

STATES OF JERSEY

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

BLAMPIED ROOM, STATES BUILDING

WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Present: Deputy Phil Rondel (Review Chairman)
Senator Ted Vibert
Senator Jean Le Maistre
Deputy Rob Duhamel
Deputy Bob Hill

In attendance: Professor Chris Coggins (Waste Management Consultant)
Professor Jim Swithinbank (Sheffield University)

EVIDENCE FROM:

Mr Chick Anthony
Mr Craig Leach
Mr Geoff Compton
(ENVIRONMENT SECTION
SOCIÉTÉ JERSIAISE)

on

Monday, 18th October 2004

(14:00:58 - 14:47:08)

(Digital Transcription by Marten Walsh Cherer Limited,
Midway House, 27/29 Cursitor St., London, EC4A 1LT.
Telephone: 020 7405 5010. Fax: 020 7405 5026)

DEPUTY RONDEL: Good afternoon, gentlemen. Could we have your names, please, for the record?

(Mr Anthony, Mr Leach, Mr Compton, Senator Le Maistre, Professor Swithinbank, Senator Vibert, Carol Le Quesne, Deputy Rondel, Deputy Duhamel, Professor Coggins, and Deputy Hill were recorded as being present.)

DEPUTY RONDEL: Before starting I have to read you the following notice. It is important that you fully understand the conditions under which you are appearing at this hearing. You will find a printed copy of the statement that I am about to read to you on the table in front of you.

Shadow Scrutiny Panels have been established by the States to create opportunities for training States Members and Officers in developing new skills in advance of the proposed changes of government. During the shadow period, the Panel has no statutory powers and the proceedings at public hearings are not covered by Parliamentary privilege. This means that anyone participating, whether a Panel Member or a person giving evidence, is not protected from being sued or prosecuted for anything said during hearings. The Panel would like you to bear this in mind when answering questions and to ensure that you understand that you are fully responsible for any comments you make.

MR ANTHONY: Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Having submitted to us your ideas on waste management in writing, would you please, if you so wish, give us your views verbally?

MR ANTHONY: Well, I don't think we have anything to add to what we have said, except perhaps a few comments on the draft document strategy which we have just seen. I don't think any of us have had a chance to really delve into that.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Would **that** be the document?

MR ANTHONY: I haven't seen it in the flesh, I have only seen it on the screen.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Oh right.

MR ANTHONY: I have really only had a chance to have a look at the management summary of that, because there seemed to be summaries of summaries of summaries in it, so I got more than a little confused, frankly. So I might like to say something about that, but I think on our main paper we agreed with the principles, the hierarchy and that those were things that needed to be

dealt with. The problem, as we saw it, was how they were dealt with. There are arguments for and against each of the headings.

The disposal really is the main problem, as we see it, and, as we said there, we had in the Société a couple of years ago invited Dr Haden-Taylor to present to the ... well an open meeting it was. We found his system very convincing and were rather surprised that it didn't appear to find favour elsewhere. But it still remains our feeling that we would like to see really a rather deeper investigation of the alternatives, because he put forward something which was convincing to us, but we were all amateurs with no expertise at all and, you know, he may be totally wrong and we may be completely fooled, but it seemed convincing to us and, you know, we note now that what we feared then, we read in the Draft Strategy where, in our view, everything had seemed to work on the presumption that incineration was going to be, that's what seems to be the recommendation of the Draft Strategy, if we are correct.

I think what we would like to see then is wider assessments, a more independent assessment of, first, what is needed and later how the selection should be made. There is a page in it which I only found this morning, which did seem to -- page 54, I think of the thing -- which did seem to be a little in conflict with the impression we got before. It went into the steps needed, which was commission an environmental impact assessment, etc, etc, then produce a detailed plant specification for issue to suppliers that are able to provide these facilities -- that seemed fine, but it didn't seem to have happened from what we have read in the document -- then conduct tendering -- fine -- and submit planning application, but that seemed to jump one. Who is going to determine the best supplier? That seemed to us to be something which needed more than perhaps just the States' view. It needed a bit of expertise to judge between the responses.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could I ask whose report you are reading from, please?

MR ANTHONY: That is the big, the 63 page one.

DEPUTY RONDEL: The Babtie Fichtner one.

MR ANTHONY: That is the one. Is that the one that you held up?

MRS LE QUESNE: Yes.

