

STATES OF JERSEY
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
BLAMPIED ROOM, STATES BUILDING
WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Present: **Deputy Phil Rondel (Review Chairman)**
 Senator Ted Vibert

Deputy Rob Duhamel
Deputy Bob Hill

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

EVIDENCE FROM:

Deputy Ben Fox
Mrs Julie O'Shea
Mrs Elizabeth Cregeen
Mrs Sheila Coutanche
Mr David Agnes
(BELLOZANNE RESIDENTS)

on

Monday, 18th October 2004

(17:08:03 - 18:29:46)

(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: **Welcome everybody on behalf of the Scrutiny Panel.**

MR AGNES: Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: I will firstly start off by introducing the various Members of the Panel so that the public know who is present.

(Professor Swithinbank, Senator Vibert, Carol Le Quesne, Deputy Rondel (Chairman), Deputy Duhamel, Professor Coggins and Deputy Hill (Vice-Chairman) were introduced to the Bellozanne Residents.)

DEPUTY RONDEL: Professor Swithinbank is one of our advisers, along with Professor Coggins. 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 that you make.

Thank you. We have received a submission from Deputy Ben Fox and others ----

DEPUTY HILL: Excuse me, could we know who's who?

DEPUTY FOX: Yes, I was going to ask, could they?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Yes. I was going to ask, but, my apologies, carry on.

DEPUTY FOX: Do you want to go there then?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Yes, we will go there now then and could Deputy Fox introduce his team?

DEPUTY FOX: What I would prefer to do is let them introduce themselves and speak on their representation. Julie, please, would you give your name and who you represent?

MRS O'SHEA: My name is Mrs Julie O'Shea and I represent residents of First Tower. I am a representative of the First Tower Community Association, obviously a ratepayer of St Helier, a

contributor to income tax and I am a Jersey born resident.

DEPUTY FOX: Very good. Elizabeth?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could you please speak into the mike?

DEPUTY FOX: Into **here**.

MRS CREGEEN: That always puts me off. I am Elizabeth Cregeen. I live just off Bellozanne Road. I have been on the Island since 1964. Anything else?

DEPUTY FOX: That will do you. You are representing the people from?

MRS CREGEEN: Yes. I am a ratepayer and a taxpayer.

DEPUTY FOX: And you are representing STAG, which is ----

MRS CREGEEN: Yes, and I assume you all know what STAG means?

DEPUTY FOX: It is not the ----

SENATOR VIBERT: States' Tenants' Action Group.

MRS CREGEEN: Yes.

DEPUTY FOX: Not that one.

MRS CREGEEN: Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: For the record, as everything is being taped, could you please tell Members of the Panel what STAG actually represents?

MRS CREGEEN: STAG actually stands for Steam Temperature And Gasification, not States' Tenants' Action Group.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you.

MR AGNES: Right. I am David Agnes, a resident of La Rue Du Hucquet and I have the concerns of the other residents in that area too.

DEPUTY FOX: That is above Bellozanne Valley.

MRS COUTANCHE: And I am Mrs Sheila Coutanche and I am a resident of Mont a L'Abbe and I represent the area that I live in and residents. I am also secretary of the Mont a L'Abbe Residents Group.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. Did you get that okay on tape?

MRS TREMELLEN-FROST: We are fine. Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you.

DEPUTY FOX: Very good. And I am Deputy Ben Fox and, until tomorrow, I am the only district representative in 3 and 4 who is not on the main Environment & Public Services Committee.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you very much. We have your various submissions. Would you like to give us verbal submissions now, please?

DEPUTY FOX: Yes. What I would like to do is just, by way of an introduction, to say that all of our submissions have been compiled as though we are putting it to the Committee because we have asked, and they have agreed, to allow us to make presentations to the Committee. We recognise that this particular Shadow Scrutiny is not the place for asking questions, and what we will try and do is to bring forth the concerns, the ideas that we wish to bring forward to the Scrutiny Panel and allow you the opportunity to ask obviously us questions, especially in relation to the local area in and around Bellozanne. Bellozanne in fact affects not just the valley but a vast densely residential area, including two schools and community areas. What I am going to do is going to shut up and let the people that are residents in the area make their presentation and if you allow me, if we have got time, just to clarify anything afterwards or add anything, I will do so.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you very much. Which one of your residents ----

DEPUTY FOX: Julie O'Shea I would like to start.

MRS O'SHEA: My concerns are primarily and most importantly those of a mother of two boys who live in the shadow of the current plant and who attend First Tower Primary School.

I am very grateful to Senator Ozouf for his efforts so far in tackling the previously much avoided issue of the current situation at the Bellozanne energy from waste plant. I sincerely thank him for listening over the past few years to residents who have expressed their concerns about the unacceptably high emissions from the incinerator, of the associated current and long term housing implications and for addressing the States of Jersey's obligation not only to the people of this Island but also internationally. It is, therefore, in a positive and constructive manner that I submit my concerns and raise questions with reference to the decisions that must

be made for improvement and implementation of the Waste Strategy and its implications.

Health. My greatest concern is for my children's health, both currently and in the long term. Due to personal circumstances, I am unable to move away from the area at this time. The Public Services Department made it quite clear over two years ago now that the emissions from Bellozanne were well above the EU limits. I am aware of what the emissions contain and their possible impact on health, especially in the young and elderly. When asking a question of E&PS, the Environment & Public Services Department, at the First Tower School meeting on 6th October this year, about what health measures were in place for my children, knowing that the plant would have to remain in operation until an alternative plant is up and running, which would realistically be some time in 2008, Mr Richardson told me that the staff at the plant are currently being monitored and they have experienced no problems. My children spend the majority of their lives in this environment. They are home, in school and they play and sleep in this environment.

My questions that I am going to be putting before the Committee will be, are staff monitored once they have left the employment of E&PS? Will a long term screening and monitoring programme be implemented for residents of the area, especially bearing in mind the volume and type of exposure that we have had and will continue to experience for at least the next four years? Will the health implications of the existing plant and what we burn in it be made public, as this may help to justify the cost and urgency of making a decision as well as kick-starting a recycling programme?

