

## CFYA Review – Potential Efficiencies

Initial discussions around some possible options for efficiencies are outlined below with the potential implications of doing so highlighted. If possible or appropriate, alternative suggestions are also provided.

Services in Scope :	Net Expenditure 2011/12	£8,510,443	%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refuse collection</li> <li>• Street cleansing</li> <li>• Grounds maintenance</li> <li>• Kerbside recycling</li> <li>• Public conveniences</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban parks</li> <li>• Markets management</li> <li>• Vehicle maintenance</li> <li>• Cowpen and Yarm Road depots</li> </ul>	Minimal Impact	£830,000	9.75%
	More difficult/some Impact on service delivery.	£905,000	10.63%
	Major impact with a reduction and/or loss of some key services	£1,300,000	15.27%

Table 1: Efficiencies with minimal impact

Proposal	£	Implications / Impact
Management / Supervision	100,000	No direct front-line impact though reduced management/supervision capacity. Potential to re-structure / configure teams e.g. markets/cleansing.
Round Reconfiguration	100,000	Can be easily achieved with minimal front-line impact (should not be visible to residents) - Subject to current recycling provision remaining and EFW plant works complete.
Parks Improvement Fund	100,000	Reduced maintenance budgets with longer programming of works. Minimal impact – but could attract complaints from service users if perceptions are that parks maintenance is reduced.
Reduce S&S (across all services)	100,000	Reduction in ability to replace damaged litter bins, etc. Need to consider reduction in floral displays and 'will' to enter BiB.
Street Cleansing / Grounds Maintenance	200,000	Reduced number of staff to be achieved through natural wastage. Net effect of efficiency shown due to top slicing of budget to allow for seasonal staff. (Need to get the balance right so as not to create a visible impact on service provision otherwise will have a negative effect on satisfaction and reputation).
Income from recyclable material.	230,000	Subject to market trends with danger of not meeting income targets
Depot relocation	N/A	Longer piece of work.
Workshops	N/A	Investigation into outsourcing of service could bring potential efficiencies – amount unknown at present and will be longer piece of work.
<b>Total</b>	<b>830,000</b>	

Table 2: Efficiencies that will be more difficult to deliver

Proposal	£	Implications / Impact
As above	830,000	See table 1 above
Further staff reductions	75,000	Reduced front-line with resulting reduction in service provision i.e. less street cleansing/grounds maintenance/grass cutting. Unable to respond quickly to service requests, removal of fly tipping, fly posting, etc
<b>Total</b>	<b>905,000</b>	

Table 3: Efficiencies that will have a significant impact on service delivery with a reduction and/or loss of some key services

Proposal	£	Implications / Impact
As table 2 less round re-configuration	805,000	NB Not possible to implement round re-configuration with remaining options
Alternate weekly collections	300k (reducing by cost of enforcement / education)	<p><u>Positive</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Increased recycling rates (residents forced to opt in)</li> </ul> <p><u>Negative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Residents may store waste (inc. recycling) for a week and still put in wheel bin. This in turn will have a cost as more waste being collected will result in more runs to empty waste vehicles, fuel costs, wear and tear on vehicles, etc.</li> <li>- Unpopular with residents and members. Big impact on reputation when national support is to move back to weekly service.</li> <li>- Not as great cost savings as expected due to need for additional vehicles to provide service.</li> <li>- Possible additional enforcement costs reducing savings by £100k</li> <li>- Side waste will return.</li> <li>- Impact on street cleansing / litter</li> </ul>
Stop green waste collections  <b>NB</b> Not favourable to impose if alternate weekly collections introduced	200,000 Reducing to <b>100k</b> because of implications	Unpopular with residents and members. Impact on recycling rates. Expectation that most Green waste will end up in wheel bin which will have a cost impact – on vehicles (as before) and disposal costs. This will also have negative effects on performance of EFW plant due to slow burning of green waste. Side Waste being left out. General reduction in other recycling as people won't bother. Possible enforcement issues.

Reduce number of grass cuts from 16 to 14	98,000	Saving of £49k for each fortnightly cut. The impact of this proposal is extremely visual. It would also mean the quality of cut is reduced as grass would have more time to grow between cutting cycles.
Further reduce S&S Budgets??	100,000	Impact upon ability to maintain / replace equipment e.g. declining number of litter bins able to be replaced. Potential impact on street cleansing / appearance with additional Weed growth, less floral displays, etc.
Reduce annual inflation and growth increases from general fund	242,235	This consisted of £172,973 for inflation and £69,262 for growth in 2011/12. Service has already absorbed fuel increase costs and growth in population / households (see below)
<b>Total</b>	<b>Approx 1,645,235</b>	

Non-cashable efficiencies already achieved within the service.

<b>Efficiency</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Fuel Increases	71,000	Absorbed by the service with no bid to general fund (though could be covered by the inflation added!) from £1 - £1.38 per litre
Any others to be added.....	25,000	e.g. absorbed market management?