

**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL** DECISION  
**REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No

meeting date: 18 JANUARY 2011  
 title: REVISED CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2010/11 AND PROPOSED PROGRAMME 2011/16  
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES  
 principal author: NEIL SANDIFORD

**1 PURPOSE**

1.1 To approve the revised programme for the current year and also the future five-year capital programme for this committee.

**2 BACKGROUND**

2.1 This report will review the following:

- i) The current year's programme.
- ii) Draft programme of schemes to be carried out in the following five years (2011/12 to 2015/16).

**3 ORIGINAL PROGRAMME 2010/11 – CURRENT FINANCIAL YEAR**

3.1 The original capital programme for the current year included schemes at a total estimated cost of £649,900.

3.2 Unfinished schemes from 2009/10, totalling £449,340 known as slippage, have been added to the original programme. Additional approvals totalling £162,090 have also been added to the programme. These are shown in Annex 1 (**BLUE**).

**4 REVISING THE CURRENT YEAR'S PROGRAMME**

4.1 We have now discussed in some detail each scheme in the programme with budget holders and revised the programme to reflect likely expenditure this year. This is shown in Annex 1 (**BLUE**), alongside the original estimate.

4.2 Updated capital evaluation forms completed by the responsible officers, for all these schemes were reported to committees in the previous cycle.

4.3 In summary, the revised programme together with the original programme and expenditure to date is:

Budget Analysis					Expenditure Analysis
Original Estimate 2010/11 £	Slippage from 2009/10 £	Additional Approvals 2010/11 £	Total approved Budget 2010/11 £	Revised Estimate 2010/11 £	Actual to date 2010/11 £
649,900	449,340	162,090	<b>1,261,330</b>	<b>1,245,670</b>	859,770

5 DRAFT PROGRAMME 2011/12 TO 2015/16

- 5.1 Officers have been asked to update the current 5 year programme and submit any new schemes for consideration. Annex 2 (**YELLOW**) shows the additional proposed schemes for this Committee in detail and how each particular scheme links to the Council's ambitions. A total of 6 new proposals have been put forward for this committee.
- 5.2 Annex 3 (**PINK**) provides a summary of the previously approved schemes in the five year capital programme for this committee, together with the 6 new proposals that have been put forward. This is summarised in the table below:

	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	2013/14 £	2014/15 £	2015/16 £	Total £
<b>Previously Approved Schemes</b>	364,900	329,300	262,700	144,000	0	<b>1,100,900</b>
<b>New Proposals</b>	11,000	190,000	0	0	331,500	<b>532,500</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>375,900</b>	<b>519,300</b>	<b>262,700</b>	<b>144,000</b>	<b>331,500</b>	<b>1,633,400</b>

- 5.3 It should be noted that this is a possible programme at this stage, which will require further consideration by the Budget Working Group and by Policy and Finance Committee who will want to make sure that both the capital and revenue costs are affordable.
- 5.4 Members should therefore consider the forward programme as attached and put forward any amendments that they may wish to make at this stage.
- 6 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE
- 6.1 Approve the revised capital programme for 2010/11 as set out at Annex 1 (**BLUE**).
- 6.2 Consider the future five-year programme for 2011/12 to 2015/16 as attached as Annex 2 (**YELLOW**) and 3 (**PINK**) with any amendments you wish to make.



