
- Option 4 will see collected garden waste exceed the capacity of Wiltshire's composting site requiring either a new purpose built facility or for the waste to be transported out of county to the nearest facility with spare capacity. The former solution will require additional time to gain planning consent and construct, whilst the latter will add to our carbon footprint due to the many additional out-of-county trips to transport the waste. Given the well established tradition of home composting in Wiltshire, and the previous work that the Council has done to encourage this, a further consideration is that much of the tonnage arising due to this collection could be (and is currently) treated by residents at home. Home composting might be regarded as a practical characteristic of resilient communities, due to its association with being more self-reliant. For those residents who currently compost their garden waste at home or use the charged garden waste service there would be little or no reduction of their residual waste by offering this free service. Those residents who do not have gardens may perceive that they are subsidising the provision of this free service.
- Option 5 (AWC plus plastic and card) would build on Option 3. Costs would be somewhat higher, due partly to the need for more capital investment. However, by 2014/15 annual cost increases would be less, due to a reduced Landfill Tax bill. The Council would also secure an increase in NIs, probably to top quartile in two cases (Table 4). The option also offers a collection of recyclable materials (plastic bottles and card) to ease the introduction of AWC by removing bulky items from residual waste and to increase recycling performance. It also offers the opportunity to re-use the current garden waste bins used by those west Wiltshire residents not electing to pay for this service, as bins for plastic bottles and card collection. Additional waste transfer and baling capacity would be needed to deal with this bulky material.
- Option 6 is a combination of Option 4 and Option 5 and the points relating to the individual options would also apply except re-using the west Wiltshire garden waste bins for plastic bottles and card would not be possible.
- Option 7 offers the greatest leap in performance of all options presented. However, there is currently no facility in or adjoining Wiltshire to handle the food waste. Procuring an anaerobic digestion plant (which WRAP in their recent report 'Environmental Benefits of recycling' describe as the preferable means of food waste disposal – particularly from an environmental perspective) would require a significant capital commitment and take time (a 2011 start would not be possible). Additional capital costs for this option to

2014-15 are in the region of £12m, whilst the total spend would be the highest of all options by a significant margin (Table 3). In this context, it is important to note that the Lakeside project and (if it goes ahead) the proposed MBT project would divert up to two thirds of residual food waste from landfill. A final consideration is that food waste could be greatly reduced by behaviour change – for example more careful buying as promoted in the national “love food, hate waste” campaign. Use of garden – based food waste digesters enables residents to treat this waste at home. Since 2007, the Council has backed a campaign to encourage food waste digestion, in which about 3500 digesters have been sold to residents.

- Option 8 (HRC expansion) by itself offers little apparent value in relation to the criteria employed within this options analysis. Marginal improvements in performance - in particular NI 192 – would require additional investment of approximately £4m up to 2014/15. Moreover, due to the rather protracted timescales typically involved in locating suitable sites and obtaining planning permissions, this does not offer a solution that could be rolled out either before or with AWC in 2011.

Risks

20. Key risks associated with individual options are summarised in Table 2. The significant risks are listed in Table 5.
21. Principal risks underlying a number of the options are:
- failure to address inequalities in service provision
 - residents in north and south Wiltshire react negatively to AWC, impacting on the Council’s reputation
 - residents in all areas may react negatively to provision of additional bins or other receptacles for separate collection of recyclables
 - options are presented to the public that require construction of new treatment facilities and so are not delivered in timeframes that residents find acceptable
 - the options that would generate greatly increased garden waste or a new food waste tonnage would raise issues about markets for the output materials which are not readily available in the Wiltshire area.
22. A risk underlying all options is that decisions are subject to further delay, leaving the service insufficient time to prepare for and implement changes within expected timescales. Most options require lead in times of over 6 months, due to the need to procure additional vehicles, some purpose built, plus the need for an intensive, phased communications campaign on the changes.

Timescales necessary to commence implementation

23. The earliest start-up dates for each of the service changes identified are included in Table 3. Costs provided, together with impacts on performance, are based on these dates. Any delays, such as those caused by the lack of clear policy from an incoming government, will impact upon the costs provided and, in some cases, performance also.
24. The key determinant of timing for most options is procurement of additional vehicles. Specialist vehicles, eg for kerbside collection of recyclable materials, cost over £100,000 each and currently take at least 9 months from ordering to arrival. Use of temporary hire vehicles would increase costs above those presented in this paper. Vehicles cannot be ordered until the Council has decided its chosen service and budget provision has been made. In the case of

options 4, 5, 6 and particularly 7 (food waste collection), additional waste transfer and treatment facilities will need to be procured. This will also affect timescales.

