

Environment Scrutiny Panel Composting Report

FRIDAY, 3rd AUGUST 2007

Panel:

Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour (Chairman)
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire of St. Helier

Witnesses:

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye of St. Helier (Minister for Transport and Technical Services)
Mr. J. Richardson (Chief Officer, Transport and Technical Services)
Mr. W. Gardiner (Director, Waste Strategy)

Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour (Chairman):

Right: "It is important that you fully understand the conditions under which you are appearing in this hearing. The panel's proceedings are covered by parliamentary privilege through Article 34 of the States of Jersey (Jersey) Law 2005 and as a result you are protected from being sued or prosecuted for anything said during this hearing although this privilege should obviously not be abused. The proceedings are being recorded and transcriptions will be made available on the Scrutiny website." The other one is pretty much the same, I think.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire of St. Helier:

I think you should read it though.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

You want me to read the other one as well for the other non States' Members? Right. For non States' Members: "It is important that you fully understand the conditions under which you are appearing in this hearing. The proceedings of the panel are covered by parliamentary privilege through Article 34 of the States of Jersey (Jersey) Law 2005 and the States of Jersey Powers, Privileges and Immunities Scrutiny Panels PAC (Public Accounts Committee) and PPC (Privileges and Procedures Committee) Jersey Regulations 2006 and witnesses are protected from being sued or prosecuted for anything said during hearings unless they say something they know to be untrue.

This protection is given to witnesses to ensure that they can speak freely and openly to the panel when giving evidence without fear of legal action although the immunity shall obviously not be abused by making unsubstantiated statements about third parties who have no right of reply. The panel would like you to bear this in mind when answering questions. The proceedings are being recorded and transcriptions will be made available on the Scrutiny website.” Right.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye of St. Helier (Minister for Transport and Technical Services):

Thank you, Chairman, for those warning notices. As this is a formal hearing, could I just inquire because I do not know, there are only 2 members of your panel here, does that mean that you are quorate?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

That is a very good question. I would need to take legal advice.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

I was just wondering if you, perchance, are not quorate, whether you are in a position to hold a formal hearing or not.

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, good point, it had crossed my mind as well. We were expecting, I think, Ken Le Brun, but he is not here at the moment. Could one of the officers find out whether we are entitled to proceed?

Mr. M. Haden:

There are 4 members of the panel, so the quorum is 50 per cent. I am not sure whether we can constitute it as 5 members, if it is constituted officially as 5 then we are not.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Right, okay.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

The second point I was going to raise was also for a formal hearing there should have been some terms of reference and we are not aware of what the terms of reference in respect of composting are. In the interests of perhaps moving things forward and the sake of good governance, might I suggest that we abandon a formal hearing and just press on in an informal basis?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, I am happy with that. Yes.

Mr. M. Haden:

Could you just carry on with the transcription only because most of the officers with the panel are either absent on leave or one on sick leave and --

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

I am happy for a transcription to be taken down on the basis that it is an informal hearing and we will not necessarily see it published as a matter of record on the Scrutiny website.

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

All right. Yes, okay. Well, I am certainly happy to proceed on that basis. Right --

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Sorry to be pedantic.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

That is quite all right. Yes.

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I think maybe what we can do is treat this as an exploratory meeting and then, if we have the need to get anything down on the website, we will call you back in the terms of reference, maybe. That would be a better way.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Right, the reason for convening this meeting was to, as Paul says, explore where we are or where we are not with the composting issue. As you are well aware, the open windrowing process is continuing at La Collette until whatever policies are put in place for their replacement. There was a report done by Paul and myself and others earlier on with the compost working party, indeed we have had discussions on the Scrutiny Panel over composting issues and we are just wondering where the department are at the moment in relation to (a) closing down or moving or updating the facilities at La Collette and whether or not there is an intention, as has been intimated in the States on more than one occasion by the Minister - by yourself - that you are prepared, or would be prepared to take on board some of the recommendations that had previously been made, in particular to distributed shredding facilities?

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

Well, the position is, to make it quite clear, that the open windrow composting operation at La Collette is proceeding and proceeding successfully, albeit with the caveat that the department is aware that from time to time there is an annoyance to some local residents by the smell that is given off in particular when the compost is turned, which it has to be, and when the wind is blowing towards the land. We regret that there are occasions when the composting process has to continue in order that the anaerobic processes do not make the smell worse when unavoidably the wind will be blowing in an adverse direction. Having said that, the strategy remains largely the same and that is that we would wish to transfer those processes into an enclosed composting plant. Indeed, if we did pursue the strategies as originally laid out, a plant of that nature would probably have been commissioned last month and would currently be in operation. Nevertheless, we, as you know, spent a lot of time to allow a Scrutiny report to be prepared, originally instigated by Deputy Le Claire. We have taken on board a number of suggestions, most significantly that it would be helpful to have various sites at key locations around the Island to act as reception centres for green waste compost, thus cutting down the number of trips required to our current location. We have also pursued and are coming to the conclusion of an evaluation of a variety of sites that were put to us as alternatives, subject to a public consultation, public advertisement, and now a full evaluation of their suitability. I have brought with me not just my Chief Officer, John Richardson, but also William Gardiner, who

is our Director of Waste Strategy, who has been spearheading that evaluation process and you are very welcome to direct questions to him or my Chief Officer to establish where we are.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

In the current Annual Business Plan, the annex to 2008, it does state on page 104 that plans are on track to complete a new in-vessel composting facility in 2009. Would you like to comment on the timetables?

Mr. J. Richardson (Chief Officer, Transport and Technical Services):

Would you like me to --

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Sure.

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. J. Richardson:

That Business Plan was produced in 2006 before we had Deputy Le Claire's report so by the time we went through the drafting programme --

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

No, this is the current one in actual fact.

Mr. J. Richardson:

That is the 2007 Business Plan?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

No, 2008.

Mr. J. Richardson:

That is the 2008 Business --

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

This is the latest.

Mr. J. Richardson:

Oh right. Sorry, 2008. So that was -- right. So, in theory if we had approval for a site then 2009 is probable. We need about 12 months to build a plant, 12 months' construction period.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

From our investigations it is clear that it could take less time than the 12 months that you are putting aside. Is there way that the timetable could be brought forward?

Mr. J. Richardson:

I think that will depend totally on land availability, whether that land is in States' ownership or private ownership and what arrangements have got to be made for procurement or leasing and the legal aspect of going through land purchase if we go into private sector land and the type of technology that is selected. So I think our Business Plan is saying the States' debate and the strategy so far is for a single in-vessel enclosed compost plant which will take about 12 months to construct once we get on to site. So we are leaving it at that. If, for any reason, we ended up with a different arrangement and land was available then it might shorten the time horizon. But I think at this stage it would be wrong to build up hopes that it would be quicker than that because we have not concluded the land issue yet.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, but that said, I mean part of the reason for doing the work previously was to attempt to persuade the department that there was perhaps potential to split the problem into a number of parts in order to bring forward the dates. So, has a decision finally been taken in that regard as yet or are you still looking at it?

Mr. J. Richardson:

Do you want me to --

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Well, we are down to a very short shortlist.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Formatted: French (France)

Right, okay. Is there any indication of when the Minister would be making his mind up finally?

Mr. J. Richardson:

I would anticipate probably 2 to 3 months to get final selection in terms of -- yes, September, so it is 2 months to get down to the final recommended sites and then after that it is a case of depending whether that site or sites are in public or private ownership, we can then work out a reasonable time period in order to get the project moving.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Right.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

So, the department has gone out and done evaluation of the sites? Obviously, we suggested some technologies that you were looking at in any event, some of the systems that we looked at with in-vessel type that you have seen. There are some things to discuss at another time about the letter and the issues that were raised about the distribution of material once it has been composted and the application of that to land which I think we can set aside for now because I would like to come back to that another time. But to try to explore where we are going or where the department is going, where the Island is going, where are we with those evaluations? How many sites have been excluded? How many sites have been set down as possible sites for future? What is the technology -- you are talking one large plant, are we talking away from La Collette or what are we doing?