TECHNICAL ACCOUNTANT

CM1-11/NS/AC  
5 JANUARY 2011

## REVISED CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2010/11 – COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Cost Centre	Scheme Description	BUDGET ANALYSIS					EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS
		Original Estimate 2010/11 £	Slippage £	Additional Approvals £	Total Approved Budget £	Revised Estimate £	Expenditure to Date
BADWC	Badger Well Water Culvert Collapse		8,580		8,580	8,580	433
CALOP	Calderstones Open Space		40,500	45,000	85,500	85,500	61,896
CPKMS	Replace Car Parking Machines and Software		60,350		60,350	60,350	53,347
CSLOT	Castle Lottery			42,090	42,090	42,090	8,106
EDFCR	Football Changing Rooms Refurbishment		213,540	57,960	271,500	271,500	103,024
FENCE	Replace Perimeter Fence at Salthill Depot	10,000			10,000	10,000	4,808
GRFLG	Castle Grounds Green Flag Award Scheme	30,000	5,080		35,080	35,080	16,617
GVDBV	Replacement for Ford Transit Drop Side Truck	25,000			25,000	25,310	25,309
LADVE	Longridge Adventure Play Facility			15,000	15,000	15,000	0
PBRNG	Repairs to Riverside Path Brungerly		21,540	25,000	46,540	46,540	1,838
PCWHA	Funding towards Whalley Toilets		1,420		1,420	1,420	1,421
PLAYK	Improvements to Children's Play Areas (2009/10)		10,940		10,940	10,940	832
PLAYL	Improvements to Children's Play Areas (2010/11)	20,000		-5,000	15,000	15,000	12,343
POENE	Pool energy efficiency measures		49,080	-27,960	21,120	21,120	0
POOLF	Pool filter Replacement & Plant Room Maintenance	20,000			20,000	16,000	0
REBIN	New and Replacement Wheeled Bins	20,000			20,000	19,720	19,718
RPAIM	Ribblesdale Pool Aiming High Grant work			10,000	10,000	10,000	0

Cost Centre	Scheme Description	BUDGET ANALYSIS					EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS
		Original Estimate 2010/11 £	Slippage £	Additional Approvals £	Total Approved Budget £	Revised Estimate £	Expenditure to Date
RVFRJ	Replacement Refuse Collection Vehicle	195,000			195,000	204,250	204,249
RVFRK	Replacement Refuse Collection Vehicle	195,000			195,000	203,540	203,539
SCMOW	Replace 2 Scag Mowers	14,000			14,000	9,910	9,907
SPARK	Salthill Play Area		38,310		38,310	38,500	37,068
UVLET	Installation of Ultra Violet Equipment to Main Pool	10,000			10,000	0	0
VLIFT	Vehicle Lifting Equipment	8,000			8,000	5,600	5,600
WVCOH	Replace Iveco Tipper	30,900			30,900	23,360	23,355
WVCOJ	Replace Iveco Tipper	30,900			30,900	30,920	30,923
WVEVM	Replace JCB	25,700			25,700	21,240	21,237
WVYXF	Replace Ford Ranger Super Cab	15,400			15,400	14,200	14,200
	<b>Total Community Committee</b>	<b>649,900</b>	<b>449,340</b>	<b>162,090</b>	<b>1,261,330</b>	<b>1,245,670</b>	<b>859,770</b>

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL  
Capital Scheme Appraisal Form: Proposal 1



**1 Capital Scheme Title**

**Football pitches drainage and improvement works**  
(submitted by: John Heap)

**2 Brief Description of the Scheme**

To install positive subsoil drainage systems under the football pitches and carry

**3 Financial Implications – CAPITAL**

	2011/2012 £	2012/2013 £	2013/2014 £	2014/2015 £	2015/2016 £
<b>Scheme Cost</b>	11,000				

**4 Financial Implications - REVENUE**

**Annual Revenue Implications**

A small amount of income  
(£250 pa)

**5 Please indicate the start date and duration of the project including key milestones.**

May 2011 for a period of 3 months.

**6 If this is a new asset, what is the expected useful economic life of the new asset? If this is a refurbishment scheme what is the current expected useful economic life of the asset, and by how long does this bid increase the functional lifespan?**

Ten years

**7 Please detail any additional information in support of your bid**

The previous capital improvement works programme was suspended 4 years ago and not reinstated.

**8 Are there any Government recommendations or guidelines to undertake this scheme (including any legislative Health and Safety requirements etc) and what would be the consequence of not doing the scheme**

If work of this nature is not done the quality of the sports facilities will deteriorate over time.

**9 Link to the Council's Ambitions**

To make peoples lives safer and healthier.

**10 Performance Management**

Pitches will be of better quality and can be used more frequently

**11 In which ways would this scheme improve the efficiency or value for money of the service?**

Those customers paying to use the facilities will have better quality facilities to play on, find them better value for money, which will sustain income streams.

**12 Please provide details of any consultation that has taken place with local people, partners, staff or any other stakeholders with regard to this scheme.**

The local football club has expressed its concerns regarding the condition of the pitches and the need to carry out drainage and surface improvement works.

