

Environment Scrutiny Panel

PUBLIC MEETING

Record of Meeting

Date: **Thursday 14th June 2007**

Meeting Number: **50**

Present	Deputy R.C. Duhamel (Chairman) (RD) Connétable K. A. Le Brun of St Mary (KB) Connétable A. S. Crowcroft (SC) Deputy P. V. F. Le Claire.(PLC)
In attendance	Mrs. C. Le Quesne (Scrutiny Officer) Mr M. Robbins. (Scrutiny Officer)

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
1.	Minutes of Previous Meetings Minutes of the meeting of 24th May 2007 Part A and Part B, 5th and 11th June 2007 were approved and signed by the Chairman. Minutes of the 2nd and 16th February 2007, having been previously approved were signed. RD. KB. SC. PLC.	
2.	Matters arising from the Minutes The Panel requested that clarification be recorded with regard to its Minute No. 8 of 24th May 2007 in respect of supplementary guidance on greenhouses. It requested that some of the changes related to green field areas and not redundant sites. RD. KB. SC. PLC.	
3.	Action Updates The Panel noted the following action updates - Connétable Murphy had extended his apologies as he would be unable to attend the Panel meeting; Ground Water - The Chairman advised that he would make contact with Mr. Mac Pollard and report back to the Panel in due course. RD. KB. SC. PLC.	
4.	Design of Homes The Panel was advised that the Chairman had provided the officer with the outline areas that required covering in the design of homes report.	CLQ

	<p>The Panel agreed that whilst it may decide to review other areas of home design in the near future, it was important to finalise its current report at the earliest opportunity. The Chairman and the lead member would attend a meeting with the officer on Friday 22nd June 2007 to discuss the progress and content of its report.</p> <p>It authorised the officer to undertake the necessary additional work required to ensure that a completed draft of the report was available by the 25th June 2007.</p> <p>The Chairman advised that an account remained to be settled with Mr. D. Mason. An invoice and details in this connection would be requested from Mr. Mason.</p> <p>RD. KB. SC. PLC.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Waste</p> <p>The Panel received a report dated 12th June 2007 on its recent fact finding visit to France, which had been facilitated by Mr. Loik Lamballais and discussed its visits to two recycling centres and a paper mill.</p> <p>The members who had been available to participate in the visit discussed the benefits of being able to witness the operation of the recycling depots and the simple approach taken to the sorting of the waste components which were by and large revenue generating.</p> <p>In addition it was considered that the visit to the paper mill provided an excellent opportunity to view the positive outcome of recycling in action. It was noted that the company operating the plant provided a booklet which gave an indication of the size of the scheme and it was recognised that the mill had significant capacity for expansion not just with regard to receiving cardboard, pamphlets, paper and magazines but without the requirement for the removal of all accidental inclusions of plastics as the process removes plastic during the production process. Plastic waste was then sent to another recycling development plant. The Panel discussed the potential for considerable economic growth with regard to the recycling industry and it was recognised that there was potential for that industry to be developed into a profitable business through innovation and diversity.</p> <p>During the course of the visit to the Company it was noted that officers from the Transport and Technical Services Department had previously visited some of the 8 recycling facilities in the area, some correspondence had ensued but no conclusion or feedback had been received for some time by the companies.</p> <p>Mr. Monier advised that his spend on the purchase of recyclable goods for processing and resale was in the region of one million Euros per month, with a staff of 84 people. Romi Recyclage had been established since 1845 and he was a 7th generation recycler. The business operated over a broad range of recyclables to ensure stability for the company during fluctuations in the waste commodities market.</p>	<p>MR</p>

The Chairman reminded the Panel that a fact finding visit to Normandy during Shadow Scrutiny had provided evidence of recycling companies operating in the Normandy area on a commercial basis. It was agreed that the sites visited both in Normandy and Brittany showed scale and capacity to deal with a significantly increased amount of recyclable products and that they were prepared to invest in infrastructure. Mr. Monier advised that he was currently investing in CCTV at all of his sites not only to allow remote monitoring of volume of products in the particular waste streams but also to provide security for high value processed recyclable materials.

The members noted that Romi Recyclage had received some recyclable metal products from Jersey over a number of years. It was noted that recyclable metal products remained a high value product.

The visit had provided members with an opportunity to discuss issues of transport, options which might be available, interest shown by up and coming companies and potential and likely competition in the recycling commodities market. It was noted that whilst the highly mechanised and obviously efficient paper mill visited focused on the production of egg cartons, many other products were made in other countries such as air-crete blocks made from paper waste which was a product just taking off in the USA produced from low quality pulp and was likely to develop into an economically viable market.

The Panel agreed that it was important that the Island adopted a method of disposing of its waste streams in a cost effective and environmentally acceptable way.