My next concern is the location. Perhaps there is no ideal location to house a waste plant. However, is Bellozanne Valley really the best location for an energy from waste plant, if that is what is going to be chosen? I have listed my points to do with Bellozanne Valley. This is a densely populated residential area with lots of young families in private and associated housing. The roads in this area were never built to take the volume of traffic that we see. As we have no MOT in Jersey, we also experience the emissions from poorly performing vehicles. We have noise pollution from the flow of traffic, refuse carts, vans, lorries, trucks, delivery vehicles, school runs and residents. There are 400 children at the nearby primary school and Haute Vallee

is at the top of West Hill. Bottom ash is currently transported on the busy road that passes by First Tower School on a regular basis. I am told it is dampened down, but only has a tarpaulin tied over the top to stop it from blowing around. Is this acceptable?

Even if some of the recycling activities were relocated to La Collette, as has been suggested, we would still have the issue of fly ash and bottom ash being transported to La Collette for shipment, processing further or recycling. In Jersey we often experience low cloud and dense fog. Living at the front of the valley, you can often see the smoke trail from the top of the stack being kept down and being unable to disperse upwards and outwards up the sides of the valley. Even if emissions from a new cleaner plant were significantly lower, will that still be acceptable? Should this be the chosen plant and location? I understand that a new cable link will need to be installed between the JEC in order to deal with the increased volume of electricity that will be produced. I do not think that the offer of cheap or free heating for residents is an acceptable trade-off.

La Collette reclamation site and my thoughts on that. This is an established and recognised industrial area. The JEC already have a power station located there. Surely this would be able to accommodate the extra electricity generated more cheaply than at Bellozanne. The location is ideal for exporting by sea any sorted waste of good quality for recycling and in the future the planned export once regulations allow for our hazardous waste. The site would mean that ash would not need to be transported on our internal road network. With a new clean plant, the emissions, we are assured, would not pose a hazard. This would be especially true in such an open area that has less housing.

The draft Solid Waste Strategy. These are just my views on how I found the Waste Strategy. I have read both the new draft Strategy and the summary documents. As reported by a number of people at the Department's public consultation meetings, I was disappointed with the quality and repetition of information given, the way it was presented and the impression it gave. I have listed some of the observations and concerns I have relating to these documents.

I am not a statistician, but I know, for example, that when we make comparisons we should have the same starting point. I refer to the bar charts that were contained in the document

comparing European countries' waste disposal records. I do not understand the relevance of comparing Jersey in 2002 with France in '93, Germany and Switzerland in '96, Sweden in '97, Holland in '98 and the UK in 2000 and 2001. I am left with the impression that maybe the document was compiled in a rush. This does not give me confidence in the information being provided or the strategy being recommended.

I feel that a decision has already been made in favour of an energy from waste plant to be built at Bellozanne. I do not feel that excluding La Collette for the two reasons given on pages 47 and 48 of the document are acceptable. The first one was the health and well being of Jersey residents should not be compromised because of the possible La Collette site, for the reasons given in the documents, which says it is on the coast and very visible from the sea. It is already an established industrial zone with a very visible power station along with fuel storage facilities, silos, the abattoir and driver and DSV etc already established there.

The second point, the second reason for not including La Collette is the First Tower ... well, my reasons for how I interpret it. The First Tower area also suffers with severe congestion, not just with traffic related to the incinerator, the sewerage works and dump, but also from the private businesses in the valley and adjoining areas, PSD's stores, yard and vehicles, residents of the area, a large primary school, as I have said before, and a major secondary school.

Although recycling is featured heavily in the document, I have concerns that it is not going to receive the same priority as constructing a new plant or will receive sufficient funding. I feel that it should be treated with equal importance and needs to be implemented sooner rather than later to help reduce the current emissions and obviously to minimise the waste that is being burnt. Referring to the table on page 58 of the document, there is no financial provision for education in relation to recycling. People won't want to recycle if they don't know how or why they should be doing it.

Shadow Scrutiny Panel, I attended the Société Jersiaise's seminar with Professor Coggins as their speaker. I was very impressed with the presentation. However, I was concerned by his comments that he had received insufficient data to make any recommendations for our waste strategy. Professor Swithinbank was appointed as a consultant. He is clearly an expert in the

field of incineration, energy from waste plants, emissions as well as technology. He was also a consultant engineer for the new plant being constructed in Sheffield.

My questions that will be going to the Committee will be who is on the Scrutiny Panel? I know that now. Could I please have confirmation that every single option available to the Island is being investigated, not purely from a financial perspective, but more importantly from an unbiased best for Jersey people and the environment approach that will see us through the next 25 years and can I also be assured that the matters that I bring before the Panel will be given true consideration and will be dealt with objectively? Thank you all for listening.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Yes, I can give you that assurance that we are looking at everything. I do not think we will leave one stone unturned or one bit of paper unturned to come to, hopefully, the right conclusion after examining all the evidence that we have been given and, hopefully, encourage the Public Services, if they haven't looked at certain areas, to look at other areas. But hopefully they will have covered and looked at everything by the time we will have finished our deliberations. Would any Member like to ask any questions? Thank you.

SENATOR VIBERT: First of all, I would like to make clear that I did not write your submission, but I agree with every word you said. Secondly, I would like to talk to you about the alternative technologies. We have had great difficulty today. We have been interviewing for the second time the Committee and I am personally not satisfied that they haven't made their mind up, but they have given us a categoric assurance that they will look at every alternative technology that is available. As I say, the reason I am not satisfied is because all their documentation points to the fact that it can only be an incinerator plant.

What I think the Panel is quite satisfied about is that modern incinerator plants, if it has to be an incinerator, are in fact very safe and do meet all European standards. So I don't think our Panel has any difficulty -- I don't think I am speaking out of order -- in saying that we don't accept the fact that incinerator plants are totally different than the ones that were built. I mean, that was built 25 years ago and it is dreadful. It would be closed down anywhere else in Europe and we sympathise with the residents of Bellozanne and the Island for having to put up with it. But we have looked at it very carefully and we are quite happy at incinerator plants today.

We visited one in Le Havre only 10 days ago which looks like the liner of a ship. You would not even know it is an incinerator plant because they have taken a lot of trouble to architecturally make it look extremely good. There is no sound coming from it. There is no smell coming from it, because they have spent a lot of money making sure that doesn't happen. So we are certainly very happy that if it goes down the incinerator route, it will be a totally different type of plant from the one you have got today. However, our great concern has been, and still is, that they have not given anything like enough attention to all the alternative technologies.

