

STATES OF JERSEY

SHADOW SCRUTINY PANEL

BLAMPIED ROOM, STATES BUILDING

WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

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

EVIDENCE FROM:

Mr James Godfrey
Mr David Ellam
Mr Jeremy Barnes
(Jersey Environment Forum)

on

Friday, 26th November 2004

(09:02:42 - 10:13:13)

(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 introduced the Scrutiny Panel as Deputy Hill, Deputy Baudains, Deputy Rondel, Deputy Duhamel, Senator Vibert and Senator Le Maistre.)

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could you give us your names for the record, please?

MR BARNES: I am Jeremy Barnes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Mr Barnes.

MR GODFREY: I am James Godfrey. I am Chairman of the Environment Forum.

MR ELLAM: David Ellam.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you.

MR BARNES: Andrew Syvret was due to be here, but he has apologised as he is unable to be here, so James is in his place.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Good. I would like to welcome you to the Panel meeting this morning. Before we start, I have to read you the following. 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 in government. During this 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 may make.

Thank you very much for attending this morning. We have a copy of your submission. Would you like to give us an overview of your submission and also give us details of consultation you have had since the submission with Public Services -- sorry, Environment & Public Services -- and any response you may have had from them prior to us putting questions of you?

MR GODFREY: Sure. Can I just kick off by saying I'm not sure if you are aware how the Environment Forum works, but as Chairman one of the things I introduced was a system of setting up sub-groups within the Forum to tackle specific subjects. On this particular subject, the

sub-group was chaired by Jeremy Barnes, and so I think it is best that Jeremy leads the discussion from the point of view of the Forum.

MR BARNES: Thank you, James.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could you please speak into the mike, on account of everything is being taped? Thank you.

MR BARNES: I think a summary of what we have to say, or the main message of what we have to say, is that the Island should try to minimise the production of waste, to recycle and compost as much as it can, to reduce the volume of residual waste and only the residual waste should be disposed of at the final stage and that that stage should be by the most environmentally benign method possible. If you read through this text you will find that more or less everything we say comes back to those three main points. There are a number of other issues discussed, but those are the three main points.

The way that this was done was by carrying out research based on reading and Internet research. We have consulted as many people as we could with the limited time available to us. We have certainly discussed this among ourselves as a Forum and with Chris Newton, who is the Environment Director, and with various other people as we saw fit. At the end of the document, there is a list of the documents that we referred to.

One of the things we have shied away from doing is trying to guide the Committee on the type of plant because none of us is an expert. We all come from different backgrounds. The only common thread among the people on the Forum is that they are all environmentalists. So we have prepared this paper from an environmental perspective. We are not experts in any particular field and, for that reason, we have tried not to and have shied away from trying to make a decision on which type of plant should be commissioned. I think that summarises what we have to say.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. Deputy Duhamel:

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Perhaps I could start by actually picking up on that, on your page 1 under “*Recommendation 1.13*”, you do actually suggest that perhaps a recommendation might be that the Island should “*commission a 2 stream Energy from waste plant that is up to 30% smaller*

than that proposed in the Strategy". Could you, in view of the comments you have just made, outline how you actually arrived at that particular conclusion in your recommendations?

MR BARNES: We arrived at that conclusion by reference to a graph which appears in the Waste Strategy document, the draft document prepared by PSD, which shows three potential scenarios for the future, with minimum recycling, a sort of middle way and extreme or advanced recycling. Looking at that graph, we came to the conclusion that if, as the draft Strategy says itself, we were to pursue advanced recycling, then we could probably achieve something in the order of 30% reduction in the volume of waste that would need to be finally disposed of and, therefore, a commensurate reduction in the scale of the plant.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Within the body of the Public Services' report they do actually indicate that, if the Island did actually move in the direction of recycling, then recycling rates of the order of 30% would be the upper limit. Bearing in mind that you are also calling for the Island to set out a programme to achieve advanced recycling, do you think, bearing in mind the experiences of other countries, notably the EU countries, in achieving higher diversion rates, that recycling rates above 30% are achievable and not only achievable but desirable?

MR BARNES: I certainly think they are desirable. We are not statisticians, so we have no access or the skills to make a judgment on that. Yes, I think it is desirable. I think we would all agree that it is a desirable thing. Certainly in the UK, from what I have read, there is a very wide range of achievements from very, very low to around 40% or higher. One report I read said that up to 60% of waste is capable of being recycled and I think we should try to achieve the highest possible rate here in the Island. People say that because we are an island it is more difficult to achieve, but it seems to me that, because we are an island, it is all the more reason why we should try to achieve it.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: If indeed those levels of recycling could be obtained, would you still stand by your recommendation 1.13, which suggests that only a 30% smaller plant should be looked at? Presumably ----

MR GODFREY: I think the question we were struggling with is that we take on board the argument that if we accept excessively high targets for recycling and fail to achieve them, we can

have a problem. So we are trying to balance that against the idea of building a plant that can cope with everything and then people at a later date saying “Well, it is more convenient just to burn it, so let’s just burn it anywhere.” It is that dilemma. It is very difficult to strike that balance. The figure of 30% is not something that we would say should be carved in stone. It was just a target to try and get people thinking about that dilemma and what is the best way to resolve it.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Do you think sufficient emphasis was placed on the recycling options within the Public Services’ Strategy document?

MR BARNES: No. I think there are many things in the Strategy document that we would agree with, but the one thing that we take issue with is the priorities given to various parts of the Strategy, and we think that much higher priority should be given to recycling all of the various levels of the Waste Strategy that come before final disposal.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. First of all, I would like to congratulate you on your submission.

MR BARNES: Thank you.

SENATOR VIBERT: It was a very thoughtful one and very impressive. I am particularly interested in the fact that you are almost totally opposed to the Waste Strategy put forward by the Committee itself because, if you take the waste hierarchy, the waste hierarchy being put by the Committee is more angled towards the disposal of all of our waste by incineration; whereas your proposal or your recommendations are that that should be reduced drastically by recycling to ensure that we are not dealing with as much waste. Now, I just wondered how often you met different people and whether you actually presented this document to them and had discussions with them, because it is so basically diametrically opposed to their decision.

