

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE ENVIRONMENT
SCRUTINY PANEL BY DEPUTY G.C.L. BAUDAINS OF ST. CLEMENT**

ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 11th SEPTEMBER 2007

Question

With regard to the Panel's review of waste, would the Chairman advise members -

- (a) why the presentation to States members and others of alternatives to mass incineration of Jersey's waste, as agreed by the Panel in January and proposed to be held in March, has not yet been held?
- (b) with reference to SR13/2007 ('Waste Recycling' presented to the States on 3rd July 2007) and especially page 89 thereof, would the Chairman advise whether his Panel carried out economic comparisons between recycling and incineration as part of the review and, in particular whether the Panel investigated –
 - (i) the assumed composition and quantity of recyclables were the Island to achieve 60% recycling,
 - (ii) the probable value of those materials, less the cost of shipping and any treatment necessary,
 - (iii) the cost of incinerating the above materials, including ash disposal and amortisation of plant costs.

If the Panel did research these issues, would the Chairman set out the results of the Panel's research, with particular emphasis on comparing the economics of recycling versus incineration?

Answer

- (a) The terms of reference of the Waste Recycling report did not include a comparison of residual waste treatment facilities. However the Panel has an active interest in the alternatives to mass incineration and will organise a presentation to States members and others well in advance of the States debate to determine the technology for future residual waste disposal in Jersey.
- (b) This has been answered in part (a). However, the Panel has requested information from the Transport and Technical Services department (in July 2007) on the cost of incineration and is still awaiting a response on which to make a meaningful economic comparison between recycling and incineration.
 - (i) The composition of recyclables, were the Island to achieve a 60% recycling rate, depends on the materials targeted within the waste stream. For example just recycling all paper and all kitchen waste would achieve a rate between 55 and 60%. It is more likely that a wider range of materials would be considered and that the mix will vary over time as consumer habits change.
 - (ii) The Waste Recycling report provides indicative prices based on May 2007 for the most common recyclable materials (P.89). The total value of recyclable materials depends on the relative quantities available. Shipping costs were given by two separate local operators and are shown on page 88 of the report. The cost of treatment depends on the method of collection and requirement for sorting. During the course of its research, the Panel investigated various types of treatment plant and relative costs.
 - (iii) As set out above, the Panel is awaiting this information from the Transport and Technical Services Department.

When the Panel receives the detailed analysis of existing and projected incineration costs a comparison of the economics of incineration versus recycling will be undertaken.