What I would like to show you and just ask for your comment on it is this. That is a photocopy of one of the alternative technologies we have been given and that we have heard about, which actually shows the plant alongside of the incinerator that it is actually working alongside. That company has come forward and put a presentation to us and that is the kind of building that would appear if it was to be at Bellozanne as opposed to an incinerator. So there is a total difference with the alternative technology compared to the incinerator. So I just wanted you to certainly be aware of the fact that, you know, this Committee, this Panel is really going to make sure that we research everything and it is evidence based.

As a result of that, we have actually today been questioning the STAG situation. I presume that the supporters of STAG are doing so because it is probably the only alternative technology that they have actually looked at. But in fact a lot of the statements that were made by the Société about STAG and what it can do and what it complies with are in fact totally wrong. That is the value, I suppose, of Scrutiny because we can actually look into is this right? Are these statements correct? You know, is it as it is supposed to be?

What we have discovered is in fact there is no Haden-Taylor system. What there is, is Mr Haden-Taylor has got a number of technologies that he is able to call on that he wants to put in place to deal with the problem of Bellozanne. What we have discovered is that there is a system in the United Kingdom where emerging technology for waste has to go before a panel and that panel evaluates it, looks at all of it and then decides whether it is acceptable or not to go forward. This system has not gone through that approval rating, so it is a very basic situation

and it has got a long way to go before it could ever be considered by any government. So I think, whilst that is disappointing, I know, for the supporters of the STAG system, that is actually the facts that have been put to us and put to us by some experts that we have on this Panel.

MRS CREGEEN: Then there is not much point me saying anything, is there?

MRS O'SHEA: Can I say for the record that I am not actually personally a supporter of STAG?

SENATOR VIBERT: Hmm hmm.

MRS O'SHEA: I am not here under those terms.

SENATOR VIBERT: No, I realise that. But it is only that one of your panel, I think it was Elizabeth ----

MRS CREGEEN: Elizabeth, yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: And that is not a criticism of you for that. It is the fact that that is what Scrutiny has discovered as a result of the questioning that we have been able to do, the documentation we have been able to look at and the evidence that we have heard here around this table today. As I say, the Société for instance were great supporters of the STAG system because they had not been able to have the facility to go and check on all the statements that had been made about it. We have had that facility and we have got the experts on our Panel who have made it very clear to us that that system has not been approved really by anybody.

MRS CREGEEN: I should like to ask why then there are 18 to 20 of the so-called STAG systems that have been signed up for all around the world?

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, we have asked for the documentation to prove that. You see, you have been told that.

MRS CREGEEN: Yes, I have just been told that, yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: We have asked for that. If that has happened, there must be documentation, heads of agreements, contracts and we have asked for those contracts to be produced. It has been assured to us that we will receive them, but I have to say to you that I have asked for those contracts for nearly two months and nothing has been forthcoming. So if it hasn't been forthcoming in the next seven days, we are going to have to accept the fact that they don't exist.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Right. Deputy Hill?

DEPUTY HILL: Yes. Can I compliment you on your letter? (reference to Mrs O'Shea's evidence)

DEPUTY FOX: Have you got the latest one, because it gobbledygooked, I am afraid.

DEPUTY HILL: Well, it was, yes.

DEPUTY FOX: We will make sure that you get a full copy.

DEPUTY HILL: Yes. In fact, in so far as I realised that what you had done is you had sort of put two letters into one now, but I was picking up the two. I did notice that Senator Ozouf has come in behind me and you weren't in the room, Senator Ozouf, talking behind my back, but, you know, you did pick up the fact that that was statistics being given from France '93, Germany '96 and there is no one from this Scrutiny Panel that put those words in your mouth. That was your words ----

MRS O'SHEA: No, that was me.

DEPUTY HILL: That is why there was maybe a smile on our faces when you read them out. Could I ask you Mrs O'Shea and quote two pieces from your letter? You say "*I am left with the impression that maybe the document was compiled in a rush. This does not give me confidence in the information being provided or the strategy being recommended.*" You are talking about, I suppose, the Green Book.

MRS O'SHEA: Yes. I saw that on line, but, yes.

DEPUTY HILL: And then you put down a series of questions here, questions like who is on the Scrutiny Panel and you now know.

MRS O'SHEA: Yes.

DEPUTY HILL: You also asked quite an interesting question, I think: "*Could I please have confirmation that every single option available to the Island is being investigated, not purely from a financial perspective, but more importantly from an unbiased best for Jersey people and the environment approach that will see us through the next 25 years ...*" With that in view, and one certainly has every sympathy for what is going on in Bellozanne etc, and if 2008 could be moved forward obviously you would accept that, but at the same time would you also accept the

fact that if indeed it was necessary to come up with the right solution, if it meant having a certain amount of delay, would you think that would be acceptable within Bellozanne?

MRS O'SHEA: I can see it from both sides. Personally my sort of feeling on the matter is that we should not delay too long, simply because every time we delay obviously these emissions are coming out and I can't see that Public Services are going to shut the plant down so that we do not suffer these emissions. So it is going to be left running, up and running, isn't it, until the new plant is up and running? So I obviously on that side do not want to see a delay. I would like to see a decision made. However, I would like reassurances that it is not just going to be a quick decision so that we can close the plant down on time.

DEPUTY HILL: So ----

MRS O'SHEA: There isn't an easy way around it. I can see it from both sides. I don't want to delay, but I also want the assurance that everything is being done to make sure that it is the best solution for the whole Island.

DEPUTY HILL: This is a dilemma actually that people are finding themselves in and it is not fair to blame anyone, but it has happened. But the concern would be that would you be satisfied, more satisfied in fact, if indeed there was some delay to ensure that all the options open are looked at rather than a quick fix solution which we may well be sorry for for the next 25 years?

MRS O'SHEA: How long a delay would you anticipate?

DEPUTY HILL: It is "how long is a piece of string". The question I was asking actually was this perception of ... you have raised the question here and we are not in a position to give the answers. We are here to put questions and obviously get the answers from people like yourselves.

MRS O'SHEA: I mean, if you were talking of a delay of, say, a year, I think that would be unacceptable. If you were talking maybe an extra two months, three months, that is more acceptable. I really don't think three months of exposure to all these emissions is going to make very much difference to the exposure we have had over the last few years.

