

## Objections to the New Municipal Solid Waste Incinerator proposal ref P/2008/2086

### 1 – It is an Environmentally unsound decision, in the wrong location

- The potential for a seriously debilitating incident that will impact upon the economic viability of Jersey is immense.
- The proximity to the: Harbour, Internationally recognised Ramsar Marine Protection Zone, Recreational Land Area, Hazardous Safety Zone will all impact detrimentally upon the future of this area.
- Emission Levels will only cope with current EU/UK regs
- Why are we not following best international practice
- The Toxic Fumes will be passing over the greatest occupied area of the island.
- There is the need to have an uneconomic new access road and to move the Fuel Farm.
- Fire Safety coverage in the area will be compromised as the site develops
- How will the high CO2 emission levels be addressed as they will inevitably be targeted by the EU for reduction
- The Impact report stated that there are 369600 deaths every year in the EU linked to Air Pollution.
- There are 5.4 million Asthma sufferers in the UK, 1.5 million are children.
- The Babbie & Fischtnier Volume II report of January 2007 – which was withheld from the Liverpool University study group, which initially met at the end of January 2007.
- The report states quite clearly that the Sulphur Dioxide emissions come from the JEC power Stations and Bellozanne Municipal Solid Waste Incinerator – but makes no reference to other chimneys i.e. General Hospital, Crematorium and others like the Merton Hotel group – what were their emissions – or were they not even measured at all!
- At 8.2.13 in the report it states that the “annual emissions from the current Bellozanne facility exceed the total emissions of dioxins from UK waste incinerators by a factor of about twenty”
- Were these Dioxins harmful to resident’s health ?
- Dr Rosemary Geller indicated on 16-10-08 that most emissions go out to sea and because they are so dispersed do no harm !
- Much of the information in the Babbie and Fischtnier Report Vol II is not based upon any like for like working plant so appears to be supposition
- Why did this report have to be requested not be supplied – we only have had less than one sixth provided to the Liaison Group
- Why has Jersey failed to follow the 1989 and 2000 EU Waste Incineration directives regarding Dioxins
- Why wasn’t the plant closed down in late 1995 ?

- Why has no reference been made to traffic movements i.e. congestion, traffic movement, dust, noise and air pollution in relation to the proposals for: -
  1. The New Roll On / Roll Off berth
  2. The New Cruise Liner berth
  3. The Mineral waste delivery, storage and transport.

## **2. The Technology chosen is a compromise and is likely to be past its sell by date when it is commissioned**

- The plant will still produce over 25,000 tons of Toxic Ash per year
- The Toxic Ash is an unknown expensive legacy. It needs to be carefully handled and possibly stored for hundreds of years or until another method of encapsulation is designed.
- How long will it be before the Plastic Bags currently used to store the Toxic Waste Ash begin leaking into the sea, polluting the bay and affecting the local fishing and shell fish industries, including the internationally recognised Ramsar site.
- It is not the most currently efficient type of incinerator
- Insufficient consideration has been placed upon better, quicker, user-friendlier methods of waste collection, sorting and storage. It just burns stuff!
- It is going to be linked to an old fashioned and well-known previously polluting chimney.
- Linking it is a poor but expensive alternative to using a purpose designed and built chimney with previous examples of use – something else to go wrong!

## **3. The Box surrounding the proposed new Municipal Solid Waste Incinerator indicates a designer who is not in touch with the Island.**

- It is an incredibly ugly and inappropriate “design”.
- Do we need to go out side of the island to get a shed designer.
- Sheds like that could have been sketched by anyone and sourced over the internet, just type in LxBxW and material for walls etc
- Its choice by Jim Greaves does not indicate his technical ability.
- Sadly the designs he opened up his recent presentation with were all 100% better than his end result.
- A 100% glass structure would be softer in the day time and quite interesting at night in any location

## **4. The Landscaping proposals**

- Do we need to go outside of the island to get a landscape gardener / designer
- Any local Landscape gardener could have carried out the work!
- Where will the security fencing have to be located to protect the public from the Toxic Ash pits?

