

. () -
 . , , , % ,
 -
 , , () , % , , , ,
) () .
 , , ()
 ()
 ()
 . , , , , % , , , ,
 . , , , , -
 . , () -
 . , - , ,)
 . () -
 . () -
 () -
 ()

:

.

.

.

-

.

.(

)

.

:

:

()

.()

:

:

| % | () | % | () |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |
| , | | , | |

: :

-
-

()

.....

.....

.....

:

:

()

:

()

.....

:

()

..... ()

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

..... ()

..... ()

..... ()

..... ()

.....

:

:

()

(/)

()

:

()

‘ ‘ ‘

% ,

,

% , , ,

% , , , ,

:

:

()

()

()

:

- () -

,

:

-

(-)

()

' () ()

()

-)

(()

-)

(

| | | |
|-----|-----|-------|
| () | () | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | + | |
| | + | (+) |
| | + | (+) |
| = / | | () |
| | - | |
| | - | - |
| | , | |
| | + | (+) |
| | | |
| | - | |
| | - | - |
| | , | |
| | + | (+) |
| | | |
| = / | | () |
| | - | |
| | - | - |

:

:

()

:

-

()

()

()

()

()

EMI

:

-

| | | |
|-----|-----|-----|
| () | () | |
| = / | () | () |
| | - | - |
| = / | | () |
| | - | - |

- () -

:

:

-

:

-

()

()

-)

(

() ()

= /

()

-

-

= /

()

-

-

EMI

-

-

:

() ()

+

(+)

()

= /

-

-

:

:

() ()

_____ + _____

_____ - _____ - _____

:

-

()

()

()

() () ()

_____ ()

. ()
 ()
 ()
 , , ()
) ()
 ()
 ()
 : -
 ()
 ())
 :

 () () ()

 , ()

 , ()

 :

:

:

-

()

)

(

-

()

()

()

()

:

-

()

()

()

)

()

(

()

()

()

()

()

:

- () -

() () ()

() () ()

:

()

% , ()

% ,

%

.()

%

()

:

:

()

:

% , ()

% ,

%

% ,

- () -

| |
|---------|
| |
| % |
| () () |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

% % ,

% , %

%

%

%

%

%

-

%

:()

()

()

()

% , ()

% ,

:

()

| | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|-----|
| () | % | () | % | () |
| , | | , | | , |
| , | , | , | | , |
| , | | , | | , |
| , | , | , | | , |
| , | , | , | | , |
| , | | , | | , |
| , | , | , | | , |
| , | | , | | , |

:

:

:

%

%

%

%,

%

-

%

:

% ()

%

() ()

:

-

% ,

% : ()

% ()

() () %

() %

%

:

()

% ()

% ()

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

:

-

:

:

% ()

%

%

| | | | |
|--|---|-----|-----|
| | % | () | () |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

%

%

%

%

-

()

%

%

%

%

%

()

:

| | | () | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|
| % | () | % | () |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

()

()

()

:

-

-

John R, Holmes, Ph, The economic impacts alternatives to crop residue burning, California environmental protection agency. 16 September 1995 Sacramento CA 985/2.

Meghan Hayes, Whatcom Country Extension, Biogas in Formation, Washington State University, 2002.

SUMMARY

Economic and Environmental Study for Recycling the Plant Waste in EL-Behiera Governorate

Abd El Aty Mohammed Mahmoud Ali, Ashraf Shebl youness

The study generally aimed at maximizing the utility of Egyptian plant wastes and particularly plant wastes in EL-Behier a governorate and suggesting of the best economic, environmental methods to deal with these wastes. This is in addition to estimating the costs of waste recycling, estimating the economic return of the waste recycling of plant, and studying the economic problems that impede the full utilization of plant waste and damage resulting from improper dealing with plant waste and proposed solutions. The study used the method of qualitative economic analysis for characterizing the problem, in addition to the method of quantitative analysis using some economic indicators such as total revenues, total costs, net yield, economic return on the pound invested, and other common statistical tests such as Cay square(χ^2). This study based on two types of data one of them is secondary data which is published and unpublished data issued by agencies and institutions interested in the process of recycling plant wastes, and the other type of data is primary data which is obtained or collected through a random sample selected from four main districts (kom Hamada, Kafer Eldawar, Hosh issa, and Abo Homoss) in EL-Behiera governorate.

This study concluded the following results:

- 1- The average cost of recycling corn Stover to get 20 tons of green fodder (silage) attained about 2597 pounds, while the average cost of recycling 2.575 tons of dry Stover to get organic fertilizer attained about L.E 1723, the average cost of recycling 2.575 tons of dry Stover for producing the non-conventional feed (treated in urea) attained about 1429 pounds.
- 2- The average cost of recycling one ton of wheat straw to get the non-conventional feed (treated in urea) attained about 709 pounds, while the average cost to produce a ton of non-conventional feed was (injected ammonia) attained about 844 pounds.
- 3- The average cost of recycling rice straw to get one ton of non-conventional feed (treated in urea) attained about 449 pounds, the average cost of producing one ton of unconventional feed (injected in ammonia) attained about 584 pounds and the average cost of recycling one ton of rice straw to get organic fertilizer about 435 pounds of rice straw.
- 4- The average cost of recycling cotton stalks to get a ton of organic fertilizer (treated in urea) attained about 849 pounds.
- 5- Average cost of recycling the peanuts wastes to get a ton of dry hay attained about 445 pounds.
- 6- By Estimating the average return of the pound from recycling the corn crop to get silage, organic fertilizer, and non-traditional feed (treated in urea) attained about L.E1.66, L.E1.42, and L.E 1.38 for each of them respectively. While the average return of the pound from recycling wheat straw to get non-traditional feed (treated in urea) and non-traditional feed (injected in ammonia) attained about L.E 1.53, L. E1.34 respectively. the average return of recycling rice straw for producing the non-traditional feed (treated in urea) and non-traditional feed (injected in ammonia) and organic fertilizers attained about L.E 1.25, L.E 1.15, L.E 1.35 for each of them respectively. The average return of the pound from recycling cotton stalks to get organic fertilizer attained about 1.1. The average return of the pound from recycling the peanut wastes to produce hay attained about 1.56 during the mentioned season.
- 7- By studying the relative importance of environmental damage resulting from improper dealing with plant waste it is shown that: The most important damages are the decrease in the economic value of plant waste, air pollution, distorting the environment and street scene, declining farm income, pollution of both water canals and drains, causing fires and disasters in both houses and stores, declining farm income, causing a black cloud, soil pollution, harms to animals and reduces production, working the spread of agricultural pests and insects, affecting the cultivated crops and reduce the production and quality, leading to social problems (quarrels between neighbors in the fields).