

Attachment 1: Costed kerbside bin configuration

Notes:

Shaded rows are bin configurations requested by Councillors

* indicates Year 1 cost includes full bin change over for one waste stream

Options	Options	Costs			Triple bottom line assessment				Ranking	Comments
		Year 1	Recurring	NPV	Financial	Social	Environment	Total		
Configuration 8 Weekly FOGO 240L Fortnightly Recycling 240L Fortnightly Residual 120L <i>Note increased FOGO bin size</i>	W F F	\$6,466,027*	\$5,493,471	\$33,907,264	-2%	13%	26%	37%	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase cost limited to year 1 relating to bin change over. Long term AWMC reduction of approx. 1 percent or \$3 lower than current based on greater diversion of food waste reducing landfill cost. • Social impact – positive ‘way of life’, positive perception of environmental value, negative due to new bin cost, positive increased level of service • Environmental impact – greater diversion of food waste reducing landfill emissions. • Kerbside /Community survey - satisfies 70 percent preferring the current schedule and 11 percent wanting to increase the capacity of the weekly FOGO collection, does not satisfy 18 percent wanting weekly residual collection. • Consider increased bin capacity as a customisation option and promotion of existing additional bin options.
Configuration 3 Weekly FOGO 120L Weekly Recycling 240L Fortnightly Residual 120L	W W F	\$6,217,706	\$6,217,706	\$37,319,013	-12%	2%	14%	4%	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost increase with AWMC increase of approx. 8 percent or \$31 more than current due to increased collection frequency. • Social impact - positive perception of environmental value, negative due to new bin cost, positive increased level of service • Environmental impact – improved diversion of recyclables. • Kerbside /Community survey - satisfies 70 percent preferring the current schedule and 1.4 percent wanting to increase frequency of recycling collection. Does not satisfy 18 percent wanting weekly residual collection and 11 percent wanting larger FOGO. • Consider promotion of existing additional bin options.
Configuration 1 Current Service Weekly FOGO 120L Fortnightly Recycling 240L Fortnightly Residual 120L	W F F	\$5,554,728	\$5,554,728	\$33,339,783	0	3%	0	3%	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost neutral • Social impact – maintaining high diversion rate • Environmental impact neutral • Kerbside /Community survey - satisfies 70 percent preferring the current schedule, does not satisfy 18 percent wanting weekly residual or 11 percent wanting larger FOGO. • Consider promotion of existing additional bin options and increased customisation options for residual stream – increased bin capacity, increased collection frequency.
Configuration 9 Fortnightly FOGO 240L Fortnightly Recycling 240L Weekly Residual 120L <i>Note increased FOGO bin size</i>	F F W	\$6,711,338*	\$5,735,640	\$35,363,794	-6%	-8%	-9%	-22%	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost increase with AWMC increase of approx. 2 percent or \$8 more than current due to higher cost of landfill disposal. • Social impact – negative ‘way of life’, negative environmental value, positive perception of Council providing increased service, negative increased collection costs for Council and ratepayers • Environmental impact – may divert more food and green waste to landfill • Kerbside /Community survey - satisfies 18 percent wanting weekly residual and 11 percent wanting larger FOGO, does not satisfy 70 percent preferring the current schedule. • Consider promotion of existing additional bin options and increased customisation options for residual stream – increased bin capacity, increased collection frequency.
Configuration 5 Weekly FOGO 120L Weekly Recycling 240L Weekly Residual 120L	W W W	\$6,880,684	\$6,880,684	\$41,298,244	-24%	11%	-27%	-40%	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost increase with AWMC increase of approx. 16 percent or \$62 more than current due to increased collection frequency. • Social impact – positive ‘way of life’, positive perception of waste service and Council providing increased service, negative increased collection costs for Council and ratepayers • Environmental impact – reduce diversion of waste from landfill • Kerbside /Community survey - satisfies 18 percent wanting weekly residual and 1.4 percent wanting weekly recycling, does not satisfy 70 percent preferring the current schedule or 11 percent wanting larger FOGO. • Consider promotion of existing additional bin options and increased