## **5. Economic Details -has the states done its homework properly?**

- £106 Purchase cost = Loss of revenue of £7m pa
- Savings fund for purchase of new plant in 2020 @ £150m = £13m pa
- Operational costs of £10m pa

- Total costs of £20m pa = £500,000 per week and rising!
- How will we cope if waste is reduced and the “super-sized” plant is starved?
- How will we cope when new equipment changes how we deal with waste – i.e. tyre, metals & wood shredding?
- How much is the new road going to cost?
- What affects will the Mineral Waste strategy have on transport movement, noise and emission levels?
- What provision has been made for the HSE to amend the Buncefield Zones to safer levels?
- Has T&TS made any contingency allowances for dealing with potential problems relating to the existing Toxic Waste storage at the waterfront?
- Adding the Municipal Solid Waste Incinerator to the La Collette site reduces its usefulness and value.

## **Currently problems and in the past**

*Jersey has several chimneys that are potential sources of damaging emissions, which could have been hazardous to health for a great many years.*

*A Municipal Solid Waste Incinerator*

*Two Heavy Oil Burning Power Stations*

*Two Public Health Chimneys at the General Hospital and Crematorium*

*Others at Hotels and Laundries etc*

There is an emerging and considerable amount of unresolved concern relating to the possible harmful effects generated from the Bellozanne Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Incinerator, since the 1980's and possibly earlier.

It is disturbing to find out that the States declined to fund devices to reduce pollution 12 years ago

This together with the knowledge that other local chimneys were Pollutant sources has also raised the public's awareness to the possibility they have caused damage to residents health.

This is one of the reasons why some of the Public have little confidence in the ability of its politicians to choose a viable alternative option

## **WHY THE PROPOSED INCINERATOR IS NOT RIGHT FOR JERSEY**

Historical and current issues @ October 2008

Because there has been insufficient emphasis on the Scrutiny process – inadequate technically informed political debate and a reluctance to fully engage the Public of the Island in meaningful debate in a complex subject.

1. Some concerns originate from its operational methods and poor management of materials to be incinerated – they may have changed recently, but have been criticised as not following UK/EU best practice for most of its operating life.
2. T&TS CEO, John Richardson stated that he had tried and failed on 4 occasions to secure funding from the States to improve the emissions in the mid 1990's
3. What needs to be considered is the actual level of concern relating to public access to information on the potential harm that could be done by this unit?
4. It needs to be exactly established what knowledge the officers running the plant had and if it was possibly withheld from the public.
5. It should be established exactly what Politicians were told in order to base their decisions upon when they refused money to reduce known harmful emissions levels.
6. Exactly what was the role of the MOH, from the late 1980's in relation to health monitoring of local chimney emissions and what actions if any were taken to protect the public's health.
7. Was there any element of negligence present that may have caused detrimental health effects, which include cancer, depressions, suicide, emotional, hormonal, behavioural and educational disorders?
8. Was there any negligence present in the inability to recognise and deal with potential harmful emissions
9. Why were T&TS last emission tests in 1993 only taken at a level that is known not to be the best indicator of health risks i.e. PM10, instead of PM2.5 and below.
10. Both the T&TS Minister and CEO clearly indicated in recent quotes that the chimney has been a Hazard to health or "DIRTY". The exact level of hazard, its risk to health and potential damage must be established quickly.
11. The T&TS Consultants Babbie & Fischtner stated in Volume 2 of their January 2007 report state that the Bellozanne MSW Incinerator should have been shut down in 1996 as it was emitting 20 times more / worse Dioxins and Furans than any other similar UK plant.
12. Who decided to locate and build a new secondary school 100 metres away from Bellozanne MSW Incinerator, and Queens Road Power station Chimney and 250 Metres from the Crematorium Chimney
13. Has any specific health monitoring been carried out at that school in relation to health and detrimental behavioural issues and any comparisons made with other similar schools, in different locations including the UK.
14. Is there no viable alternative to continue to produce 20,000+ tons of toxic ash every year with the inherent handling and containing risk to health as well as the cost of long term secure storage to avoid future damage to health.

