

*Metroland: Letters to Editor*

<http://newsdurhamregion.com/news/opinion/letters/article/89367>

## Durham should spend as much on recycling as on incineration

Thu Nov 15, 2007

To the editor:

Re: Durham incineration

What is so difficult to understand? You have a business, you create a business plan. You have partners, you get signed commitments. Hey, I know, let's send council reps on a world tour and not require a detailed report on what they were sent to find out. Or, tell the local residents "who cares about you" we'll just do it anyway.

OK, now that frustration is voiced.

Costs of different streams of waste require a look at the whole process. Costs: capital, operational/maintenance and decommissioning. Risks: air/ground/water pollution and associated health-care costs, transportation, and traffic accidents.

The biggest instigator of change is that Michigan dumping contract can only be renewed up to 2020. Trucking to Michigan is definitely the cheapest; however, is that what we tell our children and grandchildren? Incineration costs 20 times more than landfill. We need to make sure the technology we use gets to the temperature that dioxin decomposes, 300 to 400C, and that it is capable of rapidly reducing exhaust so that dioxin cannot reform.

What everyone would like to see is that if we put a \$1 billion into hiding (landfill, incineration) garbage then we should put \$1 billion into waste reduction/recycling.

Allan Williams,

Ajax