MR GODFREY: I wouldn’t say it is opposed. I think perhaps it is just a different emphasis that we are placing. We recognise and we do state within the document that there are initiatives that the department have done that have been very successful. Recycling of glass was one and the recent composting, although it is possibly coming out concurrent with our report, the soil improvement they are now selling and, I believe, doing quite well with. So we do pay credit to that where it has been done. I think what we were saying is the emphasis should be more on

recycling, whereas we felt the strategy perhaps did cover that but was really geared at the engineering solution of an incineration plant. So it was more a question of emphasis rather than anything else.

In response to the second part of your question, yes, the paper has been to the Committee, or copied to them. I believe the officers of the department have analysed it. We have had one meeting since, or two meetings since, we published it informally at this stage. I believe that the officers of the department are taking on board some of the comments we made.

SENATOR VIBERT: And when were those meetings held?

MR GODFREY: We had one last week.

SENATOR VIBERT: Roughly.

MR GODFREY: Within the last 10 days.

SENATOR VIBERT: Right, okay.

DEPUTY HILL: Could I ask ----

SENATOR VIBERT: Sorry, I am just ... We notice on 1.7, or I have noticed, your three stream system for dustbin and trade waste, in other words, separating it into organic waste, dry recyclables and residual waste. Now, I take it that the purpose for which you are putting that forward is in fact to enable us to reduce the amount of waste that has to go to incineration.

MR BARNES: Yes, correct.

SENATOR VIBERT: And that will in fact reduce the size necessary for an incinerator to be in Jersey. In other words, let us say they are starting with 100,000 tonnes of waste -- just using round figures -- and that can be reduced to 50,000 tonnes by organic waste, dry recyclables and residual waste being separated and then dealt with in another way, it leads to the conclusion that what you are really saying is that there isn't one solution to this, there is a series of solutions, in other words, to deal with organic waste, to deal with residual waste and to deal with dry recyclables. Is that the position that you are taking up?

MR BARNES: Yes, I think that is correct, and I think you will find all of those issues contained in the Strategy itself. I repeat what James said. We simply have a different range of priorities to those given in the Waste Strategy.

SENATOR VIBERT: But they are fundamental differences, aren't they?

MR GODFREY: I think it is rather like a moving target and a question of degrees. We would rather see a greater emphasis on the recycling element than the convenient disposal method. I think that is the way we would prefer to look at it. I think we are quite clear that the issue of dealing with waste is something that the Island as a community has to grapple with, and we would like to see the Committee take on board some of the feeling that we picked up from around the community, which is that there is a great desire to undertake more recycling.

SENATOR VIBERT: If I can move on to that point, in the studies that I have actually made of recycling, I am particularly interested in the change in the attitude of the public and how that is done, and the one thing that has come out very clearly is that a considerable amount of money needs to be spent in campaigns and making provisions for places to be put where people can take their newspapers, bottles or whatever they are and that is going to take some investment. One of the arguments that has been put forward is that that should be put alongside the cost of building an incinerator. In other words, if we can get recycling up to 60% and reduce the amount that is necessary to be disposed of, it is worth spending maybe a million pounds over two years to educate the public to recycle.

MR GODFREY: I think there is a line in one section that talks about environmental taxation and we think that, to a certain extent, with many people, asking them to undertake recycling you are pushing at an open door. I think a lot of people in the Island would be very willing to take that on board. There will always be a section of the community that won't and don't and we believe they should pay more for their waste disposal if that is the case. For example, we said somewhere that there should perhaps be a surcharge on people's rubbish collection if they don't separate their waste. We think the best way to achieve the result is a mixture of the carrot and the stick, but we think that, for a large section of the population, it is pushing at an open door. They do want to do it.

SENATOR VIBERT: Would you be saying, for instance, if it was a decision to have a three stream system and somebody said "I don't want to do that, I just want you to collect my rubbish", then you would say "Well, okay, but you are going to have to pay for that"?

MR GODFREY: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: Okay, fine. Yes, I am fine.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Hill?

DEPUTY HILL: Sorry, if I tried to butt in, but I just wanted to go on that line of questioning if I could, about your involvement with the Committee when you were set up, etc, etc, and how many times you have met them. So could I just ask, I think you were set up ... tell me when you were set up. I think I know the answer, but ...

MR GODFREY: It was about 18 months ago now, I think, wasn't it?

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Yes.

MR GODFREY: It was under the previous Committee.

DEPUTY HILL: That is right.

MR GODFREY: Deputy Dubras was the Chairman.

DEPUTY HILL: And how many times have you met with the Committee during the course of your 18 months?

MR GODFREY: We haven't met the full Committee at all. When we were set up initially, I must say it did leave, I think, the forum I wouldn't say floundering, but it left us somewhat at a loose end because we had very little guideline as to how we were to work and what our agenda was going to be. In some ways that was possibly retrospectively a bit unfortunate, but in other ways it was probably quite a good thing because it meant that we could set out own agenda. So I don't have any particular criticism of the way it has been done. I think that the Forum has risen to the challenge and rolled its sleeves up and got on with things.

DEPUTY HILL: Could I ask, is there a Member of the Committee that has a direct involvement with you and he or she is your lead person to contact?

MR GODFREY: We don't have a political representative sitting on the Forum on a regular basis.

DEPUTY HILL: That you report to.

MR GODFREY: We don't have a political representative that we report to either. We do have close working relationships with the officers of the departments, most notably the Director of Environment, Chris Newton. He attends virtually all of our meetings and we have clerical

support from Sarah Le Claire for the running of the Forum, so we do have a considerable officer input as we are working, which is very helpful.

MR BARNES: And a number of other officers have also attended meetings on occasion when it was appropriate.

DEPUTY HILL: Sorry?

MR BARNES: A number of other officers from the department have attended meetings with us.

DEPUTY HILL: So you have had officer level ----

MR ELLAM: Depending on what subject we were talking about, we have had people from Education or from Public Services or from Agriculture.

DEPUTY HILL: At officer level?

MR ELLAM: Yes.

DEPUTY HILL: Could I ask you, with this waste study that you have done, was that your own initiative or were you asked to do that?