25. Sub-options identified for Option 4, (free garden waste rollout ahead of AWC) and Options 5 and 6 (plastic and card rollout ahead of AWC) provide a “carrot before the stick” approach. However, this will require the AWC rollout to be delayed for a few months and will require some additional resources to cover the period when the new service overlaps with weekly collection of residual waste in two areas.
26. Guidance on industry good practice, provided by WRAP (Waste and Resources Action Programme), suggests a minimum period of 6 months is required for successfully ‘drip feeding’ residents information on major service changes. Many of the options presented could be implemented from June 2011. However, this would require communications on the final agreed option to commence from late 2010. This in turn will require that the public consultation exercise commences no later than June to allow for the necessary analysis and subsequent agreement by Cabinet of the selected option.

Decision required and next steps

- (i) A preferred set of options to be presented to the public should be agreed by the end of May
- (ii) Consultation should start in June and finish at the end of August
- (iii) Analysis and reporting of consultation results to Cabinet should be completed during September
- (iv) Cabinet approval of favoured option in October
- (v) Allocation of budgets and ordering of additional vehicles and receptacles to commence October 2010
- (vi) Education and information campaign and service preparations start late 2010
- (vii) Implementation from June 2011 (depending upon the chosen option).

Report authors

Andy Conn, Head of Waste Management
John Geary, Head of Waste Management Transformation
Martin Litherland, Head of Waste Collection

TABLE 1 – Summary of Options

	Option Name	Key Services
1.	Existing Services	Weekly residual waste collection in north and south. AWC in east and west. Charged fortnightly garden waste collection in east, north and south. Free collection in west. Black Box (dry recyclates) fortnightly collection in all areas. Plastic and card fortnightly collection in south.
2.	Return to Weekly Collection	Weekly residual collection in all areas. Charged fortnightly garden waste in all areas. Other services unchanged.
3.	Alternate Weekly Collection (AWC)	AWC in all areas. Charged fortnightly garden waste in all areas. Other services unchanged.
4.	AWC plus free garden waste	AWC in all areas. Free fortnightly garden waste in all areas. Other services unchanged.
5.	AWC plus plastic and card	AWC in all areas. Charged fortnightly garden waste in all areas. Plastic and card fortnightly in all areas. Black box service unchanged.
6.	AWC plus free garden waste plus free plastic and card : CONSULTATION PROPOSAL	AWC in all areas. Free fortnightly garden waste in all areas. Free fortnightly plastic and card in all areas. Black box service unchanged.
7.	AWC plus plastic, card and food waste	Option 5, plus:- Weekly food waste collection from 2013.
8.	Household Recycling Centres (HRC) expansion	Development of 3 new HRCs (1 committed) and relocation of Salisbury (Churchfields) HRC.

TABLE 2 – Cost and Performance Summary of Options

Option		Costs	Performance	Top Quartile?	Carbon Footprint	Key additional risks
1	Existing Services	Rising costs. No savings	No improvement. Targets not hit.	NI 193 only (due to Lakeside)	No improvement	Variations in service not addressed.
2	Return to weekly collection	Significant higher and rising costs	Worsening performance. Targets more distant.	NI 193 maybe (due to Lakeside)	Worse. More lorry miles and less recycling.	Council loss of reputation.
3	AWC	Costs reduced but rising	Some improvement. Some targets hit, others closer.	NI191 possibly NI193	Some improvement.	West Wiltshire green bins.
4	AWC plus free garden waste	Early peak in costs, then stable	Significant improvement. Targets hit or very close.	Probably all NIs	More lorry miles but more recycling, and bio-waste recovery.	Quantity, quality and seasonal variation in green waste. Treatment capacity. Market for outputs.
5	AWC plus plastic and card	Early peak in costs, then stable	Some improvement. Some targets hit, others closer.	NI191 and NI193	More lorry miles but more recycling.	Capacity to handle and bale plastic and card.
6	AWC plus free garden waste plus free plastic and card - CONSULTATION PROPOSAL	Early peak in costs, then stable	Very significant improvement. Targets hit.	Yes for all NIs	More lorry miles but more recycling and bio-waste recovery.	Quantity, quality and seasonal variation in green waste. Treatment capacity. Market for outputs. Capacity to handle and bale plastic and card.
7	AWC plus plastic and card plus weekly food waste	Significant higher costs with food waste collection	Very significant improvement. Targets hit	Yes for all NIs	More lorry miles but more recycling and bio-waste recovery.	Food waste transfer and treatment capacity / duplication of capacity with EFW processes. Longer lead time. Market for outputs.
8	HRC expansion	Significant additional costs	Marginal Improvement	NI 193 only (due to Lakeside)	Some improvement.	Site identification, purchase and planning permission.