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Well, if it is helpful, one of the reasons that I have asked the Director of Waste Strategy to be here is that he would be in a position to give you a short presentation on how the evaluation has been conducted. So you can see the issues that were applied to each site and how we have ended up where we are. I should emphasise the decision making is not entirely based within the department, we have had a cross-departmental exercise on this, so you are not, as it were, getting the department's particular view on evaluation. It is a number of key officer personnel who have been

Formatted: French (France)

brought in to give an appropriate, in my view, holistic overview to the judgment.
William?

Mr. W. Gardiner (Director Waste Strategy):

Thank you. Good morning everybody. I have tried to set out here where we are on the process to give you a clearer position as to where we are. It is fair to say that the evaluation process has been complicated because of the necessity to treat fairly the private sites and States' sites and also to consider the number of different combinations which can be thrown up both by different technologies and also by the different combinations of reception treatment facilities that arise. We also had an added complication that the La Collette Hazard Review has changed effectively, our ability to have public receptions at La Collette for new facilities. So that has certainly been an important development.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Before we go on, that is quite an important thing you just said there, I think. You are now saying that given the ongoing evaluation the reception facilities that you were envisaging at La Collette are no longer feasible?

Mr. J. Richardson:

For mass public --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Mass public drop off point?

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Yes. It is all right for limited -- it all depends on the number of people on the site at any one time.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Right.

Formatted: French (France)

Mr W. Gardiner:

But for mass public, like a Saturday and Sunday where you have got lots of cars, individuals coming down then, La Collette is not suitable for that any longer. It is about controlling the risk to individuals and that has meant that it is certain but it is very unlikely that the public placing facilities will be suitable at La Collette. Commercial receptions may still be. So we are taking that into account. The evaluation process has been divided into 3 parts. First stage looked at the effectively screening process against the expression of interest criteria that were discussed and developed with yourselves towards the end of 2006. We developed a process by looking at each site and determining against the expression of interest criteria whether the criteria had been met to progress to stage 2. In the first part of that screening process we looked at particularly transport access because that was a key consideration for us, the zoning of the sites and then we looked at the footprint of the sites and particularly having investigated further the distance between sensitive receptors. We have got some specific advice from the Open University on what is acceptable distance to have from sensitive receptors to any composting operation which disturbs the compost so turning, windrow composting itself, shredding, those operations and we have confirmed that ideally you should be no closer than 50 metres, the very closest you should be is 30 metres to sensitive receptors. So that has also informed our review of footprints because if you have a shredding operation or a turning operation, any treatment operation you have to keep that distance. As I say, it does not mean that the areas in the consideration for each site have been under review. So, what we found in doing stage 1, we looked at all the different technologies that we had had expression of interest on which I believe covers all the different types of technology that you yourselves were interested in and indeed we have had expressions of interest on and we looked at an analysis of the footprint that would emerge from that technology assuming either full treatment of all of the compost that we are expecting to arrive(?) and then we looked also at a lesser level, so a third of the total, so that we could look at, for example, combinations of sites. So that process was undertaken and for each expression of interest site and indeed the States' sites that we had already considered, we looked at whether they met the requirement as being a potential public reception facility, potential commercial reception facility, a potential treatment facility for all of the wastry(?) or a third of the wastry and sites could proceed to stage 2 under one or any combination of those factors. It took us a while to get to that but it gave the most fair evaluation against those criteria. As a result of

that assessment we progressed 12 of the sites and those are detailed for you in this paper on the table, 6 of which were private sites and 6 of which are States' sites. The results of this stage 1 assessment are with John at the moment and I believe we are having a ministerial decision shortly on it and it will become a public document at that stage. But those are the sites that met one or more of those combination of requirements. Of the sites in stage 1, 12 were eliminated - eliminated is probably the wrong word - but if they were in the green zone the Island Plan on advice from, as the Minister says, our colleagues in the Planning Department, they said that proposals for new development in the Green Zone as stated in the paper here should only be considered where it is demonstrated there are no suitable alternatives in the built up area. So effectively those ones are your green zone and are put on hold while we do the rest of the assessment at stage 2 and 3. If we cannot find a suitable site in stage 2 and 3 we will go back to those green zone sites. There were 2 sites as well in the area of outstanding national character, so those have been ruled out altogether because it is probably unacceptable for what is an effectively industrial, agricultural operation, depending how you clarify it, to be in those areas. One site, once we have done the assessment looking at sensitive receptors as well on the 30 metre zoning was too small to pass through at all into that stage as well. So that is really the results of the stage 1 assessment. We have also detailed for you there the minimum footprint areas for the different combinations of single sites, multiple sites, full capacity processing, third capacity processing. You can see the types of site and how they had been progressed against those criteria.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Can I just ask about your criteria, but before I do, though, just to say that the work that has obviously been done so far, in your presentation, I must commend the department and the other organisations. You have obviously gone into it in a very thorough way and it is heartening to see that you have been doing it and one does not really appreciate what is going on behind the scenes. This is an opportunity to see what it going on. I must say, for the record, up to this point of the presentation anyway, it is very encouraging to hear what work has been going on. Can I just ask though before you proceed, in relation to your minimum site areas for the facility types, you have got large areas in metres squared, I guess we might want to - or I am sure the Chairman might want to discuss those. I look at those numbers and I imagine

my in-vessel compost system that I see demonstrated within certain companies within this report and ones that you have looked at and the area for treating on site strikes me straight away, looking at these numbers, minimum site area, that they are quite large. Does that include the site area and a shredding area and also -- because obviously we are not reading this as we are going, but does this also include the minimum sensitive receptor area as well?

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

In itself, Deputy, 10,000 square metres does look like quite a large number but a large football pitch is roughly 100 metres by 100 metres which is 10,000 square metres, so that puts it in context. That is the sort of thing we are looking at, the largest size football pitch, it matches up to the largest area we are looking at and everything else will be smaller than that.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Okay, thanks very much.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Well, I think it will help the panel when this report is published because we gave the breakdown for 6 categories of different in-vessel composter and looked at the metre squared requirement from the best available data that we had, either published data or submitted data with the expressions of interest we have received for each technology both for the technology and then the maturation area and then the other reception areas and what we found was that the choice of technology has a relatively small impact on the overall sizing or size requirements which I think is what we were discussing last year. We assume that. We did not have any evidence of that, we now have gathered evidence which shows that and we have got a table which I am not able to share at the moment, but you will be able to have shortly, which shows that and sets out how those areas are derived. We have also got to get to that point we have developed model footprints for each of the assumptions which you can look at in the drawings of how it is laid out so --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

You have done a lot of work on this, yes.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

I am afraid it has taken longer than we have wanted to, but it has been fair to each site we had to do this.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Yes, but you have done a thorough job so far. It is to be commended for that.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

So we can certainly show, in due course, it will be document -- as soon as it has received ministerial approval --

Male Speaker:

I think really, I mean, talk about the endgame. The endgame is the decision on what we do with the Island's green waste. But if we can track through, from a Scrutiny process, everything that we have looked at and everything that we have tried to suggest and everything the department has done and marry those up with suggestion and investigation and it seems that that is happening. Then the process of government is working, is it not?

