

STATES OF JERSEY

r

SOLID WASTE STRATEGY (P.95/2005): THIRD AMENDMENTS

**Lodged au Greffe on 21st June 2005
by Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour**

STATES GREFFE

SOLID WASTE STRATEGY (P.95/2005): THIRD AMENDMENTS

- (1) *In paragraph (a)(i) renumber the words after “be charged” as new sub-paragraph (A) and in that new sub-paragraph delete the words “PET” and “and to achieve the recycling aims in the report”.*

After the new sub-paragraph (A) above insert the following new subparagraphs in paragraph (a)(i) –

- “(B) to investigate the commercial opportunities afforded by European and international recycling companies in tendering for the construction and/or operation of the recycling centre as set out in sub-paragraph (A) above;
- (C) to instigate recycling schemes and systems in order to put Jersey in the top 5% of worldwide best practice in respect of the composting and recycling of “non inert” solid waste over the lifetime of the strategy and to set baseline recycling targets for specific commodities as set out in the report of Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour dated 21st June 2005, and to keep such targets under active review;
- (D) to take active steps to promote waste minimisation and recycling throughout the community and to encourage all States Departments to lead by example.”.
- (2) *In paragraph (a)(ii), for the words “composting facility for recycling of garden and green waste, by 2007” substitute the words “facility or facilities for recycling garden waste, green waste and household kitchen waste to form compost or soil improvers, which can be applied to the land or exported, before the end of 2006”.*
- (3) *In paragraph (a)(iii), for the words “a pilot scheme for a coordinated collection system for recyclables (including paper, aluminium, glass and PET plastics) substitute the words “a kerbside collection scheme which is capable of collecting segregated biodegradable material and dry recyclates separately by the end of 2006 with any additional or one-off costs arising from this scheme to be borne by the States of Jersey”.*
- (4) *In paragraph (a)(v), for the words “to implement the replacement of the Bellozanne incinerator with a modern Energy from Waste facility, subject to an environmental and health impact assessment and planning approval, to enable it to be commissioned in 2009, and procured according to section 5.4 of the attached report” substitute the words “to investigate fully alternative and conventional technologies to provide the final disposal route for the residual waste remaining following the implementation of the systems and facilities as set out in paragraphs (a)(i)(A), (a)(i)(C), (a)(ii) and (a)(iii) above, and to recommend a preferred solution for a replacement of the Bellozanne incinerator to the States with an accompanying cost/benefit analysis, environmental and health impact assessment no later than December 2008”.*
- (5) *In paragraph (a)(vi), for the words “keep under review the option of a joint Channel Islands waste facility, located in Jersey, in conjunction with the States of Guernsey, subject to the approval by the States of any such proposals” substitute the words “take active steps to seek co-operation from the States of Guernsey on any measures from which joint benefit, financial or otherwise, can be derived in any area of waste management, and to report to the States thereon at regular intervals”.*

DEPUTY R.C. DUHAMEL OF ST. SAVIOUR

REPORT

Comments have been expressed to the effect that the process of Scrutiny has added value and contributed in a positive way to the final solid waste strategy of the Environment and Public Services Committee and this has been publicly acknowledged by the President of that Committee.

However, although some effort has been made to take on board the constructive criticism offered by the Scrutiny Panel as a critical friend, the Committee has failed to fully address the fundamental issues raised by the Panel.

The fact remains that the Environment and Public Services Committee is firmly wedded to the concept of an expensive Energy from Waste (EfW) plant which includes a large measure of standby and over capacity. Whereas this extravagant application of capital funds might have been acceptable in the 80s and 90s, in the present climate of financial constraint, States members have an inescapable duty to the Public purse to ensure that the taxpayers' money is spent prudently.

The Scrutiny Panel's research has identified areas where both long term environmental benefits and substantial financial savings could accrue if the emphasis of the strategy were to be slightly adjusted and it is with this in mind that the amendments have been put forward.

Amendment 1

(A) that the Environment and Public Services Committee be charged to provide a recycling centre for the reception and recycling of paper, aluminium, glass, plastic and other materials, before the end of 2006;

There has been a quantum leap in the pace of change in recycling technology in recent years and this is set to continue. For example innovative packaging materials which allow for machine sorting by use of embedded computer chips and truly recyclable Belland plastics (where the plastic is dissolved for reuse) will soon be available. Companies are beginning to join in the drive to close recycling loops. Marks and Spencer recently announced that it would be using recycled plastic (rPET) in its food containers and the work being done within the EU packaging directive is encouraging more materials to be effectively recycled.

The recycling centre should be capable of responding to such changes and it is therefore inappropriate to limit plastic recycling to PET (Polyethylene Terephthalate) solely. As world oil resources dwindle the burning of plastic will become increasingly difficult to justify.

(B) that the Environment and Public Services Committee be charged to investigate the commercial opportunities afforded by European and international recycling companies in tendering for the construction and/or operation of the recycling centre as set out in (A)

Significant interest was expressed by a number of commercial waste management operators to the Scrutiny Panel in the possibility of working with Jersey in the provision of specialist recycling services. These companies have established waste management profiles and have access to a wide range of recyclate markets. The Scrutiny Panel was left in no doubt that these European and International companies could radically improve on the current and proposed recycling rates, thereby reducing the quantity of residual waste to such an extent that a smaller, less capital intensive final disposal route could be considered.

(C) that the Environment and Public Services Committee be charged to instigate recycling schemes and systems in order to put Jersey in the top 5% of worldwide best practice in respect of the composting and recycling of "non inert" solid waste over the lifetime of the strategy and to set baseline recycling targets for specific commodities as set out in the report attached hereto, and to keep such targets under active review.