DEPUTY HILL: What I am putting to you ... you don't want a brick wall, but if the brick wall could be put back a bit you would feel a bit more comfortable to ensure that what we get is the

right solution, rather than rush into something and may be sorry for ever more.

MRS O'SHEA: If I can just repeat, I do not think a year is acceptable. Maybe two or three months would be not too bad.

DEPUTY HILL: That is fine. Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Right. Any other questions?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: If I could just add one point? Even if the decision is made mid-January, the plant, the existing plant, will continue to run until 2008.

MRS O'SHEA: Yes, I know that.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: You are aware of that?

MRS O'SHEA: I am aware of that. In my notes I mentioned it as well. I know the plant is going to have to ... it is going to take at least four years for a new plant to take over and I just don't think, if we waited another year ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: No, I think the point that has got to be considered is that if indeed within that three year span during which the existing plant is going to run, if we could find a way of actually delaying the decision to give you a better solution which would mean that instead of running it for three years it ran for two years or 18 months, would it be worthwhile waiting for?

MRS O'SHEA: Depending on the outcome of your decision really.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Well, I think the decision is that you are going to get it for three years anyway unless we close it down tomorrow, but that is not being suggested.

MRS O'SHEA: Yes, but I was of the understanding that if we delay it will take even longer to close the plant down.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: No. You must understand that the plant will continue to run for three years.

MRS O'SHEA: Yes. I know. I have already agreed with you on that point. But if we delay ... if we were to delay the decision for another year, that would then be not just three years ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: No, it doesn't imply. A delay of a year might actually mean the decommissioning of the existing plant a year earlier.

MRS O'SHEA: Right.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: If an alternative, a satisfactory alternative, could be found. For example, if we said “Right, by delaying for a year, that would be the necessary time to export all of the rubbish to France”, in effect, that would mean that the plant could be decommissioned two years earlier.

MRS O’SHEA: If that was the decision, then I would be very happy, but, I mean, I don’t know what is around. I don’t know what decisions or what alternatives you are looking at.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: No, this is the point. I mean, the whole process has been shoehorned and we are being told by the Committee at the moment that a decision will be taken come January, irrespective.

MRS O’SHEA: I think I would still say that if we delayed for up to a year it would still be too long, but if you can come up with an alternative, i.e., exporting to France and dealing with our waste that way and closing the plant down earlier than the time it would take to build a new incineration plant, then obviously that would be acceptable. But I really don’t know. You know, until they actually put forward their decision as to what they would back, I can’t really comment on any alternatives, can I? I don’t know about the timescale.

DEPUTY RONDEL: I think we have explored this particular area enough. Thank you. I believe Deputy Fox wants to come in.

DEPUTY FOX: Yes, can I just comment here on this point? One has got to appreciate that, for the residents of Bellozanne and the surrounding area, at the moment they are still on a fact-finding. They have got their own concerns, their own prejudices in some cases, but we have had public meetings where some residents have been at, but there are still a lot of questions being asked.

The purpose of the residents wanting to go and see the Committee is obviously down the line to find out where they are proposing to go. At the moment, we are getting basically a broad band saying that 2008 is the deadline and we have got to have a system that is known, that has already got the quality checks, etc, etc. What we are not hearing is the detail. The detail is what options are there, you know. You have asked the question if it is going to be a maximum time that we can delay it, etc. There are a whole list of other options which can be considered. Are

we in a position to actually ask the British Government, ask the French Government and ask the EU through the very safeguards with Basel etc to actually be able to look at some alternative that we can use as an interim? It might not cover the whole thing, but it might take the pressure off the usage or the amount of parts of the incineration. There is the stepping up of the alternatives in the echelon layer of recycling which, again, will reduce the amount of pressures. There are a lot of questions that we still need to have answers before we can actually put a coherent response to the questions you are asking at the moment. We are still at the learning stage.

Now, I have got the benefit of being on the previous Planning & Environment Committee, but on the planning side, and, yes, I have seen the STAG system, as called. We went to Wales and, no, it didn't work or it wasn't shown to be working at the time. But the advisers at the moment are not giving me enough information to actually be certain that there isn't something out there. It might very well be at the end of the day, but several months ago -- like about six months ago or more -- there was a woman who was talking in town that she had been to visit her daughter in Australia and right next door to them is an alternative plant and it is working very well and the neighbours are happy with it and it doesn't make any noise or smell or anything. Then, quite rightly, the advisers to Environment & Public Services are asking me where this is. I can't remember who the woman was, otherwise I could go instantly and find out.

SENATOR VIBERT: I ought to know, shouldn't I?

DEPUTY FOX: But clearly there is, according to this lady, a plant working in Australia. I would like to know where it is and I would like to be able to give Environment & Public Services the name and let us find out if they have got a system up and running that works. Beyond that, you know, we are talking about STAG and Elizabeth rightly saying or questioning whether there is a need for her presentation now, because she has already given it publicly at the meeting at Bellozanne, bearing in mind what you are saying.

But my question would be that no one thing is usually a solution to everything and certainly the Committee recognises the echelon part, but the most thing that effects the residents of the area is the bottom bit, the disposal bit, which might look the smallest but it is the biggest potential problem for residents. The question to be asked is, is there alternatives that some can

be shipped off? Yes, it might not be able to be done immediately, but we need to know the answers, whether it is France or England or wherever? Can you have two plants? Can you have one with new alternative energy alongside another which is incineration. Could that ... because the alternative energy, I am told, when I went to Wales, will cover things like agricultural wet waste, which can't be covered and at the moment we are still spending tens of thousands of pounds taking the leachate out of the supply from the last catastrophe that we had at Beau-Port. So is that something else that we can do? These are all questions that I appreciate you are not here to listen to ... well, you are here to listen to.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, we are asking.

DEPUTY FOX: But I don't expect the answers from you. But that is the sort of questions that we are asking. We think ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could I stop you one moment, Deputy?

DEPUTY FOX: Sorry.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could you confirm whether or not your group have asked for a meeting with Public Services or had a meeting with Public Services?

DEPUTY FOX: No, we have asked for one. I have asked for one at the meeting of the Bellozanne Residents and the President, Senator Ozouf, has agreed to receive us as and when it is appropriate for the Committee to receive us. We obviously thought that it was important that we had had a presentation from the Committee before coming to this Shadow Committee and we had that for the residents, which was promised about two years ago, if not more, by the Environment & Public Services Committee as it is now, or as it was then. So we appreciate that. What you are not able to do at those type of public meetings is have any in-depth thought or discussion as to where we are or where people perceive we are.