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

Yes. I do not want to predict what the final choice is going to be in terms of site recommendations, it would be inappropriate. But what I certainly can say, it is as a result of input from Scrutiny last year that the thinking changed to some extent in terms of looking at a multiplicity of sites and it is indeed fortuitous, not to say coincidental, that following on from the Buncefield incident and its implications for development around fuel depots, it is as well that we were already doing that work because the clear implication coming out of the hazard review is that we will no longer be able to use the La Collette area for major public disposal. In other words, the public will simply have to go to alternative sites and in that sense we are all grateful that we have been looking at that issue, as it were, before we were obliged to look at it anyway.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Right, jolly good --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

I interrupted you mid-flow. I appreciate what you are saying, Minister, thank you for that. I did not mean to interrupt the officer, but I just wanted to make it on the record that I have been one of the most strongly - not critics - but sort of scrutineers, I guess, on this issue and I am heartened. I am going to go back and tell people that are affected by this, not just residents but also visitors and hotel owners and guesthouse owners, and I can say that while the end may be in sight, we do not know what the end will be. I can certainly say from a fair perspective, the department has been doing a thorough job in investigating proposals. It had been looking at alternatives because of the Buncefield issue which the Minister has just mentioned, as I say, I think it is commendable. I will go back and make that known.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

We are very grateful to you, Deputy Le Claire, but as a word of caution, I would point out that La Collette is still a potential site --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

I understand that.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

-- so I would not want you to get anyone's hopes up --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

No, no, I fully understand that the end decision has to be made and it might not necessarily please most people, but what I want to give evidence to is the fact that we have looked at all of the other opportunities and we have come up with what is the best solution. So far what I am hearing is that we are going through that process so we do not have those concerns.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Stage 2.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

We are progressing with stage 2. This is really a technical evaluation of each of the sites and it is undertaken with colleagues in Planning, Environment and Public Health. Transport and Technical Services develop criteria for key requirements that we believe are necessary consideration for any composting site and those are set out for you there.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Where are those?

Mr. W. Gardiner:

They are at --

Mr. J. Richardson:

Under that table.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Unfortunately I did not give you page numbers. Under stage 2, technical evaluation process. So, we look again at wider compatibility for the Island there, not just land zoning, issues such as visual impact, biodiversity and heritage impact are covered. We are looking at operational criteria in particular, connection of power and drainage, construction criteria such as the levelness of the site and the likely cost impact -- sorry, the likely scale of cost impact for operational criteria. Environmental criteria are largely based on noise in stage 2. This is because issues such as odour and dust with in-vessel composting systems usually can be controlled to a state that that is not a primary factor, noise becomes the primary factor in in-vessel composting services provided they are controlled effectively but we will be looking in detail at wider nuisance in stage 3. But we did not want to spend a lot of money on an enormous combination of sites because we have still got, as I will explain, a large number of combinations that we are looking at with 12 sites and a number of those sites have more than one potential solution to contribute to. We also look at the bio-aerosol risk again and hazard zoning. In terms of access and transportation criteria we are looking at the proximity to waste arisings and we have done 2 surveys then at La Collette on the parish by parish arising of green waste for both commercial and public reception.

So we now know 2 snapshots admittedly, but reasonable basis on where the waste is coming from. That has been very helpful in thinking about scoring particular sites against that requirement so obviously the site at St. Ouens is not going to score so highly as the site in --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

When did you do those snapshots?

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. W. Gardiner:

One was done in early July and one was done in April, I believe.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

So both at a time when the foliage is at its growing --

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Yes.

Male Speaker:

Yes. This year in particular.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

I am sure we could share those as part of the work if you are interested. We are also looking at the traffic junction access requirement that would be necessary for each site at a high level, not in any terms of a detailed feasibility access because that would be expensive on such a high number of combinations as far as getting that revisited at stage 3. The likely impact on the programme of - so in other words, things like vacant possession come into play there. If we are talking about a site which needs a lot of work to it that is going to have a delay and we thought it important to value, as the Chair mentioned, how long this is going to take is of absolute importance. So, what we have done is divide stage 2 into 2 processes. One is wherever a solution - and when we are saying a solution it is a site being considered as either public reception, commercial reception or a treatment facility or a third of a treatment facility - all those things on the table. Wherever it is unlikely to be viable against any of those criteria we are going to strike it out because otherwise we will have, we worked out I think,

140 different combinations to evaluate at stage 2. So what we are doing is we are saying that it is unlikely to be viable and look at the reasonable combinations of solutions that are likely to be viable against those criteria in detail in stage 2 and we call that stage 2B. Well, I did not explain very well but did it make sense?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Well, up until stage 2B, yes.

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Okay, let me try again.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

No, I did get that, but I just would like to ask though stage 2 and you have got stage A where you break down the enormous amounts of possibilities to ones that can be practical. So what is stage B going to be?

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Stage 2B will look at those criteria and score them and we are using a scoring mechanism where our colleagues in the different departments, for example in Planning, will score compatibility with the Island Plan, probably Environment will look at the environmental criteria, colleagues in Public Health will look at the nuisance criteria and score them, the individual solutions against those sites against the score of a weighting table. Say, for each category of criteria using compatibility of the Island Plan, there will be a plus 2 score if there is not any contradiction with the Island Plan at all developing on that site. A minus 2 score would mean that you have got significant issues to overcome against the Island Plan.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

It seems that this is all very thorough. What analysis has been factored in in relation to finances and options for getting there? Where would that money come from? Have you been restricted or have you just imagined you have had a big bank account which allows you to do what you want?

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Well, because of the need to get down to the nub of the latter really in terms of which sites are really viable and look best, we have saved the financial, legal and full technical evaluation on those sites to stage 3. So once we get down to what we are hoping is no more than 5 sites, 5 solutions if you like, there will be a full financial, legal and technical appraisal of those 5 combinations. Just because to do that for the number of combinations we are dealing with --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

It would be a waste of money, yes.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

-- it would take a long time we worked out. Initially, that is what we are trying to do. So in stage 3 we are looking at the operational criteria, environmental criteria in detail, access and transportation criteria including a full traffic feasibility assessment and then there are capital and operational costs, land values and we will do full legal checks both on the States' sites and private sites --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Make sure they have got the land, yes.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Exactly. So that is --

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Will each site be assessed on the applicability or not of a particular type of treatment plant --

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Technology.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

-- for technology, because obviously there is a major issue as to some sites might well be deemed to be too small for one particular technological operation but a perfect size for another.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

I think that was dealt with really in stage 1 because what we found is that the type of technology does not really have an effect on the land take, so the issue of the site being too small in relation to technology I think we have overcome. It is more about testing a range of combinations against single sites where you get --

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

So is the key criterion on site on-site availability of land for maturation?

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Not in every case. It would be, in terms of stage 3 -- we have not done stage 3 yet so that is sort of pre-empting it really. But stage 3 will look at application of the footprint that we have developed at stage 1 which includes sufficient area for maturation and the technology development to take place. You will see in response to Deputy Le Claire's question how the choice of technology does not really have a major effect on that range of solution. In fact looking at the different types of technology; tunnels, enclosed halls, vessels, containers, cage systems and vertical systems, there is, once you include maturation either in the vessel or outside the vessel, the range is -- enclosed halls are probably 110 per cent, let us say, and cages is 89 per cent. So that is the sort of rounded range.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, but specifically what you are working up is there must be maturation on site?

Mr. W. Gardiner:

What we are working at is a solution which deals with the total problem, yes. Because to be fair to different technologies, because some do deal with maturation in-vessel, some do not, but to be a fair assessment and not to pre-empt the tender evaluation, we have to make the assumption that both processes had to be included.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Right, okay. I have got one general question before we carry on. On page 3 it says: "November 2000, T and TS (Transport and Technical Services) agree to review the

potential offered by privately owned sites for a long term replacement for the current La Collette green waste composting operation in addition to the States owned sites that are already under consideration.” To what extent are you allowing any development of, or working up of, a potential solution to be flexible enough to incorporate the potential to add in food waste should that be decided upon by the States?

Mr. W. Gardiner:

We are required under the strategy to incorporate sufficient capacity for food waste and we have allowed an extension area as part of the evaluation of space for, I think it is 8,000 tonnes of food waste.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Eight thousand tons? Yes, okay.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Which is based on the assumptions in the strategy.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

That is interesting, that. You mention 8,000 tons, but in previous documentation, we have been told that there is of the order of 17,000 tonnes of food waste.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

That is -- sorry, 17,000 tonnes of input, but 8,000 tonnes of processed which is soggy.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Right, okay. Fair enough. Okay.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

What has happened with the sludge? Sewage sludge, are you looking at utilising any of that in the process?