**13 Please detail the measures that would be put in place to minimise the impact that this scheme will have on the environment.**

Not applicable

**14 Risk Assessment – Please detail any risks that you envisage and how they would be mitigated**

**Political:** None.

**Economic:** None.

**Sociological:** Greater emphasis may be placed on playing sports and healthy lifestyles.

**Technological:** New technologies may be developed over time.

**Legal:** None.

**Environmental:** None.

**15 What would be the impact if the Scheme was DELAYED or DELETED**

Customer dissatisfaction and reduced income streams.



**1 Capital Scheme Title**

**Artificial pitch surface replacement – Edisford Road**

*(submitted by: Chris Hughes)*

**2 Brief Description of the Scheme**

*To replace the artificial grass, tennis and multi use area which was installed in 2002/03 and which is believed to be need re-surfacing in 2012/13. The football areas have received heavy usage and the replacement of the carpet is required along with a properly resourced maintenance programme and drainage improvement work at the same time as the pitch is renewed. Major repair work is also necessary and this is contained within the capital cost of the scheme.*

**3 Financial Implications – CAPITAL**

	2011/2012 £	2012/2013 £	2013/2014 £	2014/2015 £	2015/2016 £
<b>Scheme Cost</b>		60,000			

**4 Financial Implications - REVENUE**

**Annual Revenue Implications**

-£21,000

**5 Please indicate the start date and duration of the project including key milestones.**

Summer 2012 for a period of 2 to 3 weeks

**6 If this is a new asset, what is the expected useful economic life of the new asset? If this is a refurbishment scheme what is the current expected useful economic life of the asset, and by how long does this bid increase the functional lifespan?**

Life expectancy is about 10-12 years and longer if the facility receives appropriate maintenance.

**7 Please detail any additional information in support of your bid**

The bid should be considered alongside the current drainage problems which result in the flooding of the football pitch area on a regular basis in the winter. Current investigatory work has identified a problem with the drainage but the extent and cost is unknown at this point. The flooding is accentuating the deterioration of the carpet and the need for ongoing maintenance to keep it in a playable condition. The improvements to the drainage and perimeter path should be arranged alongside the replacement of the carpet. The cost of replacing the carpet is £50,000 and the maintenance work to the floodlights at £10,000.

**8 Are there any Government recommendations or guidelines to undertake this scheme (including any legislative Health and Safety requirements etc) and what would be the consequence of not doing the scheme**

If this scheme is not undertaken then the maintenance costs would increase annually and the level of complaints from users of the facilities is likely to rise. The surface may become unsafe due to trip potential in the carpet surface and increased slipperiness due to contamination of the artificial surface. This will increase the possibility of claims against the Council relating to accidents, which relate to the condition of the pitch surface. It is not possible to achieve the income targets without pitch improvement and floodlighting repair work.

**9 Link to the Council's Ambitions**

To make peoples lives safer and healthier.

**10 Performance Management**

It is cost effective to replace the surface rather than undertake piece-meal replacement of the carpet as was experienced at Longridge S C. The maintenance costs are likely to increase appreciably if not replaced.

**11 In which ways would this scheme improve the efficiency or value for money of the service?**

The maintenance costs are likely to increase if the carpet surface is not replaced.

**12 Please provide details of any consultation that has taken place with local people, partners, staff or any other stakeholders with regard to this scheme.**

Ongoing assessment of the playing surface and feedback from users.

**13 Please detail the measures that would be put in place to minimise the impact that this scheme will have on the environment.**

None.

**14 Risk Assessment – Please detail any risks that you envisage and how they would be mitigated**

**Political:** None.

**Economic:** None.

**Sociological:** None.

**Technological:** None.

**Legal:** None.

**Environmental:** None.

**15 What would be the impact if the Scheme was DELAYED or DELETED**

Last winter it was necessary to cancel bookings on a regular basis due to the football pitch being either flooded or frozen. This created considerable customer dissatisfaction and will continue to do so until the drainage and year on year deterioration in the surface is addressed. It has also been necessary to cancel bookings to all areas and numerous bookings have been cancelled.





