

# STATES OF JERSEY



## **SOLID WASTE STRATEGY (P.95/2005): THIRD AMENDMENTS (P.95/2005 AMD.(3))– COMMENTS**

---

**Presented to the States on 28th June 2005  
by the Environment and Public Services Committee**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

## COMMENTS

### **1.(A) Amendment proposes that other plastics, not just PET plastic, are recycled.**

The Environment and Public Services Committee's intention in 2005 is that PET (polyethylene terephthalate) plastic is targeted initially, because it is the most commercially viable at this time. However the Environment and Public Services Committee proposition states that 'other materials' are to be considered, which could include other types of plastic. These will be reviewed in the future to determine whether recycling is environmentally beneficial. It is recommended that the decision-making procedure known as Best Practicable Environmental Option is used to evaluate whether the benefits, in environmental and economic terms, are sufficient to justify the recycling of the material. Jersey has considerable transportation distances and costs to consider in this evaluation, by comparison with some other jurisdictions.

The Environment and Public Services Committee does not support this amendment, but has already given a commitment in the Strategy to consider recycling of other types of plastics in the future.

### **1.(B) Amendment proposes that the Environment and Public Services Committee investigates commercial opportunities of international recycling companies tendering for construction and/or for operation of the recycling centre.**

The Environment and Public Services Committee wishes to emphasise that it has already investigated the possibility of utilising the commercial opportunities afforded by European and International recycling companies. It is not accepted that it would necessarily be advantageous, or even boost recycling, to outsource the construction or operation of a recycling centre to an international recycling company. It is considered that international recycling contractors would not find the scale of this operation to be attractive to them, without the inclusion of other parts of the waste management system. If local contractors – currently doing an excellent job – were put in a position of having to compete with this 'total solution approach' they would effectively be excluded from tendering. The Strategy proposes that the development of recycling initiatives and processes will be adjusted to match the development of the collection service and international recycling markets, and the Environment and Public Services Committee will have to subsidise the overall cost of recycling these materials. Private contractors will be used where appropriate, as happens today with metal, paper and aluminium. The Committee is keen to support local solutions, using local contractors, as much as possible.

The Environment and Public Services Committee does not support this amendment.

### **1.(C) Amendment proposes that the Environment and Public Services Committee sets higher recycling targets –**

***“to put Jersey into the top 5% of worldwide best practice”.***

It is a well-known fact in the waste management industry that the costs of very high levels of recycling are extremely high and it is not considered that this is a realistic target for Jersey, bearing in mind the limitations of a small island. There are other small island jurisdictions, with whom Jersey might more appropriately be compared, and they have similar problems and constraints in terms of the solutions that can be applied to their waste management and recycling initiatives.

***“to set baseline recycling targets for ‘specific commodities’”.***

The amendment proposes recycling targets for individual materials to be increased to a minimum of 75%. The costs of recycling materials are high, particularly where these materials have a low market value. The Strategy has accounted for the feasibility, the environmental effects and the cost of recycling, when setting its individual targets. The Best Practicable Environmental Option evaluation must be carried out for individual materials, to ensure that there is an overall benefit of recycling. Any evaluation must take into account the fluctuating nature of the markets for recycled materials, particularly in the case of those products where there is likely to be a surplus of supply over demand, as well as processing and transportation resource demands. Therefore, the Environment and Public Services Committee has tried to avoid setting very high targets that may prove to be unachievable, and

could result in very high and continuing costs for recycling, while maintaining the objective of reducing the quantity of residual waste to a level at which it can be sustained.

There is mention in the report of European countries with recycling rates of up to 85%. We know of no European Country with a recycling rate approaching 85%, without these figures including the quantity of waste that is dealt with in Energy from Waste plants. If Jersey were to adopt this same basis of calculating its recycling rates, we would currently exceed 95%.

The Environment and Public Services Committee strongly resists this amendment.

**1.(D) Amendment proposes that the Environment and Public Services Committee takes active steps to promote minimisation and recycling in the Community and for the States to lead by example.**

The Environment and Public Services Committee agrees with the sentiments in the amendment, which are already expressed throughout the Solid Waste Strategy. Similarly, the Strategy says that the States intends to lead by example and this has already begun, for example the recent procurement of headed paper States-wide on recycled paper for the first time. As the Environment and Public Services Committee proposition already asks that the Solid Waste Strategy is approved, the Committee sees no need for this amendment but has no wish to oppose it.

The Environment and Public Services Committee supports this amendment.

**2. Amendment proposes that the Environment and Public Services Committee be charged to provide modern facilities for recycling green waste before the end of 2006, and that kitchen waste is added into the current composting stream of garden and green waste to either be used on land locally or exported.**

The Environment and Public Services Committee is committed to providing a modern composting facility by 2007, which we feel is a realistic timescale to carry out the necessary planning procedures, including Environmental and Health Impact Assessments, and to allow time for its procurement and construction.