MR GODFREY: That is a good question. When we first met, our very first meeting, a round forum for the purpose of getting to know each other and what our individual views were and what our backgrounds were, we drew up a list of what we thought were the most pressing environmental challenges facing the Island. Since then, we have really been working through that list. Waste appeared on the list right at that very first meeting and it was a question of getting round to it. I think it was also quite convenient that the department was producing a new Waste Strategy in tandem, if you like. So I think it worked very well. So did we look to pick up on waste or was it fed to us, it was a mixture of both probably is the answer to that question.

DEPUTY HILL: But, again just to confirm, you haven't discussed this with the Committee. The results of your findings have not been discussed with the Committee?

MR GODFREY: Not with the full Committee.

DEPUTY HILL: Could I ask, anyone from the Committee?

MR GODFREY: We have had a brief discussion on it with the President and the Chief Officer.

DEPUTY HILL: Was that recorded?

MR GODFREY: No, it is not a minuted meeting, no. I believe ... well, in fact I don't believe, I

know, that the President has asked specifically if he could meet the Forum to discuss really how we work and all the issues that we are facing.

DEPUTY HILL: I would like to go on to something else, but if anyone would like to ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Is it a continuation?

SENATOR VIBERT: A continuation, yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Carry on.

SENATOR VIBERT: What you are really saying to us is that the Committee have produced a Waste Management Report, made it public and Scrutiny have said “We wish to scrutinise this Waste Management situation and we have invited you to make the submission.” It appears to me that, had it not been for the fact that Scrutiny was actually doing this, you would have made no contribution at all, and don’t appear to have made any contribution, to that document.

MR GODFREY: No, we would have ... really the turn of events was actually that we were preparing our position paper on the Waste Strategy and we would have done that irrespective of whether Scrutiny was in existence or not. In fact, we started the process, I think, prior to the Scrutiny Panel’s making it known that this was a subject you were interested in. So we would have done it anyway. I think possibly the timescale that we have been put under meant that we published our position paper concurrently to the Scrutiny system as we did to the Committee.

SENATOR VIBERT: Right.

MR GODFREY: If that timescale had not been in place, we would have sent this paper ... we would have published it, but we would have naturally sent it to the Committee first so that they could have, you know, an advanced read of it.

SENATOR VIBERT: But you actually made no input into their Waste Strategy, that document.

MR GODFREY: No, the Waste Strategy was fairly well advanced at the time we started our researches.

SENATOR VIBERT: Fine, okay.

MR GODFREY: We have actually worked quite closely and I know there have been a number of meetings between officers of the department and the sub-group as we have developed a view.

SENATOR VIBERT: It seems to me, having set up the Environment Forum for the reasons it

was set up, which was to advise the Committee on environmental matters, and bearing in mind that waste is a major environmental matter, I find it extraordinary that you made no contribution to that document, or were invited to make a contribution to that document.

MR GODFREY: I think the reason for that is because the department's Waste Strategy was well advanced when we started our research.

SENATOR VIBERT: You mean the incineration plan was.

MR GODFREY: The whole Strategy I think.

MR BARNES: We had a presentation on the Strategy in February and it was since February that we have been working on our report.

SENATOR VIBERT: Hmm hmm.

MR BARNES: The presentation was given on the main body of the Strategy, which was already in place, as I understand it, as that time.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Le Maistre.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: I think that actually it is quite an important element, and please don't interpret this as a criticism at all. I am trying to sort of sequence the events really. But you have said that you were formed 18 months ago. Clearly it seems to me that the Environmental Forum would be one of the key bodies to which the Committee would turn for an input, just to put it at that point, in advance of producing a Strategy, whatever the stage of development. So I'm interested obviously in your comments that, whilst you may have had the presentation in February, there was actually no requirement, invitation, and this goes back to the time when you were set up without actual clear guidelines. Would it be fair to say that, had you been given guidelines and a request to explore 18 months ago the implications of a waste strategy or the ramifications, that you would have been keen to have an input at that point?

MR GODFREY: I think that is a fair statement, yes.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: So it is probably not too wild a suggestion on my part that one expresses surprise that it didn't happen.

MR GODFREY: I think, yes, but I can understand why. I think we were set up in a fairly loose way and I think that retrospectively, as I said, had its good points and bad points.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Fine.

MR GODFREY: But the agenda that we set ourselves was frightening to say the least. It was a long list of subjects that were ----

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Oh I am sure.

MR GODFREY: Everything from waste to coastal management to agricultural land, where, as you know, we have had a view on that.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Yes.

MR GODFREY: And really there is only a certain amount that the 12 of us volunteers, working in our own time in an honorary capacity, can actually achieve in that period I think.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: It is not a criticism, but the reality is that this impacts hugely on the whole Island and financially £80 million is a massive requirement for investment. So your input, it seems to me, would have been valuable. But let us park that one, if we may, for the moment. Personally, I am extremely impressed with the summary that you have produced and the recommendations. I think that are they wonderful.

SENATOR VIBERT: You could have been eaves dropping on our conversations.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: But what I would like to move on to, if I may, and I appreciate that fact that you consider yourselves to be lay people and not necessarily with the technical expertise, although I think some of you may have some technical expertise, you seem to have accepted the need for incineration as a given rather than questioning whether there were other methods -- shall we call it that for the moment -- or other technologies which could be explored. I am not suggesting that you would have the expertise to recommend or anything like that, but it is a part of the debate which seems to me to have been -- tell me if I am wrong, because I am gleaning this from your presentation -- that you have accepted that as a given. With the benefit of hindsight, is that still the case or do you think there is the opportunity to consider other forms of technology?

MR ELLAM: We think there is the opportunity to consider other forms of technology, but I don't think at the present time the alternatives are well enough proven for us to be in an Island situation with a breakdown.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Right.

MR ELLAM: We haven't got a landfill site just up the road that we can run the stuff to while we are waiting. We could get into problems, so we have got to go with very proven technology and I think that, and the fact that the Island has got experience with incineration, is one of the things that was said to us. But we don't want to sort of comment much more than the fact that we don't want unproven technology at this stage. As time goes on, and we are talking about a 50 year plan rather than a 25 year plan, I think that was the original thought, that in 25 years we might look at it again, but, as time goes on, then the alternative technologies may be more proven.