**Waste Collection and Treatment
Options - Costs**
TABLE 3
all costs at 2009/10 prices / nil inflation / except
plus Landfill Tax escalator

FOR CLARIFICATION – OPTION 6 IS THE CONSULTATION PROPOSAL

	Name of Service Option	Cost profile from start up		Costs 2009/10	Costs 2010/11	Costs 2011/12	Costs 2012/13	Costs 2013/14	Costs 2014/15	Total Costs 2009/10 to 2014/15 (rounded)	Cost trend at 2014/15
1	Existing service	NA	total costs	£22,733,448	£24,180,905	£24,851,297	£25,521,689	£26,192,081	£26,862,473	£150,000,000	Rising
			capital costs *	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
			cost per household	£116	£123	£126	£130	£133	£136		
2	Return to weekly collection / charged green waste : Jan final leaflet option 1	Commence service changes 01.06.11	total costs	£22,733,448	£24,180,905	£29,017,767	£28,090,352	£28,525,969	£29,830,964	£162,000,000	rising strongly
			capital costs *	0	0	1,705,284	369,397	270,590	726,281	£3,000,000	
			cost per household	£116	£123	£147	£143	£145	£152		
3	Extend AWC to whole County / charged green waste : Jan final leaflet option 2	Commence service changes 01.06.11	total costs	£22,733,448	£24,180,905	£25,341,619	£24,336,786	£24,577,291	£25,125,174	£146,000,000	Rising
			capital costs *	£0	£0	£1,405,284	£369,397	£270,590	£261,281	£2,000,000	
			cost per household	£116	£123	£129	£124	£125	£128		

4	Extend AWC to whole County / extend free green waste collection to whole County NEW	(a) Commence all service changes 01.06.11	total costs	£22,733,448	£24,180,905	£29,898,167	£25,978,217	£25,762,086	£26,003,455	£155,000,000	Steady
			capital costs *	£0	£0	£4,388,600	£138,400	£138,400	£138,400	£5,000,000	
			cost per household	£116	£123	£152	£132	£131	£132		
		(b) commence free green waste collection 01.06.11 Commence AWC 01.10. 11	total costs	£22,733,448	£24,180,905	£30,109,107	£26,085,026	£25,993,504	£26,003,455	£155,000,000	
			capital costs *	£0	£0	£4,388,600	£138,400	£138,400	£138,400	£5,000,000	
			cost per household	£116	£123	£153	£133	£132	£132		
5	Extend AWC / charged green waste / extend plastic and card kerbside to whole County : Jan final leaflet option 3	(a) Commence all service changes 01.06.11	total costs	£22,733,448	£24,180,905	£30,020,725	£25,439,954	£25,810,763	£26,170,374	£154,000,000	rising slightly
			capital costs *	£0	£0	£5,155,284	£369,397	£270,590	£261,281	£6,000,000	
			cost per household	£116	£123	£153	£129	£131	£133		
	(b) Commence plastic and card kerbside and charged green waste 01.06.11. Commence AWC 01.10.11	total costs	£22,733,448	£24,180,905	£30,582,521	£25,439,954	£25,810,763	£26,170,374	£155,000,000		
		capital costs *	£0	£0	£5,155,284	£369,397	£270,590	£261,281	£6,000,000		