The general thing that we are, if you like, suffering from at the moment is that we haven't got a lot of answers to questions that have any depth in them and that is what we would like to go to the Committee and further consider. We are hampered, if you like, by the fact that there is a timescale that looks as though it is going to be imposed on us and, no, we as collective beings do not want to slow down any replacement, but what we do want to question is why the new

replacement has to be continued to be at Bellozanne. The whole point of La Collette was that it was getting rid of our aggregate. Yes, it has a lifecycle for X number of years, but part of that, in planning terms, was to move some of the bad neighbours from elsewhere to La Collette because principally it is a dirty, industrial site.

Now, we accept that there is a tourist area nearby at Havre des Pas and we accept there is St Helier, but one of the things that was stated at the new ... sorry, at the Bellozanne meeting at First Tower was in fact that, even though a new incineration chimney would send some residue out, the question was would it be better off at Bellozanne than it would be because of the proximity of Havre des Pas and St Helier. Well, we would argue that in fact if you were to count up the residences, there is a far greater density of people and residencies within the area where this smoke is liable to come.

You have already got a submission by Wally Battrick who is very knowledgeable on the winds and the sea and everything. I certainly wouldn't like to challenge him because I haven't got enough knowledge, but someone else might want to challenge him, but he can't be here today unfortunately, but he will, hopefully, be available when we go to the Committee to be able to say "Look, it might not be at the end of the day that we can put a suggestion forward that it makes sense that it isn't anywhere other than Bellozanne, but at the moment we are not convinced?" We haven't heard enough argument. We haven't heard from you good people with huge amounts of knowledge and indeed from the specialists advising Environment & Public Services enough information to make it look as though the Committee is going along the lines of saying "We need incineration, it is nicely able to be proved. We have got a nice valley where we can sit it in and the residents are already used to all the smells, the muck and everything else."

Well, I am sorry, but for the next 25 years we want to make sure that before any decision is made -- and we don't want delays, that is perfectly true -- that all the options, including temporary ones, a combination of things as opposed to one thing have been fully investigated, channelled and hopefully that we would have satisfactory answers that at the end of the day the residents can call another meeting at the Bellozanne Valley, put all this information together and see what residents come. The residents want to be constructive, but they are quite naturally

worried about their health. They hear now that some of the workers are being checked out medically, but the question is still asked by many of them “Why isn’t there a sample group of volunteers being checked out medically as well, whether they are in the old folk or the youngsters or wherever -- they are not just in the valley, but where the current smoke and emissions goes to -- so that we have an idea, is it affecting their health because many of them are there for longer periods than what the workers are.” These are the sort of things that we want to bring forward, but we recognise that there is a process.

So you have got a paper from me that is written to go to the Committee. It is written after the public meeting for the residents, but it was written before all the other meetings that we had at the Members’ Room at the Soci  t   and also the public meeting down at the Town Hall. I have deliberately only covered overarching things, allowing the residents to look at the things in sort of more detail. I think that ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: You will appreciate ... sorry?

DEPUTY FOX: I was just going to say that I think that really is just a summary.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Right. Thank you.

DEPUTY FOX: Okay.

DEPUTY RONDEL: You will appreciate that we have only just started our enquiry into the waste management, given that we have been researching and getting all the paperwork together over the last several months. We have just started taking hearings and we will come to a conclusion once we have got all the evidence.

DEPUTY FOX: Indeed.

DEPUTY RONDEL: I know that Professor Coggins has a question to ask.

PROFESSOR COGGINS: Thank you, Chair. Yes, I will confirm and support the balanced nature of the comments that you have made. I have been involved with waste management strategies in the UK for a long time and very often you see very polarised views coming out and people don’t admit another side’s view. So I think that is a very useful contribution which you make.

As far as the questions that you raise, one of the suggestions that I might put in is

DEFRA, the Department for the Environment, Farming and Rural Affairs in the UK, and a number of local authorities are tackling some of the issues that you have mentioned by not just publishing the document like that, but it has become ... the Government has done it twice this summer. They have actually published what they call *Frequently Asked Questions* with answers. This is to provide the general public with information. It might be something that you might consider to compliment the strategy.

The final comment would be that the only alternative technology I know in Australia is the one at Wollongong and that is one that has been visited because there were proposals in the UK to have one in Kent and Derby, but neither of those are going anywhere at the moment and the Wollongong plant has also had problems with its financial security.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Professor?

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: Yes. You have asked a tremendous number of questions and I think we could answer most of them in a fair amount of detail. Yes, the plant as it stands has emissions that exceed the European ... in fact, the standards that you would have in most places. At the same time, if it is of any comfort, there are other sources of pollution that you would have to compare. For instance, you would find it almost impossible to take measurements in the atmosphere around the plant that would distinguish the, let us say, oxides of nitrogen from the plant from those from cars. If you shut the plant down and started it up you would not detect the difference.

If I take dioxins, that plant is the worst that I know of in Europe on dioxin emissions. But at the same time, if you look at the dioxin emissions from all the plants in the UK, all the incinerator plants only contribute about 1% of the total dioxins in the UK. For example, bonfire night puts out more dioxins than all the incinerators in the whole country during the whole year. I can't think of a better way of putting heavy metals in the atmosphere than firing, you know, pretty red glows and whatnot fireworks. I am not suggesting that those fireworks are dangerous. All I am saying is you need to look at them by comparison.

If we take the NOX emissions as an example, the limits by the EU Directive and so on are 200mg per cubic metre. That plant is approximately twice that level. But if I tell you that the

regulations on a cement plant is 1,600 parts per million, the standards that are imposed on incinerators have been pulled down to a very, very low limit, to a great extent what is limited by technology as much as health effects. There are a number of reviews of the incinerators, the gasification, the pyrolysis systems, that they all give some emissions, as do cars and so on, but those emissions, all of them, can meet the European standards of new plants. I would doubt if you could identify any health effects from the existing plant. I am not defending it. It needs to come down and there needs to be a new plant, but I don't think you would find or you could identify health effects from the present plant.