MR BARNES: Could I add that we have discussed this at some length within the group and I don't think that it is fair to say that we have accepted as inevitable that an incinerator is the only way forward. In fact, I think we say in **here** that we recommend that the Committee should look at all the possibilities and search out the most environmentally benign method. We are not qualified to say what we feel that is. I think David has quite rightly pointed out that we need to choose something which is tried and tested. But my understanding is that some of the newer technologies have been in use for some years now and there may be one that would be suitable for us. I think it is important though that in selecting that method we don't choose one which claims to do everything and sort the material and do everything for us, because I think the danger then is that, instead of recycling what is effectively a resource -- much of our waste is actually a resource -- it would all go to this process and be disposed of.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Yes.

MR BARNES: So I think the important thing is to minimise our waste and reduce the waste before it gets to that final stage. But, yes, I do think that we ought to look at all the various different possibilities. Having said that, I am aware that there is some urgency because the current incinerator is one of the worst, if not the worst, in our area. We do need to do something about it quickly because we haven't got time to spend a long time making a decision over how to change it.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Would you accept that we have had incineration now for 20 or 25

years, whatever it is, and that that has not driven us to recycling because it is actually quite an easy and convenient form of disposal and that there is a danger by continuing with incineration that it would not be difficult for that same climate to prevail. It may be an inevitability, but there doesn't seem to be an urgency in the strategy. The kind of timescale of increasing recycling is over many years rather than what has happened and we have certainly seen elsewhere that has been achieved in a very short timescale actually. Do you think that is a danger?

MR BARNES: I think it is a danger, but I think there is a cultural issue that we are all used to disposing of our waste the way we have done. I can remember as a child we had two dustbins, one for glass and one for everyone else. That has always been the way. But there is a cultural change happening in the UK. People are getting used to having three dustbins, or whatever it is, disposing of their waste in different ways and sorting it at home. I do think that Jersey people will come round to that view. I think it might be a little bit harder here to achieve that, but they will come round. Therefore, the danger, I think, is that we have too big an energy from waste plant and that will kill any incentive.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Yes.

MR BARNES: But if the waste plant is smaller and there is a determination to pursue recycling, then I think it can be achieved. I would emphasise this cultural issue because if we consider much of our waste as a resource, as materials that have another use, have another life, then they shouldn't be incinerated, they should be reused. If people understand that, then they will be sympathetic to it.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Are you aware that the incinerate option as outlined in the Strategy has an absolute requirement, a minimum requirement, for a calorific value of the material that needs to be incinerated within it and by recommending, under 1.11, that the Island "*sort and remove all of the plastics and other synthetic products out of the waste stream*", that this would severely downgrade the calorific value of the material that was left as part of the residual waste? So, effectively, if you are taking out paper, card and plastics, you don't really have very much left to justify an energy from waste final disposal.

MR BARNES: I wasn't aware of that as a specific technical issue with this particular incinerator. I was aware of it in broad terms, that taking these elements out of it does reduce the calorific value, but I'm not aware of the particular specifications for the incinerator in this particular case.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Right, okay. If I may, going on from that, you do actually recommend that the Island, by taking out organic waste and dry recyclables and plastics and anything else, that effectively we will end up with a smaller amount of what it technically termed residual waste for further treatment. Could you specifically define what the components would be of the residual waste that you have outlined?

MR BARNES: I think the only definition of that is what is left after you have taken out everything that can be either reused, recycled or composted. I can't think of a better definition.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Okay. But you could not actually quantify it. You have not looked at the proportions and distributions of the waste makeup.

MR BARNES: Not in detail, no. I am aware of the study in the UK which shows that up to 60% of waste can be recycled or composted.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Okay. Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. On the question of alternative technologies, you will be aware, and we have certainly learned on this Panel, that things have moved very fast in the last three years. There has been a big sea change in the speed with which alternative technologies are now being developed and, for instance, the Department of the Environment in the United Kingdom has set up a fund to fund alternative technologies that have reached a certain level at this date to enable them to go into actual production of plants. Have you had an opportunity to look at any of this or look at any of that material as to the kind of alternative technologies that are available?

MR BARNES: Not in detail, no. We have been made aware that there are a variety of different technologies, but, frankly, in trying to understand it, the technology is certainly beyond me. I don't know how David would feel about it, but it is certainly beyond me to try and understand it to a point where I could say "I think this is a preferred method".

SENATOR VIBERT: I was thinking more in terms of the fact that this great change is taking place, and this is one of the dilemmas that I think Jersey is going to face. Because of the speed and the need, or the alleged need, of replacing the incinerator by 2008, we could well be making a decision right in the middle of this huge change that is happening and within two or three years new technology is actually going to be proven that is going to totally eradicate the need for incinerators, incinerators of any type at all. I'm just really asking whether you are aware that this sea change was taking place and the dangers that Jersey faces in making a decision at this time?

MR BARNES: Yes. We are very much aware that that is a possibility.

MR GODFREY: If I might add that, in any sphere where technology is moving so rapidly, it is very difficult to know when to pitch in and buy.

SENATOR VIBERT: It is like buying a computer.

MR GODFREY: Like buying a computer. That is just what I was thinking of. The minute you buy your computer, within a month it seems there is a more powerful version that has been produced. I think one of the first things that occurred to us when we started looking at this question is we were amazed ... and the incinerator was built, the current incinerator was built when it was, without any forward thinking in terms of setting aside monies to pay for its replacement and have some sort of structured evolutionary programme in dealing with waste. We think that is something which should be built into the new strategy, which we understand is being built in, but you are right about the technology.

SENATOR VIBERT: As an example -- and I am not sure you are aware of it -- just outside Cambridge, which I visited last week, they have proven technology there that can turn all household waste, all animal waste, all restaurant waste, all agricultural waste, into a useable compost that is approved now by the Department of Environment at an absolute fraction of the cost of incineration and it has been running now for a whole year. Farmers come to the place and collect this compost, which they can then put back on the land. They give it away free. I wondered if ... as far as Jersey is concerned, household waste represents nearly 40% of our waste disposal, which it is a necessity to incinerate. This is being done there with this new technology which is totally proven now. They are the sort of things which are actually

happening which, I would have thought from an environmental point of view, you would be jumping up and down with glee about because it is exactly the sort of thing you are putting basically in your report.