The Committee does not believe that it is appropriate for Jersey to compost kitchen waste. Currently, our green waste compost is returned to agricultural land or sold to the public. Both the Health and Social Services Committee and the Environment and Public Services Committee agree that the potential health risks, due to the presence of meat products, are too great to propose that we begin composting kitchen waste. For an island with a limited land bank and no alternative disposal route, together with high value agricultural products, we believe this is too high a risk for the Island to take, and that there are not sufficient advantages to be gained from composting this material. It is essential that the Island is able to maintain confidence in its prime agricultural products.

The Environment and Public Services Committee strongly resists this amendment.

**3. The amendment proposes that the 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**

The Environment and Public Services Committee proposes to introduce a pilot kerbside collection scheme for dry recyclables only. On a small island like Jersey, we believe that it is necessary to develop a tailor-made system for kerbside collection of dry recyclables, and intend to do so together with the Parishes, via the pilot scheme. Issues such as traffic, type of vehicle and storage of collection bins need careful consideration. By adopting this approach, this will give time to test and develop a scheme that is appropriate for Jersey's needs, taking into account costs and other factors.

Because the Environment and Public Services Committee does not believe it appropriate to compost kitchen

waste, a segregated biodegradable collection is not necessary. There are many practical issues associated with a collection of this nature, and it is our opinion that it cannot be imposed without detailed discussions and investigations taking place. Such a collection scheme would also detract from home composting.

Costs of completely segregated collection systems can be very high, and the imposition of a U.K. system, as recommended in the amendment report, may be cost-prohibitive for the Island. The amendment proposes that any additional or one-off costs arising from this scheme should be borne by the States. There is no accompanying detail on the magnitude or nature of these costs, and, therefore, the amendment is proposing an extra cost to the States of an unquantified amount. There will also be manpower implications that would need to be investigated. The Environment and Public Services Committee can say that it knows that the costs of such a scheme would be considerable, and would normally be introduced over a reasonably long period. However, the amendment is asking for this to be introduced over a very short period.

The Environment and Public Services Committee does not support this amendment.

**4. The amendment proposes that the Environment and Public Services Committee ‘fully investigate alternative and conventional technologies to provide the final disposal route for the residual waste (after the Deputy’s amended recycling and composting targets) 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 assessments no later than 2008’.**

The Environment and Public Services Committee has carried out extensive investigation of the availability, benefits and costs of ‘alternative’ and ‘conventional’ technology for the replacement for the Bellozanne incinerator. This has led to a short-list of suppliers containing both types of technologies. We believe that this list adequately reflects those companies able to supply a proven and robust solution to handle Jersey’s forecasted residual waste for the foreseeable future.

We cannot over-emphasise how essential it is for Jersey to obtain a proven technology, which has been demonstrated to be reliable and capable of providing a secure method of dealing with the Island’s waste. There are numerous other technologies that are in development and testing stages, but may still be a long way from being able to demonstrate their reliability to operate on a full-scale basis. Large cities and jurisdictions can accept the risk of ‘trailing’ such systems, because they have other disposal routes to fall back on, such as landfill, but we do not have such alternatives.

Even though the amendment claims not to be seeking a delay, the inevitable consequences of further extensive investigation are that a delay would be caused. The Environment and Public Services Committee and the Waste Strategy Steering Group believe that the unacceptably high emissions from the existing plant must not be allowed to continue any longer than absolutely necessary. Therefore, the idea of any further delay in making a decision is unacceptable.

Once the Strategy has been approved, Environmental Impact Assessments and Health Impact Assessments will be carried out as part of the public planning process. Through this process, the location of the plant will be determined.

The amendment report alleges that the States are being asked in the Strategy to endorse a plant of unknown size, unspecified technology and indeterminate costs. Nothing could be further from the truth. The process that will be followed is that, once tenders have been obtained through the procurement process, the detailed costs of the Energy from Waste plant will be included in the States Business Plan (Resource Plan) in September 2006, which will require the approval of the States.

The Environment and Public Services Committee strongly resists this amendment.

**5. The amendment proposes that the Environment and Public Services Committee be charged to actively work with Guernsey on a variety of waste management issues.**

The Environment and Public Services Committee has worked with and intends to continue to cooperate with Guernsey on all waste management solutions where there may be joint benefits. For example, Guernsey has just launched a home composting initiative that was modelled on the recent success of the Jersey scheme. This came about as part of the continuing dialogue between officers from both Islands on waste management issues.

The Environment and Public Services Committee supports this amendment.

### **Financial and manpower implications**

The Environment and Public Services Committee makes an overall statement on the Deputy Duhamel amendments that there are no details provided for the financial and manpower implications. However, the Environment and Public Services Committee considers that these could be considerable.