The achievement of an overall recycling rate of some 32% as a target over the lifetime of the strategy is hardly ambitious or aggressive. Bearing in mind that some European countries have rates of up to 85% now and that the success of recycling plays a major part in determining the capacity and therefore cost of the final disposal method, it is disappointing that the Environment and Public Services Committee is not seeking to achieve best practice worldwide either initially or at any time over the next 25 years. The recent comment in the Jersey Evening Post by

the President of the Environment and Public Services Committee that Jersey could be seen as a world leader in environmental best practice is laudable but it is questionable how this can be done considering the unexceptional recycling target that the Committee is proposing.

Baseline targets to be achieved by the end of 2008 for paper and card, plastics, timber, WEEE, textiles, tyres, should be set at a minimum of 75%. The glass and metal packaging rates set out by the Committee at 90% and 85% are acceptable as starting points. It is important to realize that glass and metal do not burn at all well within an incinerator and should as far as possible be excluded from any combustion waste stream as should household batteries. The targets should be kept under active review and improved upon whenever possible.

(D) that the Environment and Public Services Committee be charged to take active steps to promote waste minimisation and recycling throughout the community and to encourage all States Departments to lead by example.

The solid waste strategy does refer to various educational initiatives but there is no specific mention made in the proposition. States Departments represent a sizable proportion of the workforce. By setting a good example to the wider community, Departments can make a difference in their own right and encourage others to do the same. If all members of society are well-informed and persuaded to make small life style changes, the cumulative effect will be to everyone's benefit. The Environment and Public Services Committee budget and strategy should formally acknowledge this.

Amendment 2

(ii) that the Committee be charged to provide modern facility or facilities for recycling garden waste, green waste and household kitchen waste to form compost or soil improvers, which can be applied to the land or exported, before the end of 2006.

Page 41 of the solid waste strategy sets out a typical analysis of Municipal Solid Waste which indicates that kitchen waste is the largest single component of this waste stream. At present such waste is sent to Bellozanne to be burned. It has a high water content and a low energy content and, as such, detracts from the incinerator energy balance – it is not worth burning.

Better methods exist to derive value from this material. The Scrutiny Panel is aware of processes which can turn kitchen waste into useful soil improvers. Two such operations visited in France and U.K. by Panel members have received EU health certification allowing their products to be returned to the land. There is a strong case for Jersey to adopt a technology of this type. The end product could be used locally or exported to EU markets.

The amendment draws attention to the possibility of more than one type of facility. With kitchen waste and green waste collected separately there is an opportunity to produce a range of products optimised to the raw material inputs. The removal of up to 28% of the MSW in this manner would also significantly reduce the quantity of residual waste requiring thermal treatment.

Amendment 3

(iii) that the Comité des Connétables be charged to work with the Committee to introduce a kerbside collection scheme which is capable of collecting segregated biodegradable material and dry recyclates separately by the end of 2006 with any additional or one-off costs arising from this scheme to be borne by the States of Jersey.

Kerbside collection of segregated waste materials is now well established in the UK and elsewhere. The Committee's proposal to introduce a pilot scheme is unduly cautious. The amendment establishes a firm date for the introduction of the full scheme and coincides with the provision of facilities for the processing of kitchen waste.

Segregated collection of biodegradable kitchen waste and dry recyclables enables the maximum value to be obtained from the various waste streams. It may be necessary to purchase some new equipment to operate the new system and it would seem appropriate for the States to assist in the defrayment of any capital costs.

Amendment 4

(v) that the Committee be charged to fully investigate alternative and conventional technologies to provide the final disposal route for the residual waste remaining following the implementation of the systems and facilities as set out in paragraphs (a)(i)(A), (a)(i)(C), (a)(ii) and (a)(iii) above, and to recommend a preferred solution for a replacement of the Bellozanne incinerator to the States with an accompanying cost benefit analysis, environmental and health impact assessment no later than December 2008.

The main intention of this amendment is to require the Environment and Public Services Committee to obtain States approval before committing Jersey to a particular final disposal route. For such an important and capital intensive project it must be right that the States as a whole are given the opportunity to debate the merits of the chosen solution in the context of the advantages/disadvantages of alternatives.

The Scrutiny Panel was unable to make specific recommendations on alternative solutions due to commercial confidentiality conditions being imposed on a range of operating data by the Environment and Public Services Committee. However, it is possible to state from the Scrutiny Panel research that substantially cheaper systems do exist which could form part of a robust yet flexible solution and that the scale of plant is heavily dependent on the extent of waste minimisation and recycling measures.

Section 5.4 of the solid waste strategy provides no detail, technical, financial or otherwise on the preferred option of the Environment and Public Services Committee and yet asks that the States allow the Committee to pursue a tendering process without further reference to the States. The States are being asked to endorse a plant of unknown size, unspecified technology and indeterminate cost.

This amendment seeks not to delay a decision per se but rather to ensure that any decision when taken is done so in the full knowledge of the costs and benefits of the preferred solution and a rationale of its superiority to other considered options.

Amendment 5

(vi) that the Committee be charged to take active steps to seek cooperation from the States of Guernsey on any measures from which joint benefit, financial or otherwise, could be derived in any area of waste management and to report to the States thereon at regular intervals.

There are potential advantages from working with Guernsey and the other Channel Islands over a wide range of waste management operations with opportunities to undertake joint recycling initiatives, share shipping costs, provide mutual back up facilities and in general share Island experiences. The amendment widens the scope of the original committee proposal.

Financial and manpower implications

There are manpower and financial consequences to the whole strategy and undoubtedly some of these could be affected by the amendments. However the overall aim of the amendments in the long term is to realise the substantial potential capital savings which could accrue from the minimisation of the residual waste stream through reduction, reuse and recycling initiatives.