MR GODFREY: It is, and another item we did discuss when we first picked up on this issue is we were concerned that, as a result of Jersey's recent experience with composting that it might frighten people off that as an option, which we think would be very, very sad.

SENATOR VIBERT: When you say our experience of composting ----

MR GODFREY: The composting, the mainly composting site at Crabbé ----

SENATOR VIBERT: Oh, at Crabbé.

MR GODFREY: ---- which had a pollution incident.

SENATOR VIBERT: This is all under cover.

MR GODFREY: Exactly, but we were concerned that composting would become a technology that people in the Island would shy away from because of that experience, and we think that would be very sad if that happened.

SENATOR VIBERT: Absolutely, because the advances that are happening in that area are quite extraordinary. Anyway, I just wanted to raise those to you, that those are the kind of possibilities that we are currently looking at and, of course, we are trying to find out why the Committee has not gone to look at all of these technologies, because it would appear so far to us that the emphasis is on "We must build an incinerator and we have got to burn everything".

MR GODFREY: I think under 1.9 we did specifically recommend establishing a new compost facility.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes, I saw that.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Yes. But could I continue from that?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Yes, continuation point.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: It is really the principle of what I am sure James would know the in-vessel composting system is not something presumably, because you would have regarded that as sort of beyond your remit maybe, but it is not something you have looked at precisely. The reason I ask is that potentially it has a huge impact, beneficial one hopes, on the environmental

aspects of recycling. It is not just a fly by night, flash in the pan, call it what you like. It seems to be developing in a way that enables a considerable amount of waste to be recycled beneficially.

MR ELLAM: I think traditionally the Island composted refuse, didn't it, I think in the sheds at Bellozanne? I am only going from hearsay because I wasn't on the Island when that happened. Composting, you have got to remember, is a biological process. You have got to get it right and we didn't get it right when we went to Crabbé because we didn't do the job properly, and I agree, yes, there are ----

SENATOR VIBERT: But the technology wasn't there either.

MR ELLAM: A lot more technology was available than was looked at because I actually spoke to the Agricultural Department myself.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Yes, that is true.

MR ELLAM: There was more available, but it is history now and so let's ... but in-vessel or enclosed composting facilities now, provided we remember it is biology and it is not just an engineering process, but a biological process tied to a lot of engineering ----

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: The system that I looked at was dealing with 30,000 tonnes a year of household waste and turning it into very useable compost, totally approved. Where it is different is that it enabled meat and all other items to be used, which up to then had been barred as a result of the "mad cow" disease. But it has now been passed by the Department of Environment and, you know, you can go there and see the farmers coming to pick the stuff up with their trucks. Here you see dreadful stuff coming in from the house and this great compost actually going out in trucks on to the land. It is an absolutely perfect form of environmental protection.

MR GODFREY: I think where we approached this from was, rather than get into too much detail over the different technologies, which no doubt we could do if we had a lot more time to research it, we came back to the principles. If you establish a set of principles by which you want to deal with waste, it will lead you towards certain conclusions.

SENATOR VIBERT: Exactly.

MR GODFREY: So we felt get the principles right and the conclusion will follow.

SENATOR VIBERT: That is what you have laid out here, that your principles ... that is the thing. Rather than a blind approach which just says, you know, "Well, we have got to get rid of it so let's just burn it, just do the operation, the Island has been put ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Hill?

DEPUTY HILL: Yes. If I can come back to Mr Barnes actually because he touched on an issue and I did want, because it was all part of the process, I want to come back on it and maybe elaborate. It is around your energy recovery and disposal, paragraph, paragraph 7.1 actually. If we can just look, you mentioned about this and laid your cards out and said you didn't consider yourself to be too knowledgeable about the use of incinerators and all that. But you have taken again as a given that we have got to replace this incinerator by a given time. Is it because you are concerned that the plant is not going to last, or is it because you are concerned about emissions?

MR BARNES: Both of those things. We were led to believe that the plant is at the end of its days.

DEPUTY HILL: Can I ask what sort of research, for want of a better word, did you carry out to come to this conclusion?

MR BARNES: I can only say that we understand that because it says that in the Waste Strategy, that the plant is at the end of its days. But the main driver really is that we are aware that it has very poor emissions. The anecdotal evidence is that our incinerator has very, very bad emissions.

DEPUTY HILL: But we are back again to the word "*given*". You are not aware that possibly there may be more life to the machine or have you taken it as a given?

MR BARNES: We have taken it as a given.

DEPUTY HILL: There may well be ways of decreasing the emissions. There may well be. I am not saying there are, but could I ask have you looked into that, have you questioned it or have you just taken it as a given?

MR ELLAM: Internally, when we met as a sub-group, we talked about it within the group at length, but we haven't gone back and asked specific questions of anybody, you know, of PSD.

MR GODFREY: It did come out in one of our early meetings with officers of the department, where the amount of down time that certain streams ... I think there are three streams in the incinerator, on the basis that they try and keep two running at all times whilst one can be serviced. The amount of times that the second stream should be running and it is down for repairs is becoming greater and greater, and that gave us a pretty good indicator that, yes, we felt that mechanically the plant perhaps wasn't in the best of health.

DEPUTY HILL: But you have taken that as a given without ... I am not for one moment criticising because, at the end of the day, if someone tells you something, you are going to take it as read.

MR GODFREY: Yes.

DEPUTY HILL: And we have had the advantage actually because we have had a number of people before us and we are finding out that the world is bigger than just looking at what is down at Bellozanne. Again, because of this time factor, this 2008, how crucial do you think ... you have taken it as read, but do you think there may well be some advantage in maybe stretching it out, if indeed we could improve on the technology that we have got at Bellozanne? Again, there is the possibility of bringing in this new process, which is the one that Senator Vibert has just been talking about. If it can become proven, there may be some advantage in looking at ways of possibly delaying the 2008 deadline.

MR BARNES: We have considered that as a possibility, yes, but it is not something we felt we could put into the report because it would be an assumption. If we thought that the plant could last longer, then that would obviously give us more time.

DEPUTY HILL: So there may be some value at looking at that aspect.

MR BARNES: There may be, yes.

MR ELLAM: I suppose there has got to be ... somebody has got to look at the cost of keeping the plant going longer, both in terms of money and in terms of emissions, and if that balance is against waiting, then it is not worth doing.