Mr. J. Richardson:

Sewage sludge at the moment, because of the land bank issues is probably going to go to the Energy from Waste plant. The options are being kept open in terms of availability of land bank and the competition of the Island's land banks for all the various commodities that go to that land bank, whether it is compost of whichever degree and grade we end up with, food waste if it is in compost or not in the future, sewage sludge, animal manure, existing vegetable waste coming from the Agriculture Ministry itself which they are dealing with now. When you take all those combinations of, I think it is 6 I have just counted out there, clearly there is one land bank on the Island which is competing for all that material, so there is a balance to strike, and with the protocols which I am sure you have seen, that certainly are becoming much, much stricter now for the agricultural land, then the application or the ability to apply to agricultural land is reducing, which means that the other land, the normal green land, open space land, is becoming very restricted in terms of availability for sewage sludge. It certainly looks at the moment as if the ultimate route will be dried sludge to agricultural land where it is possible. Bear in mind there is now a rule of 3 months when no material can go to land at all in each year, because of the wet conditions. So, I think where we will end up is, where appropriate dried and fully thermally treated sewage sludge on the land where that land bank is available. But where it is not available, then it will be disposed of through Energy for Waste plant or replacement Bellozane plant.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Can I ask you 2 questions from that, please, John? The first one, if I could, is, you say there is a 3 months' window where the land is too wet to apply the sludge, given our recent weather cycle -- or am I wrong?

Mr. J. Richardson:

Sorry. No, not just sludge. It is all application - compost as well.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

So, given the --

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Only in nitrate sensitive areas.

Mr. J. Richardson:

I am not going to disagree. I am not sure about that, but certainly the indications we get from the industry is there is a 3 month period in the year - whether it is a combination of nitrate sensitive and condition of land - where it is extremely difficult, if not almost impossible, to get access on to farm land for disposal of compost or sewage sludge. So, nitrate, I am sure, plays an important role, but its practical acceptability and availability of land, that the farmers effectively close us down.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

From our calculations, I do not think it is an issue. But we would be happy to exchange and to argue over the calculations.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

Can I ask in what respect do you not believe it to be an issue?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Well, we have calculated that we need of the order of 2,000 vergées for food or co-composted material of green waste. Obviously, if you are adding in sewage sludge to the mix, then that would change the figures slightly. Certainly, if the problem was split into 2, which is the situation that is coming forward at the moment, and the sewage sludge is dealt with in a different fashion to food waste and co-composting or green waste, then 2,000 vergées on the total land available within the Island is not an issue.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

You say it is not an issue because the owners of that land have already agreed --

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

It is not an issue because within the make-up of that land, it is not just agricultural, it is amenity land as well, and if you only need of the order of 20,000 tonnes and 2,000 vergées, and there is the order of 64,000 vergées on the Island - admittedly, a proportion of that is built upon, but we do have an element of gardens, we have an

Deleted: 0

Inserted: 0

element of golf courses and other amenity land - 2,000 on the total land available is not an over-bearing burden to be ...

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

That is what my first question was going to be. How do you make an assessment, if I could ask? The Chairman knows his figures from his background, I guess. That was the first question I wanted to ask. I now understand the difficulty in applying it to the land because of the conditions, with the seasonal changes we are seeing. Who knows, that might increase the difficulties. But what assessment, and on what scientific basis is the department working on in relation to the actual land bank? In terms of 64,000 vergées on the Island - and I did not know it was that much - you probably have done the work to identify that, but where can we see what is the analysis of the land? You said there are 6 different applications to the land base. Could you provide us with an assessment of the land base and the different things so we can see exactly, from your perspective, what you are looking at and from our perspective, what we think we might be able to suggest as options that you have probably factored in – just to see that we are all looking at the same pie, basically?

Mr. W. Gardiner:

In response to the Scrutiny form, waste recycling details, given the assumptions that you have made, and in our detailed response to the findings we would provide a breakdown of what we think the available land is.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Where did you get that information from?

Mr. W. Gardiner:

That was from a variety of different sources.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Could you provide that information to us, as to where you have got your calculations for the land? Because that is what I am after is to see how you have assessed your ...

Mr. W. Gardiner:

I think the overall finding, without pre-empting that response, was that we would not disagree that there was the potential for that land to be available. The difficulty is that it is not just available in a vacuum. It has got a number of different conflicting uses as well as the operational application concerns and the financial drivers, and through our experience of applying different types of material to land, farmers are going to take commercial opportunities where they arise. That vegetable material applied to land, for example, is not likely to attract a lesser cost than green waste derived compost, for example. So, while there might be the potential for that material to be applied to land, you have got to think about the way that farmers approach this and the way that the land is used in rotation, and a combination of things. So, the actual availability of that land may not be economically available --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

I think this is a crucial assessment that needs to be undertaken by --

Mr. W. Gardiner:

They are going to do it.

Mr. J. Richardson:

I think it is absolutely crucial. The sums add up. I do not think we disagree with you in terms of the sums and the theoretical calculations of land bank availability, application rate and how much land could be available to use. The issue comes down to --

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

It is down to organisation. Yes.

Mr. J. Richardson:

Well, not organisation. It is down to acceptability of the product. Will the farmers accept it? Does it conform to the protocols that they are working to with their supplies, if it is on agricultural land used for growing crops? Does it fit in within their rotational cycle? Does it fit in with the competing demands of other materials? Because if you look at the rural initiative scheme, where there is an emphasis on storing cow slurry for the 3 wet months of the year, it means that at the end of that

period, the dairy industry has a large stockpile of slurry manure which they want to apply to land. So, immediately, for a period of time when that time scale ends, a large element of land subject to the application matrix is then used up to dispose of that backlog of slurry. All of these have got to be factored in to the availability of land. I think, when it comes to making the comparison between theoretical calculations and practical application, when you take all of those factors into account, what do you find? Certainly our experience, when you are working with the industry, is that the theoretical calculations do not work. You have then got to look at --

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I think you are missing out a chunk there, because it is not just working with agricultural partners, it is working with the other partners at land that would be suitable or could be suitable.

Mr. J. Richardson:

I totally agree and, no, we are not missing that out at all. We are not just talking about agricultural land used for growing crops, we are talking about the Island's land bank. That is absolutely crucial. We can completely agree with you. We are not missing it out. Please do not think we are.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

From a politician's perspective, what I am doing is, I am discussing with colleagues possible application of compost to different areas within the Island, depending upon what the compost is made up of. Obviously, we know from a very basic level that there is soil improvement. There are various levels of different compost that can be used in potting plants, et cetera, maybe stymieing the importation of product, or helping to stymie the importation of product. Maybe taxing those would help to favourably diminish the amount of stuff that is being brought in and sold, although we have spoken to garden centres and there is a high margin in everything else. But it is the quality in relation to, also, potted plants, and the guy from Flying Flowers, I think, now is selling potted plants, so those applications from an industry perspective. There are all different types of applications. But what is very interesting is, if you look at all of this different material, and you say some it has got to have got sewage sludge and some of it in future may have food waste in it and some of it may not. Some of it may

Formatted: French (France)

be maturated down into a soil improver and some of it may be just shredded where it is on the land. Some of it may be bagged and sold off Island. What is, of necessity for politicians to understand, is they need to look at an aerial view of the Island and see which parts of the Island are agricultural, like in the Island plan, and this is what needs to be drawn up in the Island plan, which parts are actively in agricultural use? As you say, there are 6 different types of use. We need to know which organisations are those farms being used in conjunction with; for example, there is a field here which belongs to the Jersey Rural Organisation. They will have a list as to what they do with that field - when they plant it, when they seed it, when they turn it, when they leave it and everything else. If we can make an assessment as politicians in ticking off the boxes and see, then we can come to a position where we understand. At the moment what is happening is, I am taking it on face value. These notional sums I cannot see and I cannot evaluate for myself. Other politicians, conversely, are taking it on face value that there is no land available. When you speak to somebody like the Constable of Trinity who is a farmer himself, and you tell him that there is other land that could be used to put composting on, and he tells me that there is no land available, then I think: "Well, I think there are some, somewhere", that is not satisfactory. I am not saying that he is right or I am right. I am not saying he is wrong or I am. What I would like to know if possible, and would like to see is an actual evaluation - and I do not want you to be doing it, because it is obviously Agriculture Department's business to know what is happening with the land, but if you have got anything on what you have been working on, I would like to know if we can have it, so that we can then go off in that direction and ask the Agriculture Department: "How much land have you got? What is it being used for? Who is actively involved in agriculture? Who is not involved in agriculture? Who wants to get out? Who has turned it into a cricket pitch? Who has got it sitting fallow? Who has got some cars parked on it? Who has got alternative uses? Who would possibly take up an option?" If we can do that, I think we are doing what we need to do. Otherwise, we are all going on: "There is" "There is not", and it is not good enough.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

We did gather information from our colleagues in Agriculture and Parks and Gardens in developing our --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

You have done that?