**1 Capital Scheme Title**

**Renewal of Dunsop Bridge Toilets**

*(submitted by John Heap:)*

**2 Brief Description of the Scheme**

*The existing toilet property is in a dilapidated condition and is beyond economic repair. Its demolition and renewal is therefore proposed. The work would include the construction and fit out to include male, female, disabled toilets as well as a store room/electric cupboard. Fit out and decorate the superstructure to include doors, cubicles, partitions, taps, wash hand basins, wall tiles, lighting, alarm systems, toilets and associated paperwork. Supply and install septic tank.*

**3 Financial Implications – CAPITAL**

	2011/2012 £	2012/2013 £	2013/2014 £	2014/2015 £	2015/2016 £
<b>Scheme Cost</b>		130,000			

**4 Financial Implications - REVENUE**

**Annual Revenue Implications**

None identified

**5 Please indicate the start date and duration of the project including key milestones.**

It is proposed that the demolition and construction scheme could start in June 2012 and last for 16 weeks.

**6 If this is a new asset, what is the expected useful economic life of the new asset? If this is a refurbishment scheme what is the current expected useful economic life of the asset, and by how long does this bid increase the functional lifespan?**

The expected economic life of the refurbished toilets would be 20 – 25 years.

**7 Please detail any additional information in support of your bid**

None

**8 Are there any Government recommendations or guidelines to undertake this scheme (including any legislative Health and Safety requirements etc) and what would be the consequence of not doing the scheme**

Construction Design and Management Regulations may be applicable.

**9 Link to the Council's Ambitions**

Improved lighting as part of the scheme will reduce the risk of anti social behaviour including vandalism and associated damage, and as Dunsop Bridge attracts a significant number of visitors every year, the importance of the area is not reflected in the quality of the facilities.

**10 Performance Management**

None.

**11 In which ways would this scheme improve the efficiency or value for money of the service?**

Improved and modern toilet facilities would be more energy efficient.

**12 Please provide details of any consultation that has taken place with local people, partners, staff or any other stakeholders with regard to this scheme.**

Several letters have been received from visitors requesting improved facilities.

**13 Please detail the measures that would be put in place to minimise the impact that this scheme will have on the environment.**

The proposed construction would specify automatic sensors on the wash hand basins and toilets, low energy light fittings and components with a high recycled material content.

**14 Risk Assessment – Please detail any risks that you envisage and how they would be mitigated**

**Political:** None.

**Economic:** None.

**Sociological:** None.

**Technological:** None.

**Legal:** None.

**Environmental:** None.

**15 What would be the impact if the Scheme was DELAYED or DELETED**

Continuing complaints from users.



**1 Capital Scheme Title**

**Car parks rolling programme 2015/16**

*(submitted by: John Heap)*

**2 Brief Description of the Scheme**

*To continue to improve the Councils off –street car parks so as to ensure the sites are safe, clean and fit for purpose*

**3 Financial Implications – CAPITAL**

	2011/2012 £	2012/2013 £	2013/2014 £	2014/2015 £	2015/2016 £
<b>Scheme Cost</b>					45,000

**4 Financial Implications - REVENUE**

**Annual Revenue Implications**

None identified

**5 Please indicate the start date and duration of the project including key milestones.**

This is part of a rolling programme of work which will start in 2015/16

**6 If this is a new asset, what is the expected useful economic life of the new asset? If this is a refurbishment scheme what is the current expected useful economic life of the asset, and by how long does this bid increase the functional lifespan?**

Fifteen years.

**7 Please detail any additional information in support of your bid**

Ongoing programme of improvement work.

**8 Are there any Government recommendations or guidelines to undertake this scheme (including any legislative Health and Safety requirements etc) and what would be the consequence of not doing the scheme**

There are recommended standards of design for car parks and they must be made safe for those who use them.

**9 Link to the Council's Ambitions**

To make peoples lives safer and healthier.

**10 Performance Management**

Not applicable.

**11 In which ways would this scheme improve the efficiency or value for money of the service?**

Not applicable

**12 Please provide details of any consultation that has taken place with local people, partners, staff or any other stakeholders with regard to this scheme.**

None at this stage

**13 Please detail the measures that would be put in place to minimise the impact that this scheme will have on the environment.**

Work will improve the local environment

**14 Risk Assessment – Please detail any risks that you envisage and how they would be mitigated**

**Political:** Car parking supports the concept of vibrant towns and villages.

**Economic:** An increase in the use of public transport may mean a decline in the use of car parks.

**Sociological:** None.

**Technological:** None.

**Legal:** None.

**Environmental:** Greater pressure to reduce car usage may have an impact on car parking charges

**15 What would be the impact if the Scheme was DELAYED or DELETED**

Not applicable at this stage.