MR ANTHONY: Fine, so we are talking about the same thing. I think that is all I need say at present. I don't know if there is anything else you want from us?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: There is just one point. There seemed to be within your submission what I saw as perhaps an over-reliance on one particular technology, the RCR STAG system as being the way forward or the way out for Jersey. Do you have any comments on any other alternative technologies that might perhaps actually save even more than what is being suggested by the take-up of that particular technology?

MR ANTHONY: Well, I will ask Mr Leach to comment on that.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could you turn the microphone to Mr Leach so that it picks everything up?

MR ANTHONY: Oh sorry, yes. I will ask him to do it, but I would start off by saying that I don't think we probably can go into detail because that is what we have heard.

MR LEACH: Yes. I think it is a good point. I felt reading the report it was quite valid that they were setting criteria for an adoption of a technology which was entirely reasonable. If you took a cynical view of it though, it was, in effect, loading the dice a little, because the other alternatives are either not established, there are only pilot plants built. I was told of an example of a pyrolysis plant which could take one wheelie bin at a time, so there are all sorts of problems there. However, I think that the public perception would be much improved if it was, as Chick was saying, if there was another independent assessment of the technology, perhaps this time taking away some of the loading on the dice. By that I mean, for example, I was talking to one company this morning called International Waste Industries and they fall into the same trap of the criteria that they have only got a pilot plant under construction. But they said they could help counter that by having a technology insurance policy, whatever that might mean. As ball park figures for Jersey's requirements, say, 100,000 tonnes a year, they would be talking £10 million. Now, there could well be all sorts of reasons why it would not be appropriate, but I think the public perception of this whole issue would be much improved if that Haden-Taylor technology and any others were ... if we were prepared to look at them objectively and rationally without

discarding them perhaps a little too much out of hand as so far. So I hope that answers that question.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes. One further one if it may. There does still seem to be an over-reliance on the technology at the end. We heard from various submissions this morning that perhaps what would be of greater significance to the Island would be changes on the educational front, which could be seen to be lifestyle changes, which would actually seek to minimise the amount of rubbish or to encourage people to separate at home and things like that which would offset a large part of the costs. Bearing that in mind, and the figures were produced in the green document indicating the experience in other EU countries in terms of recycling and composting, which are largely in excess of our rates or our projected rates, and looking at the fact that within the technical document it has been stated publicly that Public Services have indicated that they don't think that the Island could actually achieve a combined composting and recycling rate above 35% -- Germany, for example, are round about 60% -- do you think that it is outlandish for the Scrutiny Panel to actually consider that Jersey might some day emulate the experience of those EU countries that are achieving substantially higher figures for their recycling and composting?

MR COMPTON: I think it is difficult to visualise that a small island like ours can actually emulate the same as EU countries. I know that at a public meeting that I attended that the President did say that 35% was the optimum level and we haven't gone into it in detail, but that would probably be the right figure. The point about recycling in this Island is that there is no recycling culture and we haven't got any public support for it, or we haven't generated any public support for it. So it is very difficult to get it off the ground when there isn't that culture to start with.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes, but the fact that such culture exists in other societies fairly close to us, I mean, what surprises me in your comments is the statement that you have categorically stated that you don't think Jersey will ever be able to achieve figures which are routinely being achieved elsewhere.

MR COMPTON: We are an island community and I think probably an island community would find it more difficult to achieve that, a developed island community such as ours, rather than

where you have greater facilities possibly in Germany and Lowland countries. The only way we would possibly achieve it is by exporting the recyclable waste to other countries so that they could then manage it. I don't think we could probably do it within our independent jurisdiction.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Could you put your finger on why then?

MR COMPTON: It is just instinctive.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Certainly we run an education ----

MR COMPTON: It is just instinct and the fact that there isn't a great public support for it and it is very difficult. If there is so much public apathy, I just don't see how it can be achieved. There isn't the ... unless there is going to be a great educational campaign and you are going to actual mobilise public opinion, it is very difficult to see how it could be achieved; whereas in Germany and other countries they have done that and Jersey seems to be very apathetic in these sorts of matters. In environmental matters generally there seems to be a great deal of apathy and this is just one example.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Are you surprised at the elements within the Waste Management Strategy which refer, or maybe don't refer enough, as to the educational provision for changing people's lifestyles?

