## Extract from Hansard

[COUNCIL - Tuesday, 15 June 2010] p3675a-3675a Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Donna Faragher

## LANDFILL LEVY — REDUCTION IN WASTE

## 348. Hon SALLY TALBOT to the Minister for Environment:

I ask this question on behalf of Hon Linda Savage, who has had to leave the chamber on urgent parliamentary business.

- (1) Is the effectiveness of the landfill levy measured in terms of reductions in the amount of waste going to landfill?
- (2) Can the minister cite any evidence to substantiate claims in the budget papers
  - (a) that the amount of waste deposited to landfill will reduce as a result of the increase in the landfill levy; and
  - (b) that there will be an increase in waste due to economic growth?
- (3) If no to (2), why have these claims been made in the budget papers?
- (4) If yes to (2), how does the minister propose to assess the effectiveness of the landfill levy in reducing the amount of waste going to landfill?

## Hon DONNA FARAGHER replied:

I thank the member for some notice of Hon Linda Savage's question.

- (1) The landfill levy has a number of objectives, one of the most important being the diversion of waste from landfills. This objective is reflected on page 820 of 2010–11 budget paper No 2 volume 3 in the indicator "Percentage of waste in the metropolitan area diverted from landfill through recycling".
- (2) (a) There has been one period of landfill levy payments at the higher landfill levy rate. Data for the January to March 2010 quarter is yet to be fully verified; however, early indications are that there has been a reduction in both putrescibles and inert waste going to landfill.
  - (b) Page 819 of 2010–11 budget paper No 2 volume 3 states —

The amount of waste deposited in landfill is expected to reduce as a result of the increase in the landfill levy. However, this is likely to be offset to some extent by an increase in waste due to economic growth.

It is generally accepted that waste generation is related to a number of factors, including economic activity from both a production and consumption perspective.

- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) See the answer to (1).