Mr. W. Gardiner:

-- outlying assessment. It is not fully systematic system that I think you are outlining there, it is more a --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

I think that would be our task, because that is an extremely time-consuming thing to do. But I think that is something we could do as Scrutiny. We could go and look and see. I do not think that is your responsibility. You can evaluate.

Mr. J. Richardson:

I do not disagree with the theory of what you are trying to do. But I think you have got to try and take a mid-position of the practical option, because if you look at our operation which is compost, sewage sludge, which are -- compost that goes to land is accepted quality at the moment and we have got a number of farmers and non-agricultural people who will take it - golf course type scenarios - and we have got sewage sludge which, when it is in its dried condition, a number of agricultural and non-agricultural, depending on rotation issues, will take it from us. So, in terms of disposal of those 2 end products, we have got a pretty good data base of land and people on the Island who will take it. Now, I would not for one minute suggest that that data base covers 100 per cent of the Island and land availability, but it is those who are prepared to take it. There you have got to factor in when the conditions are right and when their land is available to take that material. Now, I think our data base is pretty comprehensive, but I can give you an example of last week, there was no land available for application of any material, and the staff were frantically ringing round trying to find land that was available for disposal of sewage sludge. If we had not got the sludge drier back into service last week, we would have been bagging semi-dried sewage sludge and storing it, because there was no land available. No one would take it 2 weeks ago.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

It has happened a number of times.

Mr. J. Richardson:

It has happened a number of times. So, what I am putting over to you is, if you take a theoretical, as you say, aerial photograph of the land and you try and identify all of the land that could be used for, whether it is agricultural or non-agricultural, then you try and build that data base up, I think we will be here in 2015 still trying to work out, let alone trying to get a pump running in 2009.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I do not think we definitely have to do that. But I think there has to be a general kind of meeting in between the 2 different positions to accept, as you have already accepted, that there is a land base, the application and everything implies that it could be all got rid of on to land, but there might well be organisational problems in determining a schedule for the spreading of such materials, and some work would have to be done.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

Chairman, there unquestionably would be organisational problems. I do not believe States is likely to get into the business of compulsorily insisting on disposal of composted waste on to private property. Therefore, if I may finish -- you cited an example of golf courses. Sure, there are plenty of golf courses. They certainly do not grow agricultural products, and therefore a mixed compost solution would be potentially viable. Assuming that the owners and members of the golf club were happy for that to take place. I suggest that is by no means a certainty. Similarly, while it is possible to take theoretical overview of the available land mass of the Island, I think we all are entirely aware that there are huge tracts of it where it would be entirely inappropriate to have any form of composted waste disposal. You would simply be altering the local ecology. So, this is a difficult issue. It has taken a period of time to build up our own green waste composting. Firstly, building confidence in the local community it is a product that is reliable and of high quality. But let us not forget that we still have to pay farmers to distribute to the land. It is not something that they pay us for, or accept for nothing. They also have difficulty in that various products have different impacts on the ph values of the soil and the chemical content. So, this is not, by any stretch of the imagination, an easy area to deal with. The

difficulty the department faces is that we must have certainty. We cannot go ahead with projects and processes unless we have a very clear view of what the final disposal point is going to be. We do not deal simply in waste treatment. The department is responsible for waste disposal, which means there must be a final resting place for everything that we process. That is, frankly, the key issue.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

That is why I am asking what work has been done on it, and I am asking whether or not we can take an evaluation as to what is available. There is a couple of things that I am tempted to say, tempted not to say. I do not want to be unhelpful. I think the thing, maybe moving on to something that would help to ascertain where I am coming from: it is a costly exercise to recycle this material, and to do the best use of all of this, and it is something that is causing the States of Jersey an enormous amount of time and energy. It is a good thing we are doing, undoubtedly. There is a new directive in the Island plan, an amendment that was brought by Senator Perchard to say where States' functions are not necessary, we should be looking to cut those back. There are issues, therefore, about the dissemination of not only the location but also the working practices in the private sector. But as you rightly say, the farmers are being paid to put this on their land. Now, our investigations had us meeting with some farmers that could not get their hands on enough of it. The application rates which the department have put down and everything else, which are ever moving targets in relation to the industry which -- I am not a scientist, so I am not going to start mentioning it. Those need to be assessed. One thing I do know is that the department obviously has an ongoing issue with sewage sludge, and I am not trying to talk about sewage sludge, I am trying to talk about composting - if it could be incorporated or if it could not be. The fact that it could be, or it might be or might not be, that is obviously a factor. But putting sewage sludge to one side for the moment, I know when the trial was done when I asked if the sewage sludge was being factored into the compost, that you distributed it to some farms at the time to see if they wanted it. I went to speak to the managing director of Jersey Royal, and we were talking about the processes of what can and cannot be applied to land at the time, and he was quite concerned to find that one of his growers had had the application to his land which, in his view, should not have happened. Now, there needs to be, in my view, an assessment of what land bank and application rates there are within the

department by us, so we can have a clear view as to what we are offering as an alternative in relation to distribution. Also, another factor that is missing from all of this, which I would like to start to introduce although it has already been on the cards for a long time - an introduction of a gate fee for the reception of this stuff. It is costing us money, the States of Jersey, to pay farmers to take it after we have had an extremely expensive process in dealing with it. When I was down there yesterday watching all of the commercial vehicles coming in, some of them uncovered, with huge piles in pretty much an unsafe state, arriving at the reception area, I am thinking these people are making a good buck out of this. A lot of them who do this gardening service, have told me, including Mr. Binet, that 9 times out of 10, if they were told that there would be a gate fee which would help to offset these costs, averages the amounts being received, 9 times out of 10 they would be told by the people they are gardening for: "Do not bother taking that down to La Collette, create my own little compost area down there at the end of my land." What consideration has been given, if any at all, to the introduction of a gate fee for commercial receptions or private receptions of green waste? It is costing us money to distribute it. Has the department been thinking along those lines of what the revenue could or could not - or just completely excluding that?