MR COMPTON: Well, there is probably insufficient. I mean, you can only educate people who want to be educated and, if they don't want to be educated into changing their lifestyle, you are not going to achieve that. I mean, if, for example, you hold meetings and only about 70 people, who are generally the same people, come to those meetings and there isn't a general interest or concern about how we manage our waste, then I would think it would be very difficult to ... how do you raise that interest? I mean ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: The Government has actually introduced seatbelt laws and it could have been argued that many people didn't wish to be restricted by the seatbelt legislation, but they have actually literally buckled under and habits have changed. So could not the Government actually find itself in a position whereby bringing forward substantial changes in legislation would actually encourage people or begin to encourage people to move towards better lifestyles?

MR COMPTON: Well it may do over a period of time, but I think this should have been put into

effect at an earlier stage. I mean, we have had a Waste Strategy. I think it has been produced four years ago, for example, when the incinerator was costed at £60 million, but no great attempt was then made to get public ... to mobilise popular opinion at that stage. I mean, if one can see that there is going to be some move towards this getting popular support, then perhaps something can be done, but it hasn't happened so far.

MR LEACH: I think that is part of the process. For instance, I have got the Isle of Wight brochure here. I think most of you will be familiar with the *Waste Aware* campaign in Hertfordshire. In Germany they produce quite a thick booklet. My German wasn't enough to read it, but in other words there is a lot that can be done, to be achieved through education. The other area to be looked at is financial incentives. You do come across places where they have a bag charge, which incentivises people to compost at home rather than fill a bag which they then have to pay for. That is another incentive for increasing your recycling rates.

I would make one major qualification though, in that it is all very well producing recyclables, but then what do you do? Others here will know more than I do on this, but I do hear that places like Cyprus and Germany have a serious problem. They have created this recyclable mass, then what? So the process needs to be grounded in reality and it may well be that you may have a whole football field of recyclables which the only way of disposing of might be an incineration or some other process.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. I must say I was a little bit concerned to hear the evidence that you have just given [referring to Mr. Crompton], because it seems to be in total conflict with Concern's evidence, which you yourself are a member of, because Concern have told us -- I will read this to you -- *'Recycling requires the participation and support of the public to succeed. This in turn requires public debate and information. As far as we can tell, none of this has happened in Jersey. Given the level of public consultation that was involved in the production of the Island Plan, it is quite astonishing that a proper waste management strategy was somehow "omitted". And given that lack of strategy, the commissioning of a new incinerator (or any other piece of infrastructure) appears to be a case of putting the cart before the horse.'* So what

they are really saying is until you put a strategy together for waste minimisation and recycling, you are really putting the cart before the horse by deciding how you are going to get rid of the waste. Do you agree with that sentiment?

MR LEACH: You saw there was a difference of emphasis in what we both said, so I would go along with Concern. In my case, I support Concern.

SENATOR VIBERT: If I can just deal with your actual submission, it would appear that in fact what you are doing, what you have been saying in this submission, is that not enough attention has been paid to alternative technologies. You have actually latched your wagon on to the STAG system, and I assume that is because that has been the only one you have been able to look at and get any information on.

MR LEACH: Exactly.

SENATOR VIBERT: It is a question of how one has to assess those alternative technologies. Now, we are fortunate in fact to have two experts on our Panel who have shown the Panel that there is a system that is used in the United Kingdom in which this kind of technology can be assessed and judged by experts. It is quite clear, and has been clear from the evidence this morning, that the STAG system does not stack up in any way, shape or form against the criteria required for the new technologies in the United Kingdom. That has led to a number of errors basically in your submission because you have used evidence that has been given to you that we now know is totally inaccurate; for instance things like none are promoting incineration which fails to achieve any of the targets which are the European targets. Now that is totally untrue. We have found out that in fact incineration nowadays meets all of the targets of all of the EEC requirements, because they have updated it.

DEPUTY RONDEL: A point of clarification from Deputy Duhamel, I think?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: No, I will pass over it.

DEPUTY RONDEL: All right, okay.

SENATOR VIBERT: So in fact you have gone down that route and you have talked about Thailand, where the Government has adopted this technology, Johannesburg has done it and in the UK etc, etc. In fact, we have asked this morning to see all the documentation that confirms

this. We are going to get it apparently within the next couple of days, but I take it you haven't seen any documentation ----

MR ANTHONY: No, no.

SENATOR VIBERT: ---- to actually say that that is the case. You do actually say in your submission that you are not in a position to make a technical evaluation of any of the stuff, but you do say "*its international acceptability commends it and its principles are ones that we fully support.*" In fact, there is no international acceptability of the technology at all that we can trace.