15. How long will we be able to put toxic substances in plastic bags close to a protected and registered internationally registered environmental protection zone – Ramsar 3 UK151.
16. Why are T&TS now keen to comply with UK&EU emission guidelines when they failed to use them in the late 1980's.

T&TS point out that Bellozanne MSW Incinerator is not the only source of pollutants in the Island

1. They mention traffic flow and vehicle emissions, which are being monitored in 2 locations.
2. They fail to mention:
  - a. Their 3 failed Green Waste processing plants that have created very serious water and air borne pollutants.
  - b. The previous Potato Leachate and the Air Port Fire Service Training ground pollution
  - c. The current 3+ Toxic ash waste sites
3. They are aware of the 2 JEC Chimneys – La Collette and Queens Road and their poor history in relation to smoke and fire
4. They are aware of the Public Health Chimneys at the General Hospital and Crematorium (recently replaced)
5. They are aware of a large number of other local chimneys at Hotels and Laundries etc.
6. But they have failed to provide evidence of what monitoring and recording of emissions has taken place in the past.
7. Is there any physical evidence that T&TS and the MOH have been safeguarding Islanders health?

Has the Public and Environmental Health Departments followed best practice and been effective in monitoring the risks to residents health and the general environment over the past 30 years

1. Jersey's MOH Dr Rosemary Geller and a UK GP, Dr Dick Van Steenis seriously disagree about the harmful affects of living close to – or downwind of Incinerator and Power Generating chimneys - This is an important issue that MUST be resolved ASAP.
2. Are emission statistics available for the 6 larger chimneys i.e. Apart from the acidic particles emitted from the both JEC chimneys immediately around and upto 200 m of the base - what else was floating down onto residents, and what affects could they have on health and welfare.
3. What are the life spans of the Butyl bags containing the Toxic Ash on the reclamation site?
4. What long term affects will there be from the unrestrained dumping of Toxic Ash on the old reclamation site along the Esplanade?
5. What precautions are being made to reduce the indiscriminate waste dumping of inappropriate materials in the present reclamation site? i.e. asbestos, glass etc.

6. Are reports of an odour and ash like scum at the Havre des Pas swimming pool being investigated?
7. Why is St.Aubins bay still blighted with strong sewage smells and green sand? Should it have health warning posted?

Has the process of deciding upon where a replacement MSW Incinerator should be located been carried out i. efficiently, ii. economically and iii. in conjunction with all concerned parties.  
Has the process of deciding upon what type of replacement MSW Incinerator should be obtained been carried out iv. efficiently, v. economically and vi. in conjunction with all concerned parties?

1. NO to all 6 parts of the questions
2. John Richardson said on the 9<sup>th</sup> October 2008 that there had been 15 “Public Meeting”, we are not aware of the definition he is working to, but would only refer to them as “presentations”
3. We have attended 9 + meetings where some members of the public were either targeted or generally invited (3)
4. In each case the attendees were lectured to and usually kept to a very tight agenda /schedule with a restricted amount of questions and discussion time been made available.
5. A classic copy of this procedure was the vastly expensive and possibly ineffective “Imagine Jersey” event at the Royal Yacht Hotel, where there was;
  - Preset Q&A exercises with no opportunity to look out side the “box”.
  - An unrepresentative cross section of the immigrant community e.g. 1 Polish, 0 Portuguese!
  - Difficulty or discouragement in getting answers to important related questions.
6. Obtaining the full picture in these sessions was virtually impossible and there was always the feeling that there was a “fast track” procedure being followed, with little or no opportunity for deviation.
7. “Too little meaningful discussion too late” was a commonly made statement at the initial Liverpool University managed Impact Assessment in January 2007 –
8. The comment did find its way into the final draft of the Impact Assessment in June 2008. It was not supplied to the earlier participants for either their comments or proof reading to correct embarrassing inaccuracies
9. How much reliance on public consultation was attributed to 700 “blind “ telephone calls “managed “ by Liverpool University.
10. Why was the January 2007 Babbie & Fischtner report was not made available for the initial Impact Assessment meeting late January 2007 nor at the subsequent May meeting.
11. Why was Volumes I-III of the January 2007 Babbie & Fischtner report not made available for the Liaison Group?