Equally, there are emissions from composting plants. There is dust and so on. It is also subject to questions. Almost anything -- a farm, a farmer ploughing the land -- there will be emissions of dust particles that are all part of what one is experiencing. The question of relocating the plant at La Collette is something that I don't feel competent to make any real comments on that point.

DEPUTY RONDEL: You had other submissions, I think, amongst your group.

MRS CREGEEN: Could I ask Professor Swithinbank a question about the in-vessel composting that you have just touched on? What I wonder about is will it be able to produce high enough temperatures to kill plant diseases, weed seeds and fungus diseases for such things as armillaria root rot, which is, on an island which used to have lots of orchards, this armillaria root rot, which we know as "honey fungus", is rife? By making compost in which these things are not killed, we could be spreading pests and diseases and weed seeds round the Island.

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: I am not an authority on composting.

MRS CREGEEN: What sort of temperature does it go up to?

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: They are recommending temperatures of about 160 to get rid of the ----

MRS CREGEEN: Weed seeds, disease and so on.

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: Everything that one needs to get rid of. It also depends what you are going to do with the compost when you have got it and particularly what goes into the compost. There are many things that go under the name of compost. Here the compost plant

takes entirely green waste from gardens and so on and that is excellent compared to some compost plants I have seen.

MRS CREGEEN: The big danger here obviously is potato plants and tomato plants.

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: Yes.

MRS CREGEEN: And the base part of the dead trees, where you could have the armillaria.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Professor Coggins?

PROFESSOR COGGINS: Thank you, Chair. In-vessel composting is something that is being actively pursued in the UK. Windrow composting is only now acceptable for garden waste. With the problems we had in the UK with the farming sector a few years ago, all food waste, all kitchen waste, has to be dealt with in-vessel, and that is either by in-vessel composting or anaerobic digestion. There are a number of authorities which put sites in place and they are working, as I understand it, perfectly well and dealing with the problems of the pathogens which would otherwise be picked up by birds and scavenging animals. So I think there is information around and I think it is worth checking on. The other thing I was going to say about ... no, I will leave that.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: I wonder if I could just ask you about the attitude of the residents of the Island generally about recycling, because we have looked at the figures and it is clear that Germany leads or is one of the leaders in the field and is doing about 60%. We have actually been told that in Jersey the optimum that they would expect to be able to do would be 30%. You know, there is such a divergence between that position in Europe and the Jersey position, which appears to be based on the fact that Jersey is an Island and, therefore, we are not going to be able to achieve any more than that.

Now, we recognise that it will take a strong educational programme, but also an important organisation to be able to put this thing together and so far we don't appear to have seen it. When we went to France quite recently we saw a newly introduced programme that had only been running for six months which had risen the town up to 44%. We think ... we take the view that I am sure if the French can do it, then why on earth can't Jersey do it, and of course it

will make a huge difference if we can be successful about what is actually going to go into whether it is to be an incinerator or another plant, because if we can get up to 50% or even 60%, if you made that the target, that is going to reduce the amount of residual that you are going to have to get rid of and that would be greatly to the benefit of the people of Bellozanne, I would suggest.

So the question is, you know, how do you feel as residents of the Island about the idea that, you know, it can't be done?

MRS O'SHEA: I agree that there is a big education programme needed. I have a friend who is German and, as part of her primary school education, she was taught how to recycle. They were taught how to split their waste. They were taught the implications of doing it and it is quite natural to her to have boxes that she puts her different rubbish in. When she came to Jersey she was quite shocked that we had nothing in place when she came over. It is only recently that we have sort of got our clean glass in our bring banks over here.

I work in retail and I think people are starting to become more aware of sorting their waste at home. I mean, I know that where I work customers are starting to drop their batteries on the shelf, their dead batteries, and we don't have a receptacle to put them in yet. It is being put into motion. But that is a store directive. I know that the recycling officer at Bellozanne has contacted me and had a very good meeting with them to discuss it, but I think that more needs to be done and I think people need to be made aware not just how to recycle but why they should be recycling.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes, the consequences of not recycling.

MRS O'SHEA: Exactly. And personally I think that every opportunity should be put for the public to recycle. Obviously it is a cost thing and listening to the different public meetings that have gone on and Public Services' presentation on recycling, they are talking about charges and things, and that doesn't go down well with the public. A lot of my neighbours are just switching off completely because all they keep hearing are the possible charges involved -- £175 per household or whatever it is per year -- and they are rattling loads of questions off saying "Well, is it fair that I pay the same amount as somebody living in a great big house and I live in a little flat? I don't create as much waste as somebody else." Obviously that needs to be looked at, at a

fair way of doing it. I was impressed with Mr Coggins's, Professor Coggins's, incentive plan to encourage it.

But, yes, I think, if people are educated right the way through and the receptacles are there for them to dispose of things conveniently, I don't really see that there should be a problem. As we said, I have been to France and I know that, batteries again, when you purchase batteries in the hypermarkets and things, they usually have a little plastic shute on the side of the battery counter that you just put your dead batteries in the top and there is a chamber at the bottom which gets emptied regularly. I just don't see what the big deal is about recycling.

SENATOR VIBERT: I wonder if the other Members would like to comment on anything?

MR AGNES: Yes. I have got ----

SENATOR VIBERT: As residents.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can you come forward, please, so that it is recorded?

MR AGNES: I would like to think that we all like to recycle 40 or 50%, but I think the reality in Jersey, if you look at the car ownership, for instance, is we all know we shouldn't drive cars as we do and yet we have got more cars than probably almost any other community and we use them and we use big vehicles and we don't need big vehicles. So the evidence is that recycling has been very slow in its uptake. So I don't think we could look at 40% or 50% for a long, long time, much as it is desirable.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. Deputy Hill?

DEPUTY HILL: Yes. Could I just clarify one thing and ask a question also? Can I just clarify because I was a bit concerned when Deputy Fox was speaking and can I confirm that you did get the terms of reference so that you are fully aware of the terms of reference of the Scrutiny Panel?

DEPUTY FOX: No, I haven't got any reference, but I didn't ask for them either.

MRS LE QUESNE: It went out with the letter of invitation.

DEPUTY FOX: Yes.

DEPUTY HILL: I have got to say that really we are to review the current position with regard to strategic and other policy proposals with respect to the plan and hence the second one is the reference that I asked you really. The second one of course is to scrutinise alternative waste

strategies and technologies and there is also to assess the costs etc. There are a number. If you haven't got it, I think it might be helpful to the Residents Group to know exactly why we are here and our involvement. Okay, thank you.