The Panel discussed the waste figures produced by the Transport and Technical Services Department which seemed to indicate that only half of paper products were recycled. It was suggested that a concerted effort could result in a significant increase, particularly with regard to commercial operations given that paper products generated an income which could be redirected to fund less lucrative recycling. In addition some consideration should be given to following EU guidance that commercial enterprise should provide funding for the disposal of its own waste in an environmentally acceptable way. The Panel was aware that requirement for an incinerator had been arrived at based on the calculations of the day; however, it was essential that a change in situation with regard to the handling of waste and the product value should be examined prior to any progression of the incinerator proposal to the States.

The Panel agreed that a further request for an update on the recycling revenue being realised by current recycling initiatives should be requested from the Transport and Technical Services Department. It was recalled that this information had been previously requested but that no response had been received to date.

The Panel was also mindful that one of the key issues used as a prohibiting factor for the shipment of recyclables off island was the cost. The Panel was advised that every item that was sent out or came in was subject to harbour dues. The issue of an

	<p>exemption for waste materials was suggested and agreed as a recommendation for inclusion into the waste report.</p> <p>The Panel directed its officer to work the necessary hours to ensure that the report was ready for presentation to the States on the 17th July 2007. A road show programme would be developed through the summer months.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that it would meet all day on the 11th July 2007 to finalise its report. It requested that lunch time refreshments be provided.</p> <p>The Panel further agreed that it would call Ministers to a Hearing in September to outline which of the report actions they would accept and initiate or otherwise. Dependant upon those decisions it would take any outstanding matters to the States for consideration in a proposition. Tentative dates would be agreed at the next Panel meeting.</p> <p>RD. KB. SC. PLC</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p>Officer time -</p> <p>The Panel received and considered a paper outlining the officer time available to it in the next two months. Having already agreed that it would wish to finalise its Design of Homes report in the next two weeks and its Waste Review report by the 17th July 2007 it confirmed that it would not allocate any additional tasks to its officers. On that basis the Panel agreed that it would not attend any of the forthcoming conferences relating to its remit given the time required for the organisation of such visits.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that it was essential that attendance should be subject to existing work loads and the relevance of the event to current or forthcoming reviews. The Panel decided that it would not attend the SDUK Conference at this time due to time pressures to complete its reviews although it did consider attendance valuable.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>EDAW</p> <p>The Panel received an update from the Chairman in connection with the EDAW report and public meetings which had been held to discuss its content. It was noted that the meetings had not been well attended by the public.</p> <p>The Panel was concerned that the key focus of the report was geared towards traffic; it expressed some reservations as to the direction of the report's recommendations and was not in agreement with proposals to take down car parks. The Panel considered that a more effective approach would be to support small businesses and the enhancement of a community feel to the town area.</p> <p>It considered that the report did not really address issues of regenerating community areas such as the residential areas around the Havre des Pas pool. It believed that the focus of the report should have provided for innovative ways to engender a more active community approach to living.</p>	

	<p>The Panel agreed that as soon as both of its current reviews were completed, a short report should be produced to forward to the Council of Ministers expressing concerns over the focus of the report and the lack of attention given to providing adequate infrastructure to promote community activity and living.</p> <p>The Panel requested that the Chairman draft a list of key bullet points highlighting its concerns for submission to the Council of Ministers at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>RD. KB. PLC.</p>	RD
8	<p>T&TS</p> <p>The Panel recalled that the Minister for Transport and Technical Services was in the process of revising some of the proposals to be included in the draft Transport Policy.</p> <p>The Panel further recalled that it had participated in a number of useful meetings which had provided the opportunity for an exchange of ideas, some of which were being incorporated into an updated draft of the proposed transport policy.</p> <p>The Panel requested that the Department be invited to advise when the revised draft policy would be available for detailed consideration and response.</p> <p>The Panel directed its officers to enquire as to the expected date of the report's availability.</p> <p>RD. KB. SC. PLC.</p>	CLQ
9	<p>Orchid</p> <p>The Panel received an email invitation through the Scrutiny Manager from the President, Chairmen's Committee to comment and indicate whether or not it felt that Orchid's work to date with their respective Panels (without Orchid being present) had provided a value for money service and if its contract should be extended. This was with a view to each of the Chairmen reporting back the views of their Panels to the next Chairmen's Committee meeting on 29th June 2007.</p> <p>The Panel advised that it would not wish to extend the contract with the company as the arrangement was not considered to represent best value for money.</p> <p>The officers were requested to advise the Scrutiny Manager of its view.</p> <p>RD. KB. PLC.</p>	CLQ/MR
10.	<p>Cierra</p> <p>The Panel welcomed Mr. D. Henbest and Mr. J. Hanley of Cierra, a Jersey based waste solution company to its meeting.</p> <p>The Panel was provided with a detailed presentation on the proposed Cierra autoclave solutions. It noted that the concept outlined was one of a number of solutions that could revolutionise the use of the waste commodity.</p>	

The Panel agreed that the concept of waste as a commodity should be promoted as potentially an innovative approach could provide light industry and a new industry for the Island. It was agreed that the potential for such growth should be discussed with the Minister for Economic Development.