12. When the report was requested on 01-10-08 why was only 1 of the 39 chapters provided at the end of the 16-10-08 meeting.?
13. Why was the unsolicited request to add agenda items made on 01-10-08 for the next meeting to be held on the 16-10-08 only referred to after the meeting had officially ended?
14. I would sincerely argue that the events have been far from efficient e.g. Impact assessment by Liverpool University – poorly managed
15. The two most recent information meetings where Public attendance has been invited on the 9<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> October were very poorly advertised.
16. Economic? Was getting 3 sets of UK consultants to attend one 3 hour evening session the best use of taxpayers money, potentially costing the public around £4,000.
17. Figures are yet to be made available for Liverpool Universities work but that could be well in excess of £150,000
18. Evidently Babbie & Fischtner were paid fees approaching £1M in 2004 and as they produced a 2007 report for T&TS and remain closely involved with them that figure could have easily escalated to well over £2M by now.
19. Value for money can be a difficult concept when dealing with consultants, as they are able to produce a variety of reports dependant upon what they are asked to do, what they want to do and what they are paid to do. It might also be dependant upon their commercial association with other related businesses
20. Reports therefore may often be entirely different and occasionally contradictory:
  - All the relevant facts available as seen at that time
  - All the relevant details given the remit to which they are working to
  - The outcome they are asked to support.
21. The Incinerator Community Liaison Meetings, which started in January 2008, appears to have an unrepresentative invited group, who are frequently out numbered 4:1 by T&TS or JEC officers, because with a core of around 10 invitees only 3 or 4 regularly attend.
22. Because no one really wants to admit there may have been serious health damaging affects from the existing Bellozanne MSW incinerator and other chimneys, there is some considerable spin attached to almost any new plant as being the solution to all the problems, with insufficient current evidence to prove that the La Collette is the best location or the technology the most safe and cost effective currently available.
23. Some of the criteria previously to decide upon the proposed location can now be seriously questioned due to time delay and changes in circumstances.
24. Many of the “alternative “ technology solutions may have now become more acceptable if not desirable.

25. Emission levels and qualities of the proposed replacement to the existing MSW Incinerator are at best projections not established facts, as very few new MSW Incineration plants would want to be connected up remotely to a very old Heavy Oil burning Power Generating Chimney.
26. It is difficult to believe that there is any financial benefit in using an old and different technology chimney with the added issues relating to linking up costs.
27. Hopefully T&TS have not fallen foul of their own guidelines i.e. having 2 plants running for 20 years. We are only aware of one plant set up like they and their Consultants are proposing i.e. linking a new MSW Incinerator to a very old Heavy Oil Burning Power Generating Chimney previously known to be a serious polluter.
28. As it isn't the correct type of chimney designed for the MSW Incinerator, it may even invalidate any performance related criteria laid down in the Incinerator contract!
29. By proposing that the MSW Incinerator is located at La Collette one of the major levers was to "Save Money" but at what real cost in additional equipment, risk to health and associated future works. Like moving the Fuel Farm, a new access road, re-align existing roads, site security, changes in exclusion zones etc.
30. Some reluctance in the discussion of costs re replacement.

Will the MSW Incinerator be an *efficient & economic* supplier of Combined Heat and Power?