MR ANTHONY: Fine, right.

SENATOR VIBERT: So really what ----

MR LEACH: I don't think that would change from the point that was being addressed though, that the alternatives perhaps need a more critical look.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes.

MR LEACH: I mean, I am happy to pass **this** one around. It is just one that has been ... International Waste Industries. It is anaerobic technology and it would cost 10 million, I am told.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes, because ----

MR LEACH: But the point I was making, the most important point is that, even accepting incineration, which I would accept there is nothing wrong from a pollution point of view these days from modern incineration plants, there are alternative technologies around and we need to take a fresh look.

SENATOR VIBERT: Exactly, a fresh look.

MR LEACH: That is the point.

SENATOR VIBERT: That is really the main point. The main point that you are actually making, which is really the point that we are making to the Committee as well, is that we have not seen enough of the alternative technologies ----

MR LEACH: Indeed.

SENATOR VIBERT: ---- before decisions are made. I think also we would want to put to you that the assessment about recycling places the Committee here in a bit of an awkward situation,

because they need to replace an incinerator which is currently doing 50 to 60,000 tonnes of waste a year and they are saying that it is going to be 100,000 tonnes, that really that is the amount it is going to be. If that is reduced as a result of recycling to the 60% level, we are only going to need an incinerator to do 40,000 tonnes. So, therefore, their position is that recycling is not top of their list anywhere, because if it is that way we are going to have to find another alternative method for getting rid of the residual. So that is certainly a situation we are having to deal with on the Panel. I wondered whether you had any comments, because it did seem with the need to continue to be able to recycle and minimise the amount of waste, that was an absolute criteria in a waste management strategy.

I would like to also ask you about France. We went over and had a look in France quite recently, and they are up to in one place, quite a large area, up to nearly 40% now and that has all been done by education, by publicity, by work in schools.

MR ANTHONY: That is right.

SENATOR VIBERT: So to be able to achieve it you have to change public perception and public opinion and that means spending money. Now, this is worth spending half a million pounds to achieve that to reduce the amount of waste going in an incinerator and that would actually do the job in Jersey very simply because half a million pounds goes a very long way in a promotion programme. So really we have a situation in Jersey -- this is what I wanted to put to you -- that not enough work is being done in terms of changing the public attitude and the real plan ... we can't find a plan for recycling or waste management in that respect.

MR ANTHONY: Our first sort of chunk, our piece on domestic waste starts "*We believe that there needs to be a major educational campaign ...*" You know, that is it. I think we wouldn't disagree with anything you said. The figures would be marvellous if one could get them, and one should get them. I mean, that is the way, taking a very wide view, internationally it should be. It should be sustainable. It should be promoted in every way. But, in the end, will we succeed? We can't tell. You may have far more information than we can have, but from the outside we feel that, for instance, the hierarchy makes sense as a hierarchy and, as to when you make the choice, I think it is perhaps too soon to make the choice.

SENATOR VIBERT: The choice was made four years ago actually. It has been made.

MR ANTHONY: Well, the choice being to go for an incinerator? We have always been told that that choice was not made, that all the options are open. We have never believed it, but that is what we were told and everything went that way. You know, you can see little bit after little bit after little bit based on the assumption that. Certainly in those days the arguments, they haven't settled yet, I am sure, about the benefits or the disbenefits of incineration, but they were very strongly anti-incineration at that stage and yet all we could see was "This is the road we are going". Perhaps we swung too strongly the other way, but something pushed us, something niggled.

MR COMPTON: The danger possibly is that Public Services at the moment are concerned, very concerned, with going ahead with the incinerator. They see it as something that is very pressing and needs to be in operation by the end of 2008 and it has become more pressing. The other part of their strategy, recycling, reuse and minimisation, will become a footnote. They have priced a recycling centre at £0.7 million or £0.3 million -- I don't know what the figure is -- but clearly the incinerator is 80-something million and that is obviously the headline, you know, the major project which they need to get underway, I think, by 2006 for to be built by the end of 2008.