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

In broad terms, we give very close consideration to gate fees across the range of products, and in actual fact, in respect of pallet boards, to pick up a particular example, the introduction of a gate fee and how we would handle it over time, has effectively created an internal market within the Island in pallet boards. There are at least 2 private contractors who deal with pallet boards in various ways, and because they are prepared to pay a minor figure per board, in contrast to the gate fee that people would pay to dispose of pallets down at our particular reception areas, that is working very well. Now, I do not know quite the impact of a gate fee on green waste, commercial or domestic, because the other side to the coin is that we do see, even though an enormous amount of waste is accepted for nothing, there is still fly tipping going on. I think it is a very fine line between charging gate fees that will work and have positive effects, and charging fees that simply encourage the less reliable folk in our community to simply chuck rubbish where they feel is most convenient. Now, I am aware, clearly some people might feel if they are avoiding a charge that they wish

to start composting on their own land. However, unfortunately, it is the experience of the department over years, that in many cases where this happens those people involved do not really understand the mechanics of composting; do not understand the importance of maintaining the anaerobic decomposition, turning the composting pile, and we end up with really unpleasant, foul-smelling, ghastly mixtures of leachate and various remnants in dreadful piles all round the Island, which simply create an unpleasant public nuisance. So, I will ask the Chief Officer to give you a clearer detail of how we do tackle gate fees, but it is a very difficult issue, and if you get it wrong it can have much more expensive repercussions, because you end up with very expensive clean-up fees around the Island, because people have just dumped anywhere.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I think we need evidence for that, because I think it is anecdotal at the moment.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

You can call me a liar, but I have seen it with my own eyes, and I would not talk about fly tipping if I was not aware that it unquestionably goes on. I have had the evidence. I offer it to you. I have seen it take place. There is, even now, indiscriminate use of even legitimate dumping. Around our harbours you will find litterbins filled with computer monitors and entirely inappropriate --

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

To be fair, we are talking about the indiscriminate dumping of green waste material from garden contractors who should know better.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

Yes, they should, but it does not prevent them. If the opportunity to do something for nothing is removed, people do not like having to pay.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

I do not think the Chairman was calling you a liar.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

No, sure.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I am sorry. I do not think the Chairman was -- stop there for a second, if you could.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

I am sorry. I apologise. I over-reacted. I offer my apologies to the Chairman.

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I think where he is coming from, which is where we are looking at as well, is that it is significantly expensive and it is a significant nuisance to some people how we are managing that at the moment. Education is an ongoing process, and dealing with the green waste in different areas and in different applications, if we had been talking in a void without all of this work you have been doing, which has been great, it would be a never-ending discussion. But I think emotive issues about fly tipping and all the rest of it, will probably be addressed in separate shredding areas that are available. But surely, there must be a stick and a carrot approach to some of these sorts of issues in relation to the fact that if you encourage the gardening companies to have an understanding - and surely some of them do have an understanding - rather than just turning up at La Collette and unloading it, they will save themselves money in fuel; they will save themselves money in time. Surely we can reach out and we can provide some education. But, certainly, on its own it is all anecdotal, and notwithstanding all that, there certainly are issues with people fly tipping. Now, you have seen it. So, therefore, we have got an expensive facility at the moment that is being operated in a location which is causing a lot of people a lot of issues, and yet we still have fly tipping. So, what I am asking is, is there an opportunity to encourage by the introduction of a gate fee, a more responsible situation than we have got?

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Well, we have looked at this already. John can give you a breakdown on the general theory of gate fees.

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. J. Richardson:

Before I get to the gate fees, I think you have got to turn the clock back to --

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Fly tipping is illegal, first of all. Let us make that clear.

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

So is speeding.

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

It is against the law.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

So is speeding, taking drugs, getting drunk. People just break the law.

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

It is a fact people do.

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

It is a question of degree, is it not? I will give you an example. The other day I went down to have a look at La Collette because it was particularly smelly in town, and there was an onshore wind blowing from the southwest or the southeast or whatever, and I went down and had a look, and I said I thought that the problems had been caused by the shredding operation. It was not. It was a turning operation. I had a word with Lou Wagstaff and I think it was Mr. Fauvelle was called in as well, and we had a chat. Part and parcel of the problem was, it was being suggested, that the piles were turning anaerobic and that was not just caused by the material in the piles, but there were also occasions where anaerobic material was being delivered to the site and it smelt. Everybody knows that is the case. I said to the 2 officers involved, I said: "Well, surely you could charge for that material? Or, failing that, just put up a big sign to say that you are not going to accept any material to your shredding site or composting site in the short term or whatever. It is not going to be a large amount, once the message strikes home. If people are going to be charged for material that is going to cause your department problems, and problems with substantiate or not by members of the public, why accept it?" They said they would love to be able to charge, or at least to put up a sign to say that any material that does not fit the bill in

terms of it is freshly cut or whatever and is going to cause you problems, you do not take it. I mean, you do not have to take it.

Mr. J. Richardson:

I think we agree with you, and if the opportunity was there to charge, we would certainly look at it. But I think, certainly, before --

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

The point is you do charge. You charge for the large tree trunks. Right? You have introduced a new charge for pallet boards, and that is not a long-standing thing. It has just recently occurred. So that the actual issue of charging for the materials to come to be disposed of in whatever fashion by your department, it is an established procedure, albeit not particularly highly, perhaps. But that is the point Paul was making.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

It costs us to get rid of it. We cannot give it away for free. It is costing us money.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Can we not look at a semi-charging system or ... ?

Mr. J. Richardson:

Chairman, can I make a point? Because this is being transcribed, and that transcription is going to be absolutely useless today, because we are talking across each other. I have sat in so many Scrutiny Panel meetings where the transcription has been useless to us and to everyone because we have talked across each other. I am sorry I am raising it, but I think this discussion is starting to go into a very poor state because we are cutting across each other. I am very happy to answer questions, but I would ask that we respect each other by not talking across each other, because that transcription - we might as well turn it off, the rate we are going. So, can I continue where I started, where the Minister asked me to start, which was to try and explain a little bit about gate fee, and some of the background and some of the experience we have had in the past in terms of distributed composting and alternatives, which we are quite happy to look at this, but I think we have got a lot of background evidence and a

lot of history now, in terms of how it has and has not worked and some of the legislation that is now in place, which I would suggest is probably much stronger, much more onerous on us and the private operator now, if we go to that formal route. We started by trying satellite composting on farms many years ago, and it was the Minister that said, and there is evidence, because it is on committee record and, I think, Deputy Duhamel, you were a member at the time, it was stopped because of pollution problems.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I take strong issue with that. I think it was stopped for other reasons as well.

Mr. J. Richardson:

There may have been other reasons, but one of the prime reasons was there was evidence of pollution of this material not being turned when it should have been turned, and leachate running off the site, and leachate pools. If you want the photographs I will gladly go back in the archives and get them for you. So, we have got that evidence of not working well. That was before the Water Pollution (Jersey) Law 2000, and clearly now any composting that were to take place in any form of satellite location, whether it is on anything other than a domestic garden compost, admittedly, would require approval from the Environment Department or Planning in terms of leachate collection and treatment. So, I think we are going into a much, much bigger and a very different scenario now to where we were when we tried satellite composting. Not to say satellite composting does not work. In an open windrow situation you would certainly need proper drainage and leachate collection of some form. Before we get to the gate fee issue, in terms then of how you could operate any type of remote composting on a number of locations will require a reception facility at that location, and a shredding facility and a composting technology of whatever format. Alternatively, it can be a central reception, central shredding, and distributor composting. Now, these are exactly the things which we are looking at as part of this major report we are doing. Whichever one you do, there is a significant cost, regardless of whether it is public sector or private sector who provide that facility. You have got the capital cost of one or more shredders, you either have a shredder on each site and you have got to man it and operate it and maintain it, or you have one shredder that goes round several sites each day or each

week and shreds it and processes it. So, you have got the capital cost of setting the facility up, and you have got an operating cost and there are loads of scenarios you can work through to get to that stage. Now, the question then is, how do you establish a gate fee? So, if we set a gate fee for our facility which says for every kilogram or every ton or every delivery of material that comes to us, we will charge you the customer x per ton, if that means that they are not going to bring it to me but they are going to go to someone - let us assume that 2 or 3 in the private sector are happy to operate that facility, they will then have to cover the cost of capital and the cost of operating. So, they are going to look for a return on that. If you look at the UK market and European market, the only way these processes become viable is when you put them into one single site of a very large scale, which has got a big enough throughput and turnover to cover your cost of capital and your cost of operation. So, go to the private sector, and if the private sector can set up and run, and operate at a profit, or certainly make a viable business, great; good luck. But at the moment, the indications are that does not happen, and when you look at the UK and European market, that certainly does not happen. So, I am not quite sure why Jersey would be different. But if we set a gate fee, we could set a gate fee of £1 or whatever rate -- the rate is not the issue, the principle is. Once you set the gate fee, you are then saying the market is free to operate, and the pallet board is an extremely good example. The reason that the market works for pallet boards is because there is an end market which has got value to it. You then have to consider the value of the product, and the pallet board is a product with a value to it, and the cost of processing to get it to that re-use stage is of a certain scale. The cost of composting is a cost of processing at an end value, and unfortunately in those 2, the 2 do not balance. So, whatever you set your gate fee, you have got to try to make that equation balance, and unfortunately with composting the only way it is being found to work sitting on all the sites we have seen in the UK is a mass single site, one big plant.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I think the difference, though, has to be taken into account is this gate fee for pallet boards has only just come about. It is a very, very recent ministerial decision. I am not even sure it has been formally recorded as yet. I have not looked, to tell you the truth. But the difference between pallet boards and a gate fee, and compost and a gate fee, is that with pallet boards at the moment you have got a private operator who is

beaver away to generate business, based on the resource recovery of those materials. I think, personally, the same thing could happen if it were allowed to happen, or encouraged to happen, as indeed it has been for wood pallets, in terms of composting facilities as well.