**1 Capital Scheme Title**

**Replace floors in RV waste transfer station**  
(submitted by: John Heap)

**2 Brief Description of the Scheme**

Repair/replace the floors in the waste transfer station at Salthill Depot due to damage caused from continuous daily use.

**3 Financial Implications – CAPITAL**

	2011/2012 £	2012/2013 £	2013/2014 £	2014/2015 £	2015/2016 £
<b>Scheme Cost</b>					81,500

**4 Financial Implications - REVENUE**

<b>Annual Revenue Implications</b>	None identified
------------------------------------	-----------------

**5 Please indicate the start date and duration of the project including key milestones.**

Start date April 2015.

**6 If this is a new asset, what is the expected useful economic life of the new asset? If this is a refurbishment scheme what is the current expected useful economic life of the asset, and by how long does this bid increase the functional lifespan?**

Fifteen years

**7 Please detail any additional information in support of your bid**

The council is committed to the operation of the Waste Transfer Station for 25 years from 2006 and are responsible for its management and maintenance.

**8 Are there any Government recommendations or guidelines to undertake this scheme (including any legislative Health and Safety requirements etc) and what would be the consequence of not doing the scheme**

The facility needs to be a safe place to work in and if not repaired could lead to accidents and injury and reduce the efficiency of the operation.

**9 Link to the Council's Ambitions**

To make peoples lives safer and healthier and to protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.

**10 Performance Management**

The waste transfer station is a key part of the service and must operate as a safe working environment.

**11 In which ways would this scheme improve the efficiency or value for money of the service?**

No additional efficiencies identified.

**12 Please provide details of any consultation that has taken place with local people, partners, staff or any other stakeholders with regard to this scheme.**

None.

**13 Please detail the measures that would be put in place to minimise the impact that this scheme will have on the environment.**

The existing concrete floor when removed will be reused as fill or cover material.

**14 Risk Assessment – Please detail any risks that you envisage and how they would be mitigated**

**Political:** The waste transfer station was a joint project with LCC and failure to comply with the agreed terms of operation may lead to conflict.

**Economic:** None.

**Sociological:** None.

**Technological:** The method employed to replace the floor will be the latest process available at the time.

**Legal:** There is a service level agreement between LCC and RVBC covering the operation of this facility.

**Environmental:** The waste station is a key component of the service..

**15 What would be the impact if the Scheme was DELAYED or DELETED**

Potential for accidents to occur and non compliance with the SLA with LCC.



**1 Capital Scheme Title**

**Replace Refuse Collection Vehicle**  
(submitted by John Heap:)

**2 Brief Description of the Scheme**

To replace refuse collection and recycling vehicle

**3 Financial Implications – CAPITAL**

	2011/2012 £	2012/2013 £	2013/2014 £	2014/2015 £	2015/2016 £
<b>Scheme Cost</b>					205,000

**4 Financial Implications - REVENUE**

<b>Annual Revenue Implications</b>	None identified
------------------------------------	-----------------

**5 Please indicate the start date and duration of the project including key milestones.**

Order in April 2015 for delivery six months later.

**6 If this is a new asset, what is the expected useful economic life of the new asset? If this is a refurbishment scheme what is the current expected useful economic life of the asset, and by how long does this bid increase the functional lifespan?**

The replacement vehicle should have a life expectancy of seven years.

**7 Please detail any additional information in support of your bid**

Part of a rolling replacement programme.

**8 Are there any Government recommendations or guidelines to undertake this scheme (including any legislative Health and Safety requirements etc) and what would be the consequence of not doing the scheme**

Failure to replace the vehicle would increase the possibility of failing to provide the service due to breakdowns.

**9 Link to the Council's Ambitions**

To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.

**10 Performance Management**

**11 In which ways would this scheme improve the efficiency or value for money of the service?**

The replacement would help continue to provide an efficient and effective refuse collection and recycling service.

**12 Please provide details of any consultation that has taken place with local people, partners, staff or any other stakeholders with regard to this scheme.**

None.