My concern is that the two should not be decoupled, that the incinerator should not go ahead without a comprehensive waste management strategy in place at the same time, and that could be a possibility whereby, you know, within the States there could be some sort of trade off and they could say "Well, okay, you must have your incinerator, but the recycling plant can be reviewed" and it gets put on a backburner and eventually gets dropped. The two must not be decoupled. I think, as far as I understand it from a conversation with Public Services, that they are determined that it should not be decoupled, but of course they have got to stick to that. Otherwise, you know, they may be under pressure.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I put it to you that in fact, coming back to the analogy of the cart before the horse, in a document that was prepared by the European Commission, headed "*Waste Management in Island Communities: A Strategy to Integrate Waste to Energy Policies*", it says very clearly that "*Incinerators are designed on the basis of specific throughput and calorific*

value of waste. We cannot alter these parameters at a later stage, i.e., by introducing another waste management option such as recycling of paper or plastics without affecting their performance.”

So what they are really saying is, until you have done your assessment of how you are going to actually handle the recycling, what is the volume of the various kinds of waste that are going to go in, you actually can't effectively design the plant that needs to do the job. So the waste recycling has to come first. That is really what you are saying about decoupling it. The only difference is you are putting an incinerator on the front and the waste minimisation at the back instead of the other way around.

MR COMPTON: Well, that is the impression I get from meetings that I have attended by Public Services, that they are putting the incinerator first.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes.

MR COMPTON: And the rest behind, which is not the right way round.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, they are doing it on the basis of the timescale. It has to be done by 2008.

MR LEACH: I think there are several issues. What the Isle of Wight -- **this** is their annual report **here**. It is quite well structured, with targets by year, performance against target, a target for year seven and so forth. I think that is what you were getting to.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes, it is a waste management strategy.

MR LEACH: We need a strategy which gives specifics, which this does. It is done to very specific levels and that is what we should have implemented some time ago. I can leave these as a sample, if you wish.

SENATOR VIBERT: Fine. Thank you.

MR LEACH: The attraction of ... the point was well taken about the waste that goes into the incinerator and that is an attraction of some of the other technologies, as I understand it -- I am sure your experts will know better -- that with the aerobic and anaerobic process, the one I have given you a sheet for, there they can ... before it enters the burning unit, they get the right moisture levels [homogeneity] so there isn't that problem of divergence. That is my understanding of it. With a conventional incinerator you do have the problem you have

described.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Hill?

DEPUTY HILL: Yes. Could I just assure Mr Leach actually or just to remind him, because I heard what Mr Anthony started off saying, that you would welcome other options, and just remind him that the rôle of the Scrutiny Committee, with our terms of reference, is, just to remind you, that we are to review the current position with regard to strategic and other policy proposals in respect of that and -- and I think this is very important actually -- to scrutinise alternative waste strategies and technologies. So we are here as an independent body. We are not here supporting one view or the other. That is why we welcome your presence here, as to obviously in a way we hope we will assist Public Services in maybe arriving at the right decision. The decision they are going ahead with at the moment may well be the right one, but until we have gone through all the processes we won't know. In fact, it may well be that the decision they are making is the wrong one, but who knows? If I can give you that sort of assurance that, you know, that is our rôle here.

I also, if I could refer you almost to the front page of your report actually, it says "*We believe that community involvement is essential and that, without it, authoritarian attempts to control the problem will at best be less effective than they could be and at worst may fail to make impact and involve a waste of money.*" We are getting back a little bit more to what Senator Vibert was saying. This morning we heard an interesting concept, or it was for me because I hadn't heard it before, when we were talking about whether we can get co-operation. There was talk about the possibility that in future you and I, when we went in and bought a new fridge or a new car, may well pay or give some form of payment to ensure that that goes into a waste strategy fund somewhere along the line so that when our car or our fridge gets to be at a stage where it is no longer of any value, we, as the purchaser, have already made our contribution to get it disposed of. Have you any thoughts on that, on that point of view, because, again, we are looking at authorities and someone being told to do something which they may not be coerced to do? Do you think it would work in Jersey? Or had you heard of it?

MR ANTHONY: I only recently heard of it. I knew something like that had been going on some

years ago, but only recently have I given it any thought. I don't know, it's attractive and it's an element of "*polluter pays*" and I think it would be desirable to get that message home to people. The figures that have been quoted about how much it will cost, this, that and the other, what people don't appreciate at present, I think, is how much they are already paying. Now, that cost is perhaps not going to be an extra because they are paying for something already. What it needs to be done in a process of education is to explain how much it is costing, that if you are going to be charged that it is to a large extent instead of something which you are paying now and it needs to be identified as to where there would be some reduction perhaps. I am sure we would all favour the "*polluter pays*" principle, but it is trying to identify it and to get the payment as cheaply as possible, because you will have to set up quite a bureaucracy under many of the systems. I mean, weighing waste is perhaps fairest for the household that only generates a little bit than the household that makes a large claim on things. But that has got to be measured and the measurement there is expensive, I should imagine. But it should be done.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Professor Swithinbank?