			cost per household	£116	£123	£155	£129	£131	£133		
6	NEW OPTION - Extend AWC/ free garden waste/extend plastic and card kerbside to whole County - CONSULTATION PROPOSAL	(a) Commence all service changes 01.06.11	total costs	£22,733,448	£24,180,905	£35,981,675	£28,267,106	£27,775,372	£27,785,535	£167,000,000	steady
			capital costs *	£0	£0	£8,151,100	£138,400	£138,400	£138,400	£9,000,000	
			cost per household	£116	£123	£183	£144	£141	£141		
		(b) Commence recycling services 01.06.11. Commence AWC 01.10.11	total costs	£22,733,448	£24,180,905	£35,801,675	£28,267,106	£27,919,372	£27,785,535	£167,000,000	steady
			capital costs *	£0	£0	£8,151,100	£138,400	£138,400	£138,400	£9,000,000	
			cost per household	£116	£123	£183	£144	£142	£141		
7	Option 3 plus weekly food waste collection whole County NEW	commence AWC, plastic and card kerbside and charged green waste collection 01.06.11. (Option 3a)	total costs	£22,733,448	£24,180,905	£30,020,725	£25,439,954	£37,908,779	£32,441,750	£173,000,000	recently peaked due to food waste service 2013.
		Commence food waste collection 01.04.13	capital costs *	0	0	5155284	369397	6085230	261281	£12,000,000	
			cost per household	£116	£123	£155	£129	£193	£165		
8	NEW OPTION - extend household recycling centre network	Open Marlborough mid 2010/11									
		Open Westbury mid 2012/13									

	<u>NB costs are additional costs</u>	Open 3rd site (Tidworth or Mere?) mid 2013/14	total cost	£0	£135,000	£270,000	£820,000	£1,445,000	£920,000	£4,000,000	NA
	-	open new Salisbury Site mid 2014/15	capital costs * cost per household	£0 £0.00	£0 £0.69	£0 £1.37	£400,000 £4.17	£700,000 £7.34	£0 £4.67	£1,000,000	

* capital costs are those identified as additional to maintaining current services. Capital costs are also included in the Total Cost figures.

TABLE 4 Waste Collection and Treatment Options - Performance
FOR CLARIFICATION – OPTION 6 IS THE CONSULTATION PROPOSAL

	Name of Service Option	Waste Reduction (NI191) performance by 2014/15	Recycling (NI192)% by 2014/15	Landfill Performance (NI193)% by 2014/15	Helps deliver corporate plan commitment - Landfill down to 25% by 2014	Helps deliver outstanding JMWMS commitments - AWC by 2011 and 50% recycling by 2020	Helps deliver LGR 'One Council' commitment to make savings and use for additional recycling services	Recycling Performance	Savings for additional recycling	Top Quartile Performance Likely ?		
										NI 191	NI 192	NI 193
1	Existing service	647.58 kg	40.47%	34.24%	No improvement	No	No	No improvement on current performance	None	No	No	Yes (due to Lakeside contract)
2	Return to weekly collection / charged green waste : Jan final leaflet option 1	717.91 kg	34.94%	39.46%	Reverses improvements achieved by 2010	No. Reverses trend towards AWC and reduces recycling	No	Significant reduction (5%) from current performance	None.	No - Worsening to lowest quartile	No - Worsening to lowest quartile	Possibly (due to Lakeside contract)
3	Extend AWC to whole County / charged green waste : Jan final leaflet option 2	576.49 kg	42.83%	30.43%	Yes. Some reduction in landfill, due to recycling and waste reduction.	Yes. AWC achieved, plus increase in recycling.	No (savings not re-invested)	Improved	Yes	Probably	No	Yes (due to Lakeside contract)

4	Extend AWC to whole County / extend free green waste collection to whole County NEW	534.67 kg	48.69%	26.04%	Yes. Significant reduction in landfill, towards the 2014 target. But service likely to increase overall tonnage collected and reduce home composting.	Yes. AWC achieved, plus major increase in recycling, to close to 50% target.	Yes	Significant improvement, due to major increase in garden waste collected.	No (but 2020 target may be almost met).	Yes	Probably (due to green waste tonnage)	Yes (due to green waste tonnage and Lakeside contract)
5	Extend AWC / charged green waste / extend plastic and card kerbside to whole County : Jan final leaflet option 3	555.90 kg	43.98%	28.38%	Yes. Significant reduction in landfill.	Yes. AWC achieved, plus increase in recycling.	Yes	4% improvement, focused in areas with low current performance	No	Yes	No	Yes (due to Lakeside contract)
6	NEW OPTION - Extend AWC / free garden waste / extend plastic and card kerbside collection to whole County – CONSULTATION PROPOSAL.	509.55 kg	51.1	23.92%	Yes. Significant reduction in landfill, to hit 2014 target. But service likely to increase overall tonnage collected and reduce home composting.	Yes. AWC achieved, plus major increase in recycling, which should exceed 50% target.	Yes	Significant improvement, due to major increase in garden waste collected.	No (but 2020 target should be met).	Yes	Probably (due to green waste tonnage)	Yes (due to green waste tonnage and Lakeside contract)