**13 Please detail the measures that would be put in place to minimise the impact that this scheme will have on the environment.**

New vehicles will be more environmentally friendly as engine performance improves over time and emissions are reduced.

**14 Risk Assessment – Please detail any risks that you envisage and how they would be mitigated**

- Political:** Greater emphasis may be placed on the need to recycle
- Economic:** Prices of materials recycled will vary on the global market
- Sociological:** Increased desire from the public for recycling
- Technological:** Vehicle technology will change over time.
- Legal:** May be legislative change which affects the service.
- Environmental:** Increased emphasis likely to be placed on recycling over time.

**15 What would be the impact if the Scheme was DELAYED or DELETED**

Increased likelihood of breakdown, increased costs of repairs, reduced standard of service.



## PROPOSED FIVE YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAMME – COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	2013/14 £	2014/15 £	2015/16 £	Total £	New Scheme Proposal Number
<b><u>Outdoor Recreation</u></b>							
Football Pitch Drainage and Improvement Works	10,000					10,000	
<b>NEW PROPOSAL:</b> Football Pitch Drainage and Improvement Works	11,000					11,000	1
Improvements to children's play areas	20,000	20,000	40,000	50,000		130,000	
<b>NEW PROPOSAL:</b> Edisford Artificial Pitch Surface Replacement		60,000				60,000	2
<b><u>Depots</u></b>							
Replace Fuel Storage Tank at Salthill Depot		10,000				10,000	
<b><u>Ribblesdale Pool</u></b>							
Small Pool Filter Refurbishment				10,000		10,000	
<b><u>Public Conveniences</u></b>							
Refurbishment of Castle Field Toilets		43,400				43,400	
<b>NEW PROPOSAL:</b> Dunsop Bridge Toilets		130,000				130,000	3

	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	2013/14 £	2014/15 £	2015/16 £	Total £	New Scheme Proposal Number
<b><u>Outdoor Recreation Vehicles and Plant</u></b>							
Replace John Deere Lawn Tractor PN04 NPZ		16,500				16,500	
Replace Kubota Mower PN05 PLO	16,500					16,500	
Replace John Deere 4WD tractor Mower PN05 BYS	12,500					12,500	
Replace John Deere Mini Tractor PN06 TSZ		9,000				9,000	
Replace Vauxhall Vivaro Panel Van PK06 VWY			13,000			13,000	
Replace Man ERF Tipper truck PN06 FRV				38,000		38,000	
Replace Hayter Triple Mower PN07 MVG			28,000			28,000	
Replace John Deere Cylinder Mower PN07 OWU			17,000			17,000	
Replace Ford Ranger PK07 LSY				15,500		15,500	
Replace Ford Ranger PK07 TZG				15,500		15,500	
Replace Gang Mower TDR 16000	20,000					20,000	
Replace 1 Heavy Goods Trailers			2,200			2,200	
<b><u>General Works</u></b>							
Replace Vauxhall Vivaro Panel Van PK06 HKA		15,400				15,400	
Replace Ingersoll Rand Compressor			7,500			7,500	
Replace Iveco Tipper PO54 COA	30,900					30,900	

	2011/12 £	2012/13 £	2013/14 £	2014/15 £	2015/16 £	Total £	New Scheme Proposal Number
<b><u>Car Parking</u></b>							
Car Parks Rolling Programme	40,000		40,000			80,000	
<b>NEW PROPOSAL: Car Parks Rolling Programme</b>					45,000	45,000	<b>4</b>
<b><u>Refuse Collection</u></b>							
Replace Refuse Collection Vehicle PN05 PWL			100,000			100,000	
Replace Refuse Collection Vehicle VX04 FXV	200,000					200,000	
Replace Refuse Collection Vehicle VX53 TZJ		200,000				200,000	
Provision of New and Replacement Wheeled Bins	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000		60,000	
<b>NEW PROPOSAL: Replacement Floors in Transfer Station</b>					81,500	81,500	<b>5</b>
<b>NEW PROPOSAL: Replacement Refuse Vehicle</b>					205,000	205,000	<b>6</b>
<b>TOTAL COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE</b>	<b>375,900</b>	<b>519,300</b>	<b>262,700</b>	<b>144,000</b>	<b>331,500</b>	<b>1,633,400</b>	