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: Yes. As an adviser to the Panel, I would like to say that I have found your contribution to be thoughtful and obviously trying to understand the issues that arise. The issues are very broadly based and I certainly welcome the input from the Isle of Wight, for example, because these are others who are already facing similar problems.

Really there are two things I want to ask. One is, is there some way in which your activities can help to publicise and make people more aware and, secondly, to have a public or an external sounding board is always useful because there are difficult balancing points, for example, the insurance issue. The insurance issue is quite a challenging one because what you have to bear in mind is that the waste will come continuously. An insurance policy doesn't stop it happening. It may be gives you some funding, but insurance is never free. You are paying whatever you get back in the long run.

So there has to be a robust solution. The robust solution is effectively minimising risks, the risks of the system not meeting the demand. The demand is going to come, come what may. So that balanced programme I think is vital. The recycling and minimisation of course, but the

materials still have to be dealt with that cannot be recycled and there are problems right at the end of the line because you will end up with ash which can, if you pay for it, be reused. It has got to be detoxified. Fly ash in particular can be reused. There are some difficult decisions as to how much is something worth or what are the alternatives in terms of additional landfill sites and sea exploitation. I think input from people like yourselves is very valuable.

MR ANTHONY: If I could pick up the end product, this was something that I thought was lacking in the reports ... I don't know what name you want to give it, but the Waste Strategy Report. It doesn't, to my mind, deal with disposal. It seems to talk about the energy from refuse as though that is the end of it, but there is no reference that I could see, certainly in the management thing -- it may be in the body of the report, which frankly I haven't read in detail -- but disposal wasn't touched on. The word is used, but the facts didn't seem to be there.

You make the point of us acting as a sounding board. I think we would be very interested in doing so. In fact, the first, the invitation two years ago was exactly that. We called it a forum and we were trying to get, you know, views or a little bit of education perhaps to States Members that came, although I don't think many did. It is the sort of thing that certainly the environment section of the Société sees as part of its function, to try and protect the environment and waste is one of those elements. At the end of our piece, it actually talks about things which are perhaps not so material, but pollution as such. We see that as an element of waste and we would hope that perhaps this Committee can encourage Public Services, the Planning Committee and Environment to think in those terms, that pollution of all sorts is waste and it should be brought into everything that we deal with. We mentioned just the light spill. It is quite simple, it is aggravating, but it is total waste and land pollution is something which you have to put fertilisers on the land, but that is waste because what goes into the sea is doing all the wrong things.

MR LEACH: I think the first point you make could be addressed partly by the States, which is the biggest employer on the Island, setting leadership by example, by introducing policies of waste management in its own business which could then, I think, be fairly easily extended to the corporates, the banks and so on.

SENATOR VIBERT: Do you mean converting it to gas in the States Chamber?

MR LEACH: Yes, there is an excess of that, yes.

MR ANTHONY: A heating strategy.

MR LEACH: I think the point is leadership by example. The States itself would be a good start then and then I think we would come to the overall education such as we have seen in Hertfordshire and the Isle of Wight.

If I can just carry on for a minute on the theme, going through their strategy just raised question marks to my mind, and, as Chick said, we are not experts, we are laymen. There are several assumptions. Professor Coggins said the other day that the vast majority of waste disposal management exercises in the UK are in the private sector, so it raises the question should we seriously consider the whole thing being taken over by Biffa or some other company who have vast experience of doing it? Has that really been researched into? I know if you speak to John Richardson he will assure you that it is very efficient and all the rest of it and Biffa couldn't increase the efficiency, but nonetheless I think it is a question worth probing.

SENATOR VIBERT: We are calling three of those companies in to give us their input because you are right, it is another option that has not actually been considered.

MR LEACH: Right. Going through their energy recovery disposal policy, landfill, I just question, again going back to we are layman, is landfill or land reclamation an opportunity for Jersey? Off the wall, you know, but would a marina at Havre des Pas, would that have a huge requirement for potential waste products to make? I just ask the question. Landfill always has negative connotations. Could it be a positive one? On the Isle of Wight they are apparently building a hill. They are filling a valley as a beautification scheme, but, again, it is probably off the wall, but it is a question which perhaps Jersey ought to raise.