Options	Options	Costs			Triple bottom line assessment				Ranking	Comments
Stream/frequency/capacity	Bin colour	Year 1	Recurring	NPV	Financial	Social	Environment	Total		
										customisation options for residual stream – increased bin capacity, increased collection frequency.
Configuration 10 Weekly FOGO 120L Fortnightly Recycling 240L Weekly Residual 120L	W F W	\$6,217,706	\$6,217,706	\$37,319,013	-12%	-18%	-17%	-47%	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost increase with AWMC increase of approx. 8 percent or \$31 more than current due to increased collection frequency. Social impact – negative ‘way of life’, positive perception of Council providing increased service, negative increased collection costs for Council and ratepayers Environmental impact – may reduce diversion of waste from landfill Kerbside /Community survey - satisfies 18 percent wanting weekly residual, does not satisfy 70 percent preferring the current schedule or 11 percent wanting larger FOGO. Consider promotion of existing additional bin options and increased customisation options for residual stream – increased bin capacity, increased collection frequency.
Configuration 2 Fortnightly FOGO 120L Fortnightly Recycling 240L Weekly Residual 120L	F F W	\$5,775,721	\$5,775,721	\$34,666,193	-4%	-34%	-42%	-80%	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost increase with AWMC increase of approx. 3 percent or \$10 more than current. Social impact – negative ‘way of life’, negative perception of environmental value, negative increased collection costs for Council and ratepayers Environmental impact - likely transition of food and green waste to the residual bin, potential contamination of recycling stream. Kerbside /Community survey - satisfies 18 percent wanting weekly residual, does not satisfy 70 percent preferring the current schedule or 11 percent wanting larger FOGO. Consider promotion of existing additional bin options and increased customisation options for residual stream – increased bin capacity, increased collection frequency.
Configuration 6 Fortnightly FOGO 120L Weekly Recycling 240L Weekly Residual 120L	F W W	\$6,438,699	\$6,438,699	\$38,645,423	-16	-25%	-58%	-99%	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost increase with AWMC increase of approx. 11 percent or \$41 more than current due to increased collection frequency. Social impact – negative ‘way of life’, negative increased collection costs for Council and ratepayers, positive increased service. Environmental impact – reduce diversion of waste from landfill Kerbside /Community survey - satisfies 18 percent wanting weekly residual and 1.4 percent wanting weekly recycling, does not satisfy 70 percent preferring the current schedule or 11 percent wanting larger FOGO. Consider promotion of existing additional bin options and increased customisation options for residual stream – increased bin capacity, increased collection frequency.
Configuration 7 Fortnightly Recycling 240L Weekly Residual 120L	F W	\$4,708,870*	\$4,581,404	\$27,620,402	17%	-91%	-30%	-104%	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowest cost option with AWMC reduction of approx. 12 percent or \$45 lower than current. Social impact – negative ‘way of life’, negative perception of environmental value, negative reduced service level, negative health and wellbeing, negative rights to service and access to service, positive cost reduction Environmental impact - likely transition of food and green waste to the residual bin, potential contamination of recycling stream. Kerbside /Community survey - satisfies 18 percent wanting weekly residual, does not satisfy 70 percent preferring the current schedule or 11 percent wanting larger FOGO.
Configuration 4 Fortnightly FOGO 120L Fortnightly Recycling 240L Fortnightly Residual 120L	F F F	\$5,166,375	\$5,166,375	\$31,008,863	7%	-89%	-27%	-109%	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second lowest cost option with AWMC reduction of approx. 5 percent or \$18 lower than current. Social impact – negative ‘way of life’, negative perception of environmental value, negative reduced service level, negative health and wellbeing, positive cost reduction Environmental impact - likely transition of food waste to the residual bin, potential contamination of recycling stream. Kerbside /Community survey – does not satisfy 70 percent preferring the current schedule or 11 percent wanting larger FOGO.