7	Option 5 plus weekly food waste collection whole County NEW	459.44 kg	53.70%	20.55%	Yes. Significant reduction in landfill, towards hit 2014 target. But service likely to overlap the existing and proposed contracts for EfW and MBT.	Yes. AWC achieved, plus major increase in recycling, to exceed 50% target.	Yes	Significant improvement. 50% target likely to be exceeded.	No (but 2020 target should be met).	Yes	Yes (due to food waste tonnage)	Yes (But service likely to overlap the existing and proposed contracts for EfW and MBT.)
8	NEW OPTION - extend household recycling centre network	632.51kg	41.86%	33.02%	Marginal positive impact	Marginal positive impact	NA	Marginal positive impact	No	No	No	Yes (due to Lakeside contract)

TABLE 5 Waste Collection and Treatment Options - Risk and Other Qualitative Assessments

FOR CLARIFICATION – OPTION 6 IS THE CONSULTATION PROPOSAL

	Name of Service Option	Cost profile from start up	Impact on carbon footprint	Local Environment	Longer term outlook	Key Risks (excluding targets for recycling and landfill diversion - Table 4)									
1	Existing service	NA	Weekly rubbish collections (lorry miles) and low recycling in two areas add to carbon footprint	Need for landfill not further reduced	No further reduction in landfill dependency. Taxes and fines will go on increasing costs	Extra recycling service in south subsidised by other areas	Service transformation/morale issues					Acceptance of harmonised collection policies - eg lids shut, collection points, private roads, collection days, alternatives to bins		Services require equalities assessment	
2	Return to weekly collection / charged green waste : Jan final leaflet option 1	Commence service changes 01.06.11	Weekly rubbish collections (lorry miles) and low recycling in all areas add to carbon footprint	Increased need for landfill	Increase in landfill dependency. Taxes and fines will go on increasing costs	Extra recycling service in south subsidised by other areas	As above. May be reduced by expansion of workforce			Disposal of surplus west Wilts green bins (up to 40,000)	Lead times needed for vehicle purchase may be > 9 months	As above	Collection /disposal of some west Wiltshire garden waste bins	Services require equalities assessment	
3	Extend AWC to whole County / charged green waste : Jan final leaflet option 2	Commence service changes 01.06.11	Rubbish collections alternating with recycling in all areas (less lorry miles) and increased recycling reduce carbon footprint	Some reduction in need for landfill	Reduction in landfill dependency will reduce longer term impact of taxes and prevent fines	Extra recycling service in south subsidised by other areas	As above. May be increased by savings / role changes	Will AWC vehicle savings provide for additional garden waste collection capacity ?		Disposal of surplus west Wilts green bins (up to 40,000)	As above	As above	Acceptance of AWC in north and south. No extra services. Collection /	Services require equalities assessment	

														disposal of some west Wiltshire garden waste bins		
4	Extend AWC to whole County / extend free green waste collection to whole County NEW	(a) Commence all service changes 01.06.11	Rubbish collections alternating with recycling in all areas (less lorry miles) and increased recycling reduce carbon footprint , but much expanded garden waste collection adds to lorry miles	Some reduction in the need for landfill. But major new composting sites will be needed.	Substantial reduction in landfill dependency will reduce longer term impact of taxes and prevent fines. But much of the green waste could be home-composted by residents, a much preferred outcome.	Extra recycling service in south subsidised by other areas	As above. May be reduced by expansion of workforce	Additional vehicles needed for much expanded green waste collection.	Much greater green waste tonnage will require additional composting sites - market, planning and licensing issues	Green waste quality risk	Lead times needed for vehicle purchase may be > 9 months	As above	Acceptance of AWC in North and South. Resistance to extra bins across county .	Services require equalities assessment	Seasonality of green waste tonnage	
		(b) Commence free green waste collection 01.06.11 Commence AWC 01.10.11	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above plus numerous additional vehicles needed for free green waste collection before AWC savings realised	As above	Green waste quality risk	As above	As above	As above	Services require equalities assessment	Seasonality of green waste tonnage	