DEPUTY HILL: Could I?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Baudains?

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Thank you. Could I come in on that, because there is something which has been troubling me? We are told that the in 2008 the incinerator has to be replaced almost as if there is a day in the calendar on which it is all going to fall down. Now, we know from an engineering point of view that we could keep it going probably for ever with patching up and patching up, but it becomes increasingly more expensive and uneconomic to do so. Admittedly, if we followed that route, the emissions are still poor. I believe, to pick up on what Deputy Hill was saying, to actually improve the emissions would cost an amount of money that would not be appropriate on old equipment. But what does concern me is the fact that the emerging technologies are getting to the stage where some of them may become proven sufficiently for us to accept them in a short period of time -- months perhaps more than years -- and I wondered what your view was on whether one should look at the option of extending the 2008 deadline by maybe six months or maybe a year -- I am certainly not looking at long periods of time -- if that means that we could then choose a better technology. As you were saying, technology is developing all the time. I would personally hate Jersey to find that, because we have almost cast in stone this 2008 date, we may have to rule out certain technologies that six months down the line we would have wished we had taken on board. What do you think of that?

MR GODFREY: I think that is a very, very, very difficult question to answer, because it is a balancing act which takes on board information from a lot of different areas. It is rather like giving up smoking. Yes, it is good to give up smoking, but does it matter if I carry on for another week or another two weeks? It is a very difficult question to answer. I don't know if you have ----

MR BARNES: I would only go back to your analogy of the computers. You buy a computer and, as soon as you buy it, it is obsolete because the next one is better.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: It is down to judgment. That is basically it.

MR BARNES: I think it is, yes.

MR GODFREY: The key thing is to get the right strategy in place based on the right principles. It would be unfortunate to be in a position of never actually doing anything because you are always waiting for the next new development.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Of course. That is why I added the caveat that one would not be waiting for years or indefinitely.

MR ELLAM: I think one of the other things we have got to bear in mind is getting the principles right. We've not just got to think of the cost of the plant that we are going to install, whatever sort it is, because a lot of cost has got to go into getting the stuff from the household to that plant or not into that plant as the case may be. It seems to me that a lot of the strategy is aimed at an equivalent incinerator or something else and not enough is aimed at collection, separation or recycling.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: I wanted to move on to that, if I may?

DEPUTY RONDEL: I think there is a continuation first. I have got two continuations and then I will come back to you, Deputy. Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. On that particular issue, if I put a hypothetical position to you that in fact if we carried out what your proposal is, which is separation at the household etc, etc, and we actually reduced the amount going into the incinerator first, in other words put that at the front rather than worry too much about the incinerator, then the incinerator only would have to handle possibly only 40% of the current waste, which means that it is not under that kind of pressure, because in fact the third stream is only, is it, 15 years old.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Less than 15.

SENATOR VIBERT: It is less than 15 years old.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: It is 1991.

SENATOR VIBERT: And that would give us the opportunity to actually do the recycling and do all of these things; for instance, doing the organic waste and getting rid of that out of the stream, which would give the life of that incinerator possibly a couple of years, accepting the fact that even the emissions would drop if you are no longer putting rubber tyres in and you are no longer putting a lot of the stuff that goes in that actually helps to create many of these problems, which means that that stuff possibly has to be exported maybe to France. Well, we have looked at all that and we do not see that there would be any great problem in shipping some of this stuff to France to be recycled rather than sticking it in the incinerator and putting stuff up in the

atmosphere. So really it would seem to me that your concept of the cone, you have reversed the cone and you are talking of eliminating as much as possible, which means the pressure on the incinerator is going to be so much less.

MR BARNES: I think that is entirely correct. I would agree with everything you have said, with the exception of one thing. I think it will take time for this culture change to take place so that people actually start to sort their waste at home and so that we can take everything out of the waste stream. I don't think that is going to happen overnight. I think that is going to take some years.

SENATOR VIBERT: If I could just give you some examples.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could you please let the gentleman finish what he was saying.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes, sorry, fire away, sorry.

MR BARNES: I think it will take some years for that to take place. In an ideal world, I would entirely agree with you. When I first became involved in this ... I come from a completely different background. I am architect. I am nothing to do with waste, but the thing that was of greatest concern to me was the emissions of the current incinerator -- that is why I became very interested in this -- and the future emissions of any future waste disposal plant. That really was what made me take an interest in this subject and what has driven my working on this document. So, in response to something that Deputy Baudains said, it is the emissions that are the most important issue to me in bringing the existing incinerator to the end of its useful life and in replacing it with something which is much more benign.

SENATOR VIBERT: But something that has been running for 25 years, but ran for 26 years and we were able to save £85 million worth of taxpayers' money would surely have to be an economic advantage to the Island, accepting the fact that if it ran for another year ... as I say, it has been going badly for 26 years. With new incinerators, we know there is no problem with the emissions because that now comes into European Directives and they can meet all of that with a modern incinerator. It is a question of accepting the fact that we may have to continue to have a bad neighbour at Bellozanne to enable us to actually tackle the problem in the way that you actually outlined, because I don't believe it is possible to do what you are asking to do and keep

it within the timeframe of 2008 because it is just not feasible that that is going to happen.

MR GODFREY: I think in practical terms what you are saying is right, but in principle we would still want to press ahead.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel?

SENATOR VIBERT: There was one other issue I wanted to raise on changing attitudes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Is it continuation?

SENATOR VIBERT: It is continuation.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Right.

SENATOR VIBERT: On changing public attitudes is going to take a long time. In all of the places we have looked at where they have changed attitudes, they have done it in many cases within six months, but they have committed advertising and promotional budgets to do it. For example, in Cambridge ... there is a public relations company in London that specialises in this project of changing public opinion in various areas and they actually have people that go round and knock on doors and show them how to sort their waste out etc, etc. If all that is done, I can't see any reason why the people of Jersey are any different to the people in France, where we visited, or the people in the United Kingdom, provided there is a commitment to do it and the money is made available to do it. If we are talking about spending 85 million, what is half a million pounds in one year to change people's attitudes.

MR BARNES: I think that is entirely correct. I think one of the issues which we took up with the Strategy was that there was a figure of 84 million, or whatever it was, for the incinerator and 0.7 million for everything else, for the recycling.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. That is right.