The other one actually is just to follow on from what Senator Vibert was going on. We heard this morning from a group who said that one ought to consider when looking at recycling probably paying for disposal or paying at purchase. In other words, when you go and buy a new car in future, you pay X number of pounds to go towards the disposal. If you buy a fridge, you pay X number of pounds and maybe you have a little green sticker on there so when you come to dispose of it you know it is going to be disposed of because you paid for it at the point of purchase. Have you any views on that at all?

MRS O'SHEA: Personally it sounds a good idea, but I think you would have to bear in mind that our prices in Jersey are already much more than in the UK and I think people will probably try and find ways around that.

DEPUTY FOX: Can I come in, please, to answer some of those questions and then perhaps Sheila? The visit to France. You are quite right, there was an absolutely splendid display stand from the educational point of view which actually had ... it was almost like a little rack and it showed waste from its raw state to the finished recycled product, and I did bring back all the details and gave it to the Environment & Public Services Committee at the time and suggested that we should buy some of those for use by officers and by the Education Department. As Vice President of Education, Sport and Culture, I would certainly recommend that that would be a very effective way of increasing the education value of recycling. As you know, education takes a little longer than a direct approach sometimes, but it is the children that bring forth new ideas into families. It is a very successful way of doing it. I think that we know where that information comes from -- it comes from Saint Lô, from the Department there. We can get that information. It is a very productive way forward.

With regard to the costs factor, as you know, I was a policeman for many years and I know what fly tipping is like, especially during the time that I was on police motorcycles. I used to end up at the bottom of cliffs because someone had shoved a car over the top and you don't

know whether it is for an insurance claim or whether someone has actually just gone over the top. But often we would find subsequently it is because a car was dumped. It is a very good question to say that if a car or a washing machine or a fridge or whatever is charged at source, but we are only a small island and we can't probably do things in isolation unless it is agreed across the board and whether it be through the retail sector or wholesale sector, but I should imagine it has got to be done on a national or even on a European style before it is effectively going to work.

There are lots of proposals coming forward for different types of banks. At the moment most of the disposal is supposed to go to Bellozanne and the residents of Bellozanne can follow the residue up the road, where they have been hanging out the backs of boots and various other things and which is another good reason -- you were on about car emissions -- well, if they went to La Collette, there is a vast open area there and it is less likely to cause as much.

But, on the other hand, I live in St Helier, where we have got ... the parish have supplied lots of eurobins to aid, because of the density of residences, to aid the people in disposing as opposed to having rotting smells lasting all week until the disposal unit comes. I just walked down earlier on today to another meeting and there is a beautiful sofa lying around outside Cyril Le Marquand House. Last night there was a very nice ironing board. Round in Poonah Road, I think they had virtually a whole kitchen unit that had been taken away ... sorry, disposed of and left there. A lot of the residences in St Helier do not have transport to remove these things and it is all very nice to say "Well, if you ring up the Town Hall, for a small charge, they will come round and take it." The reality is that they fly tip it.

I would like to see what is in the UK and Europe (and I have seen many in the UK especially and some in Europe) where you use semi-retired people and they put out the various skips, but it is supervised and controlled. Some of these people have their own little second-hand shops, where they remove the good stuff and then sell it on. Well, good luck to them. I don't have a problem. It is being recycled and the less fortunate of this world have a better opportunity. So these are the sort of initiatives that I would love to see come to Jersey.

A little experience from Switzerland is that they charge, I think it was, about £1.50 for a yellow bag that has a little labelled mark on it, a number. You buy them from the local

supermarket etc. When I stay there in a mobile home, the owner says “There is a labelled bag, there are two bags, which are black ones,” and they only charge you for one, because what he is doing is not just in the particular site -- it is half a farm and half a campsite -- is he is also collecting from the neighbourhood as well. Because there is the end user charge, it is too much to expect people to pay so he is filling up the ends of a field. He digs out the earth and he is filling it up with rubbish. It is an unofficial ... and the authorities close their eyes to it.

The other last thing I would like to say is that we do have an end user pays. I had occasion to remove -- or rather I didn't, I asked my son to remove -- some slabs and a bit of a brick wall and one load going down to La Collette was just that little bit more than what the rest had been and I had to, or he had to, pay 87p which he had a receipt for. I went to the Committee the following month, because I was on the Committee, and I said “You know, this is the sort of thing that does us no favours whatsoever.”

I tell you where they go. I used to be Chairman of Les Mielles Sub-Committee and some of it goes into places like that, out far away from anywhere, and the rest in the main goes in the eurobins in St Helier. There is all sorts in there. You can tell that commercial people are using it as a dumping point. This is where I think we still have a long way to go and there are lots of positive things that people can come forward with, and these are the sort of things that I would like to bring to the Committee as well for the improvement, but it is a combination of things that is going to be successful.

DEPUTY RONDEL: I am conscious of the time.

DEPUTY FOX: So am I.

DEPUTY RONDEL: And I know that Professor Coggins has a flight to catch.

DEPUTY FOX: Yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: The initiatives you have mentioned, you were on Public Services, did you take them to Public Services at the time?

DEPUTY FOX: No. I was on Planning.

DEPUTY RONDEL: You were on planning.

DEPUTY FOX: It was two committees at the time. But I did take ... the people did know what

I was proposing and discussed because it is a small Island and Bellozanne is in my patch as well.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. Have you any other submissions to make because, as I say, I am conscious of the time?

MR AGNES: I would like to make a couple of points, please?

DEPUTY RONDEL: That is fine. Come forward, please? Can you come closer?

MR AGNES: Closer still, yes, okay. Firstly, you asked Mrs O'Shea about would it be acceptable for the plant to close after 2008 if a better solution could be found. I think we are looking at it from the wrong angle. We should be monitoring emissions. We know that they are at a high level now and maybe ... they are not at a dangerous level, but they are at a high level. Inevitably, in the next three or four years, that plant is going to deteriorate further and there should be monitoring now. It is not, to me, any good monitoring the staff at the plant because they are at the bottom of the works. It is what is coming out of the chimney which is of concern. So there should be monitoring points in Mont a L'Abbe, Mont Cochon and in the valley to check that and, if it gets significantly worse, we may have to make a decision to close, whether we have got a new system or not. That is my first point.