1. Very questionable
2. Well-documented claims made at a similar time to this for the existing Bellozanne MSW plant never fully materialised.
3. There was no district heating
4. The power generation figures have not been made available in comparison to plant capital costs v loss of income, running costs, which include labour and maintenance. These figures need to be compared against power used i.e. savings and sales at a price presumably lower than EDF Nuclear rates due to: inconsistency of supply, lack of competition and volatility.
5. High operational costs

Why are T&TS always so keen to quote UK or EU standards for compliance purposes

1. Why did T&TS decide to ignore UK and EU guidelines when they found out in the 1980's that the Bellozanne chimney was seriously dirty and polluting the surrounding area?
2. Are they the best standards to follow?
3. If they are being revised shortly will our MSW Incinerator be compliant or out of date when it fires up
4. Are we future proofing the process we are spending so much on?



5. Why are we now in a rush to complete the purchase?
6. Is the technology “past its sell by date”
7. Have we taken enough advise from alternative and conflicting sources to act as Peer Reviewers

#### Information Delivery Meetings in October 2008

1. These followed a similar format to other except that the first half of the agenda was presented by two members of staff from an architects and landscape gardeners – who with colleagues were flown in for that purpose whilst the Planning and Environment look at a current reserved matters application that has to be passed by the end of the month! Unseemly haste once again!
2. It seems to be strange that Jersey cannot find its own shed designer and gardener.
3. The Shed designer’s presentation was almost child like and condescending. He tried in glowing phrases and irrelevant statements to paint a glowing picture of a Corrugated Steel Shed. Jersey has had a long-term relationship with metal sheds of various descriptions. It had all of the normal truss like structures that you see in supermarkets and shopping Malls. It looked absolutely nothing like the introductory slides he showed. In fact most of the supermarket and shopping centres looked better than his design. It had a very strange, irrelevant and useless fencing like structure planted on top, to “soften the impact”.
4. It was to have these amazing yet glazed open spaces in the walls for light access and visibility, which I would normally call windows.
5. If he really wanted it to blend and mould itself to the surroundings it would make more sense to have the whole structure, walls and roof made from glass to let the light in and out and mak it almost transparent! (With some sort of blast proof internal meshing just in case of course!)
6. The gardeners presentation was detailed and factual, as he seemed to have done some onsite and on island research.
7. However planting on top of the Butyl bags may be inherently difficult and no mention of site security was made.
8. They may as well erect a 5-metre high steel security fence around the area and paint murals of trees and shrubs on it.

#### Conclusions.

Put the project on hold pending a full Judicial Enquiry – an independent review is needed to establish if this process has been conducted and managed impartially, as:

Health risks have recently emerged and remain unresolved to the satisfaction of residents. Evidence is emerging – quite late in the planning process that indicates that a variety of previous practices may have been flawed. – That in itself needs clarification immediately. Doubts have arisen about the procedural and professional skills of previous operators and Political decision makers.

Doubts have been raised about the choice of plant location and type that needs to be clarified urgently in relation to long-term cost and effectiveness.

This is the Islands largest single item to ever be purchased.

Unfortunately the current economic climate makes any large investment a crucial issue for the community to be aware of and its potential liabilities.

However conversely a delay could reduce the original price – as long as the company remain in business to service its product.

Why are there so many questions remaining unanswered by some residents after what T&TS CEO John Richardson calls 15 Public meetings have taken place.

Is it because that they were not public meetings where full and frank discussions could be carried out?

Is it because information has not been available or even withheld?

Why haven't our Elected Politicians exercised due diligence with regard to our previous health risks and the future potential problems?

Two enquiries are now required in order to establish for once and for all:

- Have there been serious health risks associated with local chimney emissions
- Has a proper impartial system been used to select the location and type of the Bellozanne Municipal Solid Waste Incinerator?

We remain concerned residents

Robert Le Brocq & Keith Shaw