MR BARNES: And we felt that is where there should be much greater priority.

SENATOR VIBERT: Absolutely. I do not disagree at all.

MR BARNES: I do not know how long it would take. I accept your comment that in places in the UK this has been achieved over six months.

SENATOR VIBERT: And in France.

MR BARNES: And France. I think that is very ambitious and I would be very, very pleased to see that happen here.

SENATOR VIBERT: If it was 12 months it would be brilliant, but six months has happened in France.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Thank you. We loosely talk about the Bellozanne incinerator, but in actual fact it is three incinerators in all. I think we sometimes forget about that. Two of the streams were actually installed in 1981 and if they are decommissioned in 2008, that means they will be 27 years old. The original design life was 25 years. The third stream was commissioned in 1991, so, again, if that stream is decommissioned in 2008, if you read the report it is not actually intended to decommission the plant in 2008, it is intended that that should continue to run for at least a year before any alternative is up and running to give the operators experience with the new plant. So by that time it will be 17 years old.

Now, if you look at the figures, that third stream which is generally the younger plant, if it is filled with material that was not as polluting, it could actually operate to the capacity of some 60,000 tonnes per annum. So combined with an upfront ... and this is before 2008, so if the Island moved in the direction you are suggesting and it actually reduced as far as possible the amounts of waste that required incineration, it might well be that, by 2008, you would still have eight years of a 25 year design life of plant still available. So my question to you is, bearing in mind that scenario that we could effectively run that plant to the end of its design life with a lesser damaging or polluting fuel, should the Island, having paid for that plant, write it off in 2008?

MR BARNES: Could I reply with another question? Do you know what the emissions would be of that third stream? Would they be acceptable?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: They are entirely dependent upon what goes in. So, for example, you have actually heavily recommended that we, for example, take out all our plastics. Plastics would be one of the most polluting products that are being burned, so if we did actually follow your recommendations and no plastics were burned within the plant, then the pollutant

components from those plastics would disappear.

MR ELLAM: Could I ask an engineering question of you? If one plant is 27 years old, or will be when it is stopped, and the other you say is 17, there is a lot of peripheral stuff at the beginning and the end of the incinerator itself; in other words, the loading facilities. What is the design life of that?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: I think there was talk ... a lot of talk if you read the technological surveys is about taking the bunker sizes and actually increasing them in size, adding in extra crane facilities if the intended increase in arisings of some 3% per annum take place, which I think is debatable, bearing in mind we are going to be in line with EU Directives to actually reduce the waste arisings. We have had that on the transcript. There is also talk about realigning the chimney or rebuilding the chimney dependent upon new equipment. But there was a complete refurbishment option put forward as an alternative, which has been disregarded by the consultants, at a substantially lower price. But what they failed to do completely was to actually look at the option of continuing with this third stream for a further period in order to buy the time for further technological advancements to be made. So the question really for you is can you justify from your Environmental Forum perspective the Island countenancing the expenditure of capital sums which effectively will be wasted if the design life of the original equipment is not met, if there are ways to meet it?

MR GODFREY: I think the answer to that is we didn't get involved in the end technological solution to the problem. Our emphasis was really at the front end and the principle of the strategy. So I would hope that, in any kind of project management analysis, those very points are addressed and if there is a way of buying time that is environmentally satisfactory and economically sensible, then logic would say that you look at it.

MR BARNES: Yes, it should be looked at, but, again, one of the points we make in here is to say that all options should be looked at. I wasn't aware of that as an alternative, but I certainly agree that that should be looked at as an option. One reservation might be that there would then only be one stream and if that one stream went down, then we would start to backlog waste. But, in principle, I would agree with you.

MR ELLAM: I think we would be happy to join in any discussions even at this late stage.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Baudains?

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Thank you. I would like to just focus on separation again, which Senator Vibert had touched on earlier, because the overall thrust of your position paper is recycle as much as possible, and who can disagree with that. In order to do that, separation at source is obviously the way forward. What I am trying to discover is whether you have done any research on that particular aspect of separation at source and collection. The reason I ask is because the impression that we have gained from the Committee is that greater separation will require changes in collection and the collection equipment and all this sort of thing, an enormous problem taking several years to achieve, which I personally find, my own opinion is that I find, difficult to believe. I would have thought that, with the will, it could have been done in months and not years. So what I am searching for is the evidence, because without the evidence I am left to the conclusion that the timescale is designed to suit a particular outcome.

MR BARNES: We have looked at the strategies put forward by other jurisdictions such as Northern Ireland and Hertfordshire and both of those jurisdictions have introduced separated waste, separated at source.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: What was their timescale to change around public opinion and get the equipment in place?

MR BARNES: I am not sure what the timescale was. I don't know what the timescale was.

MR GODFREY: It can't be an impossible thing to resolve.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: My own personal view is that, if the will is there and you say "In six months time your rubbish will be separated or it won't be collected", it will happen, but without the will ----

MR GODFREY: Or you charge to take it.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Yes. Without the will, it drifts on ad infinitum.

MR BARNES: Yes. I think there peculiarities to Jersey's system which make it difficult. There are problems that need to be overcome: the fact that we have 12 separate collectors and the so-called Bellozanne Covenant, which I don't know anything about, but I recognise it as an

obstacle. But we do think that those obstacles can be overcome.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Well, hopefully our next interviewee may be able to illuminate that further because I for one can't understand why, as it has been stated, we would have to have one collector across the Island. I am finding that difficult to believe, but presumably there is evidence for it.

MR BARNES: We don't believe that ----

MR ELLAM: I do not see any reason why not.

MR BARNES: We do not believe that is necessary. If we have a number of different collectors, the important thing is the specification of the waste that they collect.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: But it seems to me that the collector will do as the parish requires it to do.

MR ELLAM: And so will the residents.

MR BARNES: Yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Le Maistre?