Mr. J. Richardson:

The first thing I would say is, the pallet board gate fee is not new. It has been in for about 6 or 7 years. If you look at our scale of charges published annually, you will always see pallet boards there. It is not new, we have just changed the mechanism of how we operate it. So, pallet board gate fee is not new; it has been in for a long while. What we have done is changed the operation in order to make the market work better. So, that is the first point I need to stress.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

So, what was it before then? I had heard that it was £1 a board, to be delivered.

Mr. J. Richardson:

That is the new fee. Yes.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

That is what I am saying. This is the new gate fee.

Mr. J. Richardson:

The gate fee. If you look at our scale of charges published annually, pallet board reception has been a chargeable product for the last 6 or 7 years. It was up at £6.50 a board, I think.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

So it has gone from £6.50 a board to £1.

Mr. J. Richardson:

We have changed the way in which the market runs. But all I am using pallet boards for is as a demonstration that there is a market which can work below that gate fee, which is viable because there is value in the end product. To make gate fees work for

composting, you would have to set a gate fee and you would have to set a charging mechanism that allowed the value of the end product to be sufficient to allow private sector to operate under that fee - and the chances are that does not work.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

This is where we get into the economics and the financial aspects of running our composting organisation. I mean, if for the sake of example, we were talking about a shredding facility being operated by the department or any other kind of private operator, they would presumably charge a gate fee for material to come in to be shredded, and you are absolutely right, that gate fee charge would have to bear some relation to the further add-on value that could be made for taking that shredded material to turn it into a fully composted material. Or otherwise you would kill your market or move people into an area of suggesting that there is no value in materials and push them towards the fly tipping scenario. But, personally, I think there is perhaps an argument for looking at gate fees for at least part of the services that are being operated by the Transport and Technical Services Department at the moment and if, picking up on what Paul was suggesting about private businesses wishing to enter into the market, if indeed it was felt a sensible direction to be going in in terms of a States' policy to encourage private businesses to take up some of these materials and do useful and valued things to them, then perhaps a centre ground might develop sooner than you think.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

Well, I want to make it clear that the department does encourage private businesses and there are a number of them currently operating. I have only recently signed a new contract for Reclamit to carry on and extend their operations from paper and cardboard to now include plastic but I think you must realise there is a level, I think, of public responsibility involved. One of the reasons that we carry out the sort of operations that we do now - as I think the Chief Officer explained well - was because when they were tried historically in the private sector for whatever reason or reasons, there was a failure and consequent public concern and therefore the department in essence picked up a loose ball and took responsibility for the problem. I will continue to retain a level of concern over private run operations because the motivation is not the public responsibility or public service; it is profit. Wherever there is profit to be

made, there is a tendency to cut corners, to not worry so much about the quality of the product and there is, I think, a serious underlying issue in how any private operator would carry out their operations. There is clearly a need for some level of supervision and/or regulation because I believe there is an inbuilt element to the way the free market system works which, in many respects, reflects the private profit motive and not the public interest.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

No, but I think your officer did tell you that conditions had changed legislative-wise and that we did have a water pollution law and while he was not not in favour of independent satellite operations, he did feel that, under the present law, some of the things that may or may not have happened in the past would certainly not happen if they were operated in the same fashion today.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

I always listen to my Chief Officer's advice but I would want to make it clear to you as the Scrutiny Panel that I have distinct reservations about the capacity of the private sector to do what I would regard as a proper job.

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. J. Richardson:

Can I raise one other point which I think is very important? We should not overlook the fact that there are probably at least 3 operators now; private sector large scale landscape gardeners or whatever who do that service themselves now because the product they produce is of a very high quality that they can sell but it is very selective in terms of the product. The other point is that there are a number of sites around the Island that Planning have investigated because of apparent land raising issues that, when you look at the quality and the type of product that has been put into them, has raised serious concerns and I think that has been the matter of public record that Planning have used enforcement action. So there is an issue about regulation and managing of that site but there is a balance to strike between the 2 and if you look at some of the larger scale landscape gardeners on the Island, they will take their certain types of green waste which they take from your property and they will produce woodchip and material which they will sell on. It is a viable market which they can operate in. But when you look at the type of material that goes down to La Collette, it

tends to be the very wet green waste, grass cutting, et cetera or oversize, the tree roots type of area which is very difficult to dispose needs a very specialist process which is extremely expensive in terms of cost.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

You do charge for tree roots.

Mr. J. Richardson:

We charge for tree roots.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

That is right. That is the point.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Can I say, the last couple of days I have been down at La Collette looking at the gardens for the Britain in Bloom thing with the Parish and, at the same time, I have been talking to residents and businesses there - and it might be an ongoing factor but I do not see it done every day - I have noticed a recent large pile of what looks like clean wood material. It is interesting to hear that you have gone from a pallet collecting process of £6.50 to £1 and then, suddenly, there enormous pile of clean wood appears. I am wondering --

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

We can give you a very straightforward explanation for that. That is in anticipation and we gave the local contractors 3 months warning of the new charges coming in. One of the processors of pallet boards - who is least favoured in terms of the recycling or re-use hierarchy - cuts the pallet boards into kindling wood by basically running band saws longitudinally across them, thereby leaving all the big chunks of wood to which the original smaller boards are nailed down to because he does not need the kindling wood and does not use them. He then takes them by the lorry load back to us. We have decided that that is inappropriate abuse of our facilities and will now be levying a significant charge on, as it were, chopped up pallet board bits but because we gave them a 3-month warning, he is in the process of trying to shift every single

pallet board that he can get down to us before charges cut in. So there has been a sudden surge which is you have seen this huge pile develop. It is a temporary effect.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Hang on, that is not quite the case. From what I had heard, there is a partnership agreement that has been negotiated over the last 3 years whereby this operator took out boards to be repaired, boards to be converted into kindling wood and the blocks were to be returned to the department to allow the department to make animal bedding because they are shredded. Now I think it has since been decided by the department that, for whatever reason, they have decided not to be in animal bedding any more and so it has been stated to the operator that there will be a charge placed on those blocks being delivered back to La Collette because they are no longer required. It is only a short-term operation because if the market existed previously for animal bedding in terms of what Transport and Technical Services were doing, then presumably the market will be displaced in the direction of this other operator or anybody else and they will continue to make the product and profitably because I believe it was being done profitably by the Transport and Technical Services Department. All that is being asked for by this particular operator is that, as indeed we thought, if there is any brokering of deals of partnership agreements with the department, the conditions whereby a gate fee is introduced is not done at the wrong time and adequate warning is given to the business in order to ensure that they are not penalised financially before they make any changes to operating in the way that --

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

I am satisfied that 3 months is a fair warning but the Chief Officer can give you chapter and verse on what the precise nature of the relationship is because, unfortunately, whenever this gentleman talks with other people, the nature of the relationship seems to be slightly different from the one that we understood it to be.

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Can I ask have you ever visited the factory?

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

I have driven past and seen the enormous piles of pallet boards.