5	Extend AWC/ charged green waste/ extend plastic and card kerbside to whole County : Jan final leaflet option 3	(a) Commence all service changes 01.06.11	Rubbish collections alternating with recycling in all areas (less lorry miles) and increased recycling reduce carbon footprint , but additional plastic and card collection adds to lorry miles	Some reduction in need for landfill	Reduction in landfill dependency will reduce longer term impact of taxes and prevent fines		As above	Additional vehicles needed for P+C collection.	Likely to be P+C handling /baling capacity problems at WTSs / MRF	Need to transfer use of west Wilts green bins to P+C collection	As above	As above	Acceptance of AWC in North and South. Resistance to extra bins across county .	Services require equalities assessment	
		(b) Commence plastic and card kerbside and charged green waste 01.06.11. Commence AWC 01.10.11	As above	As above	As above		As above	As above, plus additional P+C vehicles need before AWC savings realised	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	Services require equalities assessment	

6	NEW OPTION - Extend AWC / free garden waste / plastic and card kerbside to whole County – CONSULTATION PROPOSAL	(a) Commence all service changes 01.06.11	Rubbish collections alternating with recycling in all areas (less lorry miles) and increased recycling reduce carbon footprint, but much expanded garden waste and plastic/card collections add to lorry miles	Some reduction in the need for landfill. But major new composting sites will be needed.	Substantial reduction in landfill dependency will reduce longer term impact of taxes and prevent fines. But much of the green waste could be home-composted by residents, a much preferred outcome.		As above. But likely to be much reduced by expansion of workforce	Additional vehicles needed for much expanded green waste and plastic/card collections	Much greater green waste tonnage will require additional composting sites - market, planning and licensing issues. Also, likely to be P+C handling / baling capacity problems at WTSs / MRF.	Green waste quality risk	Lead times needed for vehicle purchase may be > 9 months. Also new sites	As above	Acceptance of AWC in North and South. Resistance to extra bins / bags across county	Services require equalities assessment	Seasonality of green waste tonnage
		(b) Commence plastic and card kerbside and green waste 01.06.11. Commence AWC 01.10.11	As above	As above	As above		As above	As above, plus additional P+C vehicles need before AWC savings realised	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above

7	Option 5 plus weekly food waste collection whole County NEW	Commence AWC, plastic and card kerbside and charged green waste collection 01.06.11. (Option 5) Commence food waste collection 01.04.13	High recycling reduces carbon footprint, but requires extra collection for food waste (lorry miles). With Lakeside and MBT (prob.) contracts, about 2/3 of food waste will be diverted from landfill anyway.	Very substantial reduction in need for landfill. But with Lakeside and MBT (prob.) contracts, about 2/3 of food waste will be diverted from landfill anyway.	Very substantial reduction in landfill dependency will reduce longer term impact of taxes and prevent fines. But with Lakeside and MBT (prob.) contracts, about 2/3 of food waste will be diverted from landfill anyway.		As above, plus further expansion of collection service from 2013	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	As above	Acceptance of AWC in North and South. Resistance to multiple extra bins across county.	Services require equalities assessment	Food waste transfer and treatment will require new contract / compensation to contractor, and purpose built transfer station. Main timing factor. Needs anaerobic digestion plant to treat food waste. None in area to date. Needs purpose built transfer station. None in area to date. Needs market for digestate.
8	NEW OPTION - extend household recycling centre network	Open Marlborough mid 2010/11 Open Westbury mid 2012/13	May cut vehicle journeys to more distant HRCs. Also a small increase in recycling	Slight reduction in need for landfill. New HRCs may have	Support trend towards more recycling.	Some improvement in levels of access to HRCs by residents	Some duplication between HRC and kerbside services. However, HRCs offer	Improved service to the public with capture of a wider range of recyclable materials							Services require equalities assessment	

		Open 3rd site (Tidworth or Mere?) mid 2013/14		some local impact, but subject to planning and licensing control			much wider range of recycling	but limited additional recycling.							
		Open new Salisbury Site mid 2014/15													