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: It is a bit of a final question because I think we are coming up to ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: No, we have still got another half an hour.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Oh have we, right, okay. The question is very simple really. Would the Environment Forum be interested in commenting further on alternatives if they were brought forward? I am not asking whether you want to do that research, but rather commenting on any options that could be brought forward, because the question that we are constantly coming up with is this issue of environmental gain, in terms of the community benefits, and the commitment of going for an 85 million or 80 million plant, when this technology is changing and, in fairness, I think we are at a different stage to the computer development stage, in that that was probably true in the sort of '95 to 2000 period, but, post that, the change has gone on, but you are still using a computer. Whereas one is looking here at different forms of treatment which achieve the same or better benefits at lower costs. So the question is very simply, would you be interested or prepared to actually look at options if they were put forward?

MR ELLAM: I spent 20 years in design and research into waste treatment in the agricultural

sector, so, yes, that would be a very interesting thing personally to do.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could I put a question? On 1.2, the establishment initiative to prevent waste arising and to reduce unnecessary packaging, given that Jersey is such a small place, what kind of influence do you believe we can have or where do you think we could actually come from in trying to reduce this particular item that you have under 1.2 given our size?

MR BARNES: We recognise that Jersey's influence is going to be limited, but Jersey, like all consumers, can join in the wave of influence that is coming to bear on manufacturers and producers in the UK. My understanding is that some producers of electronic goods, for example, will take goods back to reuse the components when you buy a new whatever it is, computer or whatever. I think if we can lend our weight to that sea change, then it will be beneficial. Jersey will see the benefits in a very small way over a very long period, but I think we should do our bit.

Another example is that in Holland they are starting to reintroduce returnable bottles, for example, and that is another area where we could reduce the number of plastic, glass or whatever types of containers that the goods are brought to the Island in if we have returnable bottles. I am sure there are many other examples. The Strategy itself refers to the plastic bag tax that was introduced in Northern Ireland.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Baudains?

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Thank you. On the same subject, is it not the case that we have an uphill struggle here, because, from personal experience, things I order from the mainland by mail order, the packaging consists of far greater bulk than the product itself? The cost of product in Jersey leads many people to buying mail order or from the Internet or whatever than possibly other areas might. We therefore have one way of reducing packaging and waste, which is to get people to buy locally rather than by mail order. The subject is quite wide, but what thought has your Forum given to that aspect?

MR GODFREY: It is wide, but at the end of the day one of the best drivers is economics. The idea of user pays, I know, has favour in some quarters and not in others. But, to some extent, it was practised years ago when there were deposits on returnable bottles. There was a financial

incentive to take part. I think, if there were thought put to that, achievements can be made. If there are charges for waste, for example, then the consumer would be much more inclined, when picking up something from a shop, to say “Actually, I don’t want the packaging, you can keep it. I’m just going to take the goods.” If the business is then faced with the cost of dealing with that, they will be sending the message back up the chain “When you’re sending it to us on the boat here, don’t put so much packaging in, we’ve got to pay for it.” I think it is an assault that needs to take place on all fronts.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Working from the ground upwards.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Vibert, same subject?

SENATOR VIBERT: As an example, as far as glass is concerned and bottles, in fact had there been a decent piece of machinery in Jersey which doesn’t cost a great deal, we could in fact be using the majority of glass to put in aggregates for roads. So why would one bother to try and persuade people to stop sending us bottles and just use it in the way that it could be used to build concrete blocks and aggregates and all sorts of things? That is really the dilemma we face with the recycling in terms of what is economically viable and what is not. To try and change national positions of national companies to do something because we in Jersey would prefer them to do is almost going to be impossible. I think that has been put to us before, and it seems to me that this hierarchy here which talks about, I think they call it, “*waste minimisation*”, call it “*minimisation*”, as far as Jersey is concerned, I think it has been accepted and admitted that whilst we could have some impact, it really is way down on the list of priorities of actually being able to handle Jersey’s waste. So it would be a very small effort that you could make in Jersey. It would be far better to concentrate on recycling what we have got. Plastic, for instance, in France we saw where they package it all up and it goes to factories and it gets turned into useable conduits for electricity and all sorts of things. It seems to me that that is the sensible thing for us to be doing.

MR BARNES: I completely agree with that, yes. I think the whole influence on the UK would be very small, but we should lend our weight to that.

SENATOR VIBERT: I agree with that.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel? A new subject.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes. Within the Draft Strategy Report, on page IV and indeed on page 41, reference is made as to how kerbside collection, although it would have been desirable, will not actually be progressed in the short term. For example, it goes on to say on page 41 that if kerbside collection were to be introduced for both green and kitchen waste, this could increase the amount of green waste and remove quite a significant amount of putrescible kitchen waste -- about 10,000 tonnes -- from the waste stream, amounting to some 23% of the total inert waste. It also goes on to say that, however, kerbside collection of green waste and kitchen waste would be expensive. They then give the figures and say that it is not proposed as part of the plan. Indeed, under "*Recycling and Collection Systems*", it says "*In the short term, extended kerbside collection of materials is not recommended.*"

Now, bearing in mind that the Island will be adopting certain EU Directives, one of which is that EU countries will impose on their communities a kerbside collection of at least two recyclables in the very near future, could you perhaps comment on why -- I know it is a difficult one to do, but why -- the particular stance has been taken within the Public Services' document that kerbside collection, although it could make a difference to the way we treat our waste, the Committee are in fact not recommending it at this time?

MR BARNES: I think they have been daunted by the practical difficulties. We mentioned already the difficulty of the collection by the parishes and the Bellozanne Covenant, but we would encourage them to pursue this route. We think that it is very important that waste is separated. Contrary to what the reports says (and they talk about these things being done in the long term), we think that these things should be done in the short term and that will reduce the amount of waste and that will alter the perspective of the choice of final disposal.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: And in terms of costs, you do then actually recommend that a lot of the sorting takes place within the household. Would you actually agree that that is in fact the cheapest place for it to take place?

MR BARNES: Undoubtedly, yes.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Any further questions, gentlemen? (**pause**) If not, have you any further items or submissions you might want to give us? (**The witnesses conferred**)

MR BARNES: I would just like to emphasise -- I think this has come out in the conversation -- that we are interested in the first stages principally and that we haven't tried to give any advice on the choice of final disposal because we don't feel equipped to do that, but we would certainly be very interested in contributing to that at a later stage.

DEPUTY RONDEL: On behalf of the Panel, I should like to thank you very much for your clear evidence. Thank you.

MR BARNES: Thank you.

- - - - -