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

But you have not been shown around it, have you, although the invitation has been given?

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

I know how it operates but, as you well know, I am perfectly capable of understanding how things work without having to go and see how they work.

Mr. J. Richardson:

For the record, we have visited the operation.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I know you have but the Minister has not.

Mr. J. Richardson:

Okay. Just for the record, you mentioned “partnership”. I was not expecting to talk about pallet board management today because I could have brought the report with me but, for the record, as this is being transcribed, we do need to set the record straight. The original position was a partnership with an individual which is absolutely correct and I am not going to mention names but it is the one we are talking about making kindling wood. As a result of our concerns with the amount of rejects coming back to us compared to the quality and the value of the product going out and the opportunity of getting whole pallet boards back into the re-use market in their original form and from an expression of interest from another operator who wished to do that operation, i.e. take a whole pallet board and put it back into pallet board re-use rather than chopping up for kindling wood, we then agreed we would put the whole pallet board processing out to expressions of interest. So the one on one relationship with the original person was there but a long while ago. We then put it out to expressions of interest which we evaluated and during that evaluation period, a number of other options came up such as taking broken pallet boards to the prison to be repaired. Certain other local operations and operators who export products from the Island became interested in using re-built and strengthened pallet boards to export their product on rather than using the blue GKM boards, as we call them; the ones that

go around in a loop, as such, for re-use. So the market evolved. What happened was that, in evolving that market, we then saw the opportunity that there were a large quantity of pallet boards being chopped up for kindling wood that could go back into the market as a genuine re-use. Our animal bedding was done as an experiment to see if it worked. It does work but it does need quite a lot of refining in terms of machinery to really make a viable market. We charge for it and we try and recover costs but if we were going to go into it long-term full-time, then we would need to re-invest quite a lot of money into getting it into a viable market. If we do not use the off cuts for animal bedding manufacture, we then have to chip them, de-metal them and that material is exported to a chipboard manufacturer in the UK which is extremely expensive. So it was a combination of wanting to raise pallet board re-use back up the recycling hierarchy or waste hierarchy into genuine re-use and the opportunity to get them repaired locally and use for export that made us look at the whole marketplace again. So it is quite a complex process we have been through and what we believe now is the position is that the free market is in a position where it can operate itself at its own market value and the market forces will direct which direction the pallet boards go in. But what we have said is that if that market force is such that they still go into kindling wood, then that is fine and the market will determine that but the return blocks we will make a charge for. If there is another viable economic route for those blocks to go in, then the market can work within that ceiling we set for receiving the blocks and it is very much down to the operators then in the private sector to operate that way. It is about allowing the market to operate. I use the analogy to this compost again. It is because there is a value in the end product. If you are going to take compost and do the same, you have got to determine, from an economics point of view, whether there is a value in that end product that is viable and it is sustainable. If the answer is yes, then why have we not seen people coming forward to us offering to do it?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Would your analysis not, from an economical perspective -- you have got evidence. It is a pallet board but it is a product and you are talking about products and processes. The evidence is there that if you introduce a high gate fee for a product and it goes to a private sector resource that funds a private initiative --

Mr. J. Richardson:

Only if there is a value in the product at the end and the other example which we have used very successfully is waste engine oil. We used to receive waste engine oil free of charge and we would export that waste engine oil to the UK at great cost to the Island. As biodiesels and alternative fuel sources started to come in, and the low scale refining process came in, it became evident that there was a value in that end product. Through 2 or 3 years of playing with the market, we then developed a situation exactly the same as the pallet boards - because we used that model for pallet boards - where we set a rate for receiving it which allowed the free market below to operate in because there is a value in the end product. That is the whole essence of the economics of dealing with this waste. It will only work if there is a value in the end product. So we are very happy for a private sector organisation to come to us and say: "Here we can operate a compost or shredding process" or whatever and we have not had it and I would suggest the reason we have not had it is because when you look at the capital cost associated with reception, drainage, shredding, composting, maturing to produce the end product, the scale on which we operate in in Jersey is so small for the capex and opex that it does not give you a value and a return. So we could set a gate fee and we would end up setting such a high gate fee that the chances are very unlikely that the value of the end product would give a private sector operator an economic return, so you would end up with either them trying it and going out of business because they cannot get the return they want on that end product or the gate fee is so high for them to make that return - and bear in mind ours will be even higher to keep us out of the market - that people would not do it and you would get fly tipping everywhere.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Can I just ask what charge are you making on blocks to be returned to La Collette?

Mr. J. Richardson:

£40 a tonne.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I do not want to rest on this after this question and maybe move back on to where we are going but it did not look to me that that pile was made up of blocks. It looked to

me like it was made up of crushed wood. I am encouraged to hear that you are trying to re-use the pallet boards so that is interesting. So that big pile of material was not crushed pallet boards I saw?

Mr. J. Richardson:

It is the blocks and what happens is the blocks come back --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

No, I know the blocks. I understand what a pallet board is. What I am saying is that pile looked to me and it sounded to me - because there was an operation going on - that it was crushed, fresh pallet board, not blocks.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

Well, what it is is a length of wood with 1, 2, 3 or 4 blocks on it because the saw has gone across the other way to take out all the central sections for the kindling wood so if you, as it were, were looking through the middle of a pallet board, there are all those wooden blocks and there will be 1, 2, 3 or perhaps 4 lines of them attached to a single plank. Now what this operation does is it takes all the rest out and leaves you just with those blocks still nailed to the single plank that they are on.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

That is a significant --

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

That then gets piled into the back of a lorry; hundreds of the things and they arrive and they get piled up by the ton ready for us to deal with.

Mr. J. Richardson:

What you saw was these strips; 3 of them per board which is block, block, block, block, block, block, block, block with the 2 stringers on top and bottom together. Those are brought back. All this operator does is he takes the middle slats out to produce kindling wood. When those blocks come back - these 3 pieces per board - if you stack them up loose, they are the biggest potential fire hazard there can be because there is so much air emplaned in them. So what do is, before we shred

them, we crush them to get as much air out as we can and we build a stockpile. As I am sure you are aware - because you have been down there - we have had lots of problems with our shredder recently. The new one has just arrived yesterday. So when we have got the throughput of the shredders back into operation again, we then shred them into woodchip, take all the nails out and then either it goes to animal bedding or it goes off to the UK for chipboard. That is what we want to try to avoid because it is a very costly operation. It goes to Warrington for chipboard manufacture. Alternatively, if there is a market for the animal bedding and, again, it is quite cyclical the market, if we were going to stay in it - we do not really want to because we believe it is a private sector function - then we would have to invest very heavily in new equipment because the way we are doing it is very labour intensive and it is very rudimentary.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

The wood material will help in your composting process anyway.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

No.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

The broken up stuff?

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

No.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

You do not use that anymore?

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Because it is tanalised.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Some of it is treated.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Oh, right, okay. So if we park that because, obviously, it is very interesting and very informative. It was a question I was going to ask anyway; what is that big pile of wood down at the La Collette site? It looks like it is reception composting. We have got to the point where we have gone past 2(b) and now --

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Okay. While we were talking about that, I just looked it up on the stage 1 report and just for the record, I think it is important to clarify on the kitchen waste and the assumptions that we have made. The waste strategy envisages 17,000 tonnes per year of waste and rising and kitchen waste and for the purposes of the expansion area, we presume 50 per cent realised would be collected for composting. The UK experience is that that is quite a conservative estimate on what can be captured in our view, so that equates to 8,500 tonnes of kitchen waste on a single site and so that gives us an overall area requirement of 12,700 square metres and I am very happy to repeat that for the record or provide it for the record just to be accurate on that because I do not want to give a misleading figure.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Can I just say that there was some criticism in response to the *Scrutiny Recycling Report* that we had not visited some facilities that had been set up in Bellozanne and La Collette. I personally would welcome - if your officers get any opportunity - the chance to go and look at some of these things you are doing. I turned up once before with your authority to ask them questions. I asked them in the wrong way; the wrong person in the