

## COMPARISON OF RECYCLING OVER DESALINATION

	Labor's Desalination Plant	Coalition's Recycling Plan
<b>Volume Yearly</b>	45 gigalitres	86 gigalitres
<b>Volume Daily</b>	125 mega litres	235 mega litres
<b>Capital Cost</b>	\$1.9 Billion	\$0.949 Billion
<b>Recurrent Cost of water (\$/GL)</b>	\$ 3,000 / ML <sup>1</sup>	\$1,000 / ML
<b>Time Frame</b>	Minimum 26 months	18 – 24 months
<b>When the Drought Breaks</b>	Switched Off	Used for environmental flows and industrial recycling
<b>Energy Consumption</b>	Energy demand for recycling is at least two thirds lower than desalination <sup>2</sup>	
<b>Environmental Impact</b>	Is more energy intensive to run, will destroy local marine ecology, and provides no additional environmental flows.	Increase environmental flows through the Hawkesbury-Nepean River when not used for drinking purposes, and improved health of Georges River.
<b>International Comparison</b>	Labor has approved the plans to build the World's Biggest desalination plant	Similar scheme to the Brisbane proposal, Singapore, Atlanta, Israel and California

<sup>1</sup> Based on Gold Coast desalination plant and reported by Greg Stolz, Brisbane Courier Mail, 'French to profit from Queensland drought', available <http://www.news.com.au/story/0,23599,21145356-2,00.html>

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor Greg Leslie, quoted in <http://www.smh.com.au/news/environment/recycled-water-rejected-out-of-fear-say-critics/2007/01/29/1169919274749.html>