My second point is that we have here a hierarchy of waste management, which we would probably agree with. I think there should be a similar hierarchy of waste disposal. Initially to go off-Island that would be ... we are such a congested island that should be the preference. Secondly, it should be an industrial area and obviously I am talking about La Collette and, thirdly and very lastly, the last resort is a residential area such as where it is now.

Just on La Collette, if it had to be the second choice -- I would prefer it to be off-Island -- in the larger report here it has two reasons for not using La Collette. One is traffic and one is the visual impact. I am sure the visual impact could be much improved. As has already been mentioned, there are some good examples of how it can be done. Traffic is a concern, but it is a huge concern in the First Tower area at the moment. In any event, La Collette is going to generate more traffic anyway, so there will need to be improved traffic arrangements for that area.

At the meeting at the Bellozanne Residents a few days ago a third reason was brought up

which is not actually in here, and that is the La Collette reclaimed area is not stable enough to support such a structure. If that is the case, then perhaps we should be looking at the previously reclaimed area, even if it means relocating something else. For instance, I think it used to be the Channel Island Welding building which I think is now the Romerils' building. That is on land which has been reclaimed for quite a few years and possibly would be suitable. It may be a swap has to be done. But Bellozanne should be the last resort, not the first choice. That is all I want to say. Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Sorry Professor?

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: Could I come in and make just a couple of comments? To the best of my knowledge the measurements are already made in the flu gases, so what is going up the chimney is known. I think the other point that is worth bearing in mind is that, to some extent, the city is responsible for most of the waste. It is, therefore, the city's responsibility and the citizens' to dispose of that waste. If you go to somewhere like Tokyo you are not allowed to send waste from one part of the city to another part even. It has to be disposed of locally. There are advantages to that, and that is if you are generating power and even heat, you can distribute that to the local people much better than sending it long distances and sending the waste long distances. So keeping it altogether, whether Bellozanne is the right spot I don't want to argue, but the city is the appropriate place and you will find that these plants are normally located in the city.

Then one almost comical point is that I visited one plant in Japan where they took all the waste to the plant through pipes. There was no traffic. They ran pipes from office blocks and so on, a little bit like some stores, if you are in retail, used to send bills around and so on many years ago. On the other hand, that costs. It is very expensive to maintain, but technically there are often solutions to problems, it is just a matter of balancing the cost against the benefits.

MRS O'SHEA: Can I just mention about the heating scheme that you have mentioned, because that is in place or going to be in place in Sheffield. It is already in place with the old plant in Sheffield, I think.

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: Yes.

MRS O'SHEA: And it is also going to be in the new plant in Sheffield too. I was told that it could actually be quite a big network area that you could supply and, with one conversation that I had, I was told that the hospital could be included if it was sited at Bellozanne, that there is no problem with heating the hospital and Haute Vallee and the residential areas. Why can that not happen from La Collette? Could that be looked into? I don't see that that is a good enough reason to exclude La Collette from the ----

PROF SWITHENBANK: It isn't, but we would need to talk to the Committee first.

MRS O'SHEA: It is just routing it a different way.

PROF SWITHENBANK: Yes.

MRS O'SHEA: And St Helier ... First Tower isn't actually in the centre of the city of our town. It is not in the town centre. It is actually a little suburb on the outskirts, isn't it, of St Helier and La Collette is equally part of the town. I must just keep ----

MR AGNES: Can I just ask, when you say "city" I presume you mean the Island? The Island should deal with this problem rather than ----

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: No, no, I mean literally the city.

MR AGNES: You mean that close proximity.

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: In Sheffield you are correct.. Sheffield, I initiated the system there, the district heating scheme and we now have 150 megawatts connected. It is heating five hospitals, two universities, all the civic buildings and several thousand dwellings are all heated from the waste. And at the same time we generate 6½ megawatts of electricity.

MRS O'SHEA: So that doesn't discount La Collette because La Collette is just as good a location as Bellozanne then?

PROFESSOR SWITHINBANK: I wouldn't want to comment on whether one or the other, but there is a current European Directive that one should try and utilise waste heat whenever possible.

DEPUTY FOX: Well, we already do, of course.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. As I say, I am concerned about the time, given Professor Coggins has got to go.

DEPUTY FOX: Yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: We have run 20 minutes over the prescribed time, although we were late starting. We set an hour aside for your presentation. Would one of you like to sum up what you have actually told us, as briefly as possible, and then we will call it a day?

DEPUTY FOX: Okay. Well, first of all, may I take this opportunity to sum up collectively and say thank you to you all for listening to us. You have our written presentations, so you have got the backup paperwork that goes with it, including one, I hope, from Wally Battrick and, if you haven't, I will leave it for it to be copied. Unfortunately, they are out of the Island at the moment. There you are, there are several copies.

To sum up what the residents of Bellozanne are looking for is to have as much information for us collectively in the Bellozanne and the surrounding area to bring together the rest of the residents and brief them as to what we have learned and what we have heard. Clearly Bellozanne is an option for a plant to remain there, but what we recognise is that it is not necessarily the best place for a future plant to be.

Technology has changed. There are different options that must be examined and brought forward, and what we would like is that this very small window, because it has been left far too late, be intensively examined to see what other options there are; what is feasible and what is not feasible; is there a combination of things we can use; the bringing forth of the education-wise; the health checks in the intermedium in the hierarchy of waste; to look at the other alternative instead of everything going back to Bellozanne or the few things going to La Collette because there are other alternatives. As you were rightly saying about the City, we have other villages and towns and things can be localised instead of the transport all bringing its pollution into one area. It would be much better if it was collected, sorted and then brought in.

I think that summarises where we are coming from, and we are grateful to have had this opportunity to impart this. I was actually grateful also to have the President and the Chief Executive here as well, because he knows exactly, or they both know exactly, where we are coming from. We are in a constructive mode, but we have a lot of questions that we would like answered so that we can make up our minds and take it to our residents so that they can come

back and constructively look for what is best not only for the residents but for the Island as a whole.

DEPUTY RONDEL: On behalf of the Panel, can I thank you very much for your presentation and your submissions, and I can assure you that we will be looking and doing what we believe is right for the residents not only of Bellozanne but for the Island.

DEPUTY FOX: But for the Island. That is what we believe in. Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you, Ben.