Export. This is why I went into some detail and Senator Ozouf phoned me up the other day to thank me, but I have been in touch with Brussels and DEFRA to ask the question, that this policy has dismissed exports as not being feasible or possible and they both came back with very similar answers that, with a bilateral agreement, it might be possible. So, again, whether the economics of export stack up is another issue, but, again, is it a question we should be addressing or exploring in more detail than has been done by their strategy so far?

Anaerobic digestion. Again, it says it is not feasible. According to International Waste Industries and other companies no doubt maybe it is feasible. So the assumption needs challenging.

Refuse derived fuel production. There is no comment there. The Isle of Wight is interesting though. That is what they do. They produce floc, which is then exported to cement kilns. It involves shipping. It is an island, like Jersey. You know, should not we be doing a lot of exchange of information on the whole waste process? So those were the things as I went through **this** that I thought ought to be challenged (if that is the right word) to make a constructive questioning of it.

SENATOR VIBERT: I think you will be very pleased to know that I think all of those we are taking up.

MR COMPTON: Just one point. Coming back on the reclamation point, there is the probability or the possibility of an environmental impact on the marine ecology particularly at Havre des Pas and Havre des Pas is quite important because it has in a recent report, a recent survey by the Wetland and Wildfowl Trust in the UK, been assessed as a potential SSSI on the basis that it is equivalent in importance with marine ecology to Bembridge in the Isle of Wight.

Now, a recent ... I know a marine biologist spoke recently, Andrew Syvret -- you don't mind if I mention his name -- and said that Havre des Pas has become muddier and boggy recently and he wonders and thinks that a survey is required to find out why this is so because that is obviously having an impact on the marine ecology in the area. So when you talk about reclamation projects and that is one way to dispose of waste, we should bear in mind the impact that it has on the immediate environment and indeed carry out surveys and there should be an environmental impact assessment before such projects are considered, particularly as we have RAMSAR site designation, for example, on the south east coast, so we are recognising the importance of our coastal situation and any development should be seen in that light.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. Professor Coggins?

PROFESSOR COGGINS: Just two comments really. One is that, apart from the over-reliance on one technology, I think you have explained that you are interested in a more holistic review of

technologies, which I think everyone around the table would agree with. I also think it is interesting that you, in your questions and in the texts that you are looking at, are flagging up the possibility of other things rather than just waste. For example, your comments about liquid waste, for example, which is something which has been very slow to develop in the UK. Already we have had water waste management and solid waste management as completely separate options, but there are moves now -- and Leicester is the one example -- where they are beginning to put the two together.

MR ANTHONY: I am glad to say it is, yes.

PROFESSOR COGGINS: At Leicester they are putting in a materials recovery facility and the fine organic material from there will go for to an anaerobic digestion plant, which is already built for dealing with sewerage sludge. So I think there are lots of things going on and I think that is important.

The other thing is obviously I have seen the Isle of Wight material and it seems that you have been doing a little bit of ferreting on good practice elsewhere, which I would always say is a very good thing and we have discussed this. Perhaps in the paperwork there is a lack of that in the Strategy documentation. Thank you, Chair.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Gentlemen, have you any other comments?

MR ANTHONY: I think we can say though that we welcome the existence of this Committee as a questioning and probing committee. I think it is often felt that the States committees do exist somewhat in isolation and it is very difficult to get input to them. We have welcomed changes, more promised than delivered, so far in the Environment Department of open meetings, but those are all moves in the right direction which we welcome in the same way we welcome your Scrutiny Committee.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Professor Swithinbank?

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: Yes. Just a small technical point, Chairman. If you do look at the infill, the sea infill problem it goes into two parts. One is the leakage of material from the infill into the ocean. There are very good examples in Tokyo, where, if you go to Disney Land in Tokyo, you will find it is all built on land recovered from the sea using the material from the

incinerator or incinerators in the area. But it is completely isolated from the ocean by barriers, proper barriers. There is the separate issue of changing movement due to structures put out into the sea that can change the currents. I think those two issues will have to be looked at independently.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Panel Members, any further comments?

SENATOR VIBERT: No, fine. Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: If not, I would like to thank you very much for giving your time, having submitted your written submission and also your verbal submissions. Thank you very much indeed.

MR ANTHONY: Thank you.

MR LEACH: Thank you, Chairman.