The delegation advised that it understood the reasons for the pursuance of the incinerator option for the island and accepted that decisions of any kind could only be made on the best information on the day. However, it was agreed that the situation and public feeling had changed since the initial decision to favour the introduction of a large incinerator had been taken.

It was noted that the States as an assembly had not made a final decision as to whether or not it would support an incinerator as the waste solution for Jersey.

The Panel was advised that the solution being offered by Cierra was one that would meet Jersey's requirements focused on the use of autoclaves to reduce all waste streams to an inert matter which could be used in the production of plastic woods in a number of colours and finishes. The 'wood' could be used in a number of recreational areas within the garden and the long term potential for its varied use was expected to be significant. The autoclave system would be operated by generators running on chip fat. The proposed plant would be significantly smaller than any incinerator and emissions would be negligible.

It was explained that Cierra would be working closely with an American partner company. The delegation invited the Panel to meet with its partner who would be visiting the Island to discuss the proposals further. The Panel agreed to attend such a meeting at a time and place to be confirmed.

The delegation advised that it could produce compost as part of the process and that it could share technical details of the trials from America. The Panel requested detailed technical specifications relating to the proposed solution, including materials required for inclusion to the mix for the process to be successful, where such materials would be sourced from, what the cost implications would be, would there be a gate fee associated with the solution and what was the basis for such a fee considering the anticipated commercial viability of the plant.

It was noted that the proposed solution was similar to the Murph facility viewed by the Panel on its fact finding visit to Cardiff in 2006. The current proposal represented an improved plant where an improved quality control could be ensured.

The Panel was advised of the following -

- (a) What you are left with at the end of the waste product is ultimate waste - It requires no burning process;
- (b) The process is one of pressure and steam;-
- (c) Metals would come out clean and ready for sale and shipment;
- (d) Glass could be crushed subsequently or sold on;
- (e) Paper could go through the process or be shipped on for sale.

	<p>The process would not be able to dispose of gas bottles or batteries however these could still be shipped off. It was noted that any incineration plant would be in the same position and would be unable to dispose of those products,</p> <p>The Panel was advised that the process would allow for a one bin collection or if preferred a mix. It was suggested that it was not practical to enforce recycling and it was proposed that the company would do that on its site. The separation process that Cierra had developed was 90 per cent automation and 10 per cent manual. Labour was kept to a minimum requiring only engineering and quality control staff on the waste side of the business. It would need additional personnel on production, development and sales.</p> <p>The Panel was advised that the company was not seeking to promote a hard sell approach, its aim was to facilitate a trial in Jersey and as a result of that waste trial it was confident that the evidence would lead to a positive decision. It suggested that the approach would afford Jersey with an opportunity to become an innovator in the waste industry.</p> <p>It was asserted that the solution would produce green products, would result in tax revenues and provide an example of Jersey being a best practice leader.</p> <p>The Panel thanked the delegation for its time and requested that it be provided with a copy of the presentation and the technical detail to support the content of that presentation. The Panel also requested an outline of the associated costs which it would be prepared to consider in confidence.</p> <p>The delegation agreed to the requests and thanked the Panel for its time.</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>Business Plan</p> <p>The Panel agreed that it should feedback its concerns with regard to some aspects of the business plan received from the Transport and Technical Services Department. It agreed that its concerns over the proposed use of the La Collette site should be highlighted and that some verification of projected costs outlined in that business plan should be tested. The Chairman agreed to produce bullet points outlining the key areas of concern to be approved at the next Panel meeting and subsequently to be formed into an amending proposition to be lodged 'au Greffe' at the appropriate time.</p> <p>RD. KB. PLC.</p>	<p>RD/PLC</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>Next Meetings</p> <p>The Chairman and the lead member for Design of Homes Review would meet with the officer on Friday 22nd June 2007 in the First Floor Meeting Room, Morier House to progress the report. Subsequent meetings relating to the drafting of the report would be agreed at that meeting.</p> <p>The next public meeting of the Environment Scrutiny Panel was to be at 09.30 am on Thursday 28th June 2007 in the Le</p>	<p>CLQ</p> <p>CLQ/MR</p>

	Capelain Room, States Building. RD. KB. PLC.	CLQ/MR
13.	<p>Matters for inclusion of the next agenda</p> <p>The Chairman would report back on the forthcoming Water Group meeting;</p> <p>The Chairman would report back following a meeting with a representative of the American company working with Cierra on its proposed waste solution to Jersey. The meeting was to be arranged for the 20th June 2007. It was agreed that the waste review lead officer should attend the meeting to take notes.</p> <p>The strategic Plans for the La Collette area were to be included on the next agenda.</p> <p>RD. KB. PLC</p>	MR

Signed

Date:

.....

.....

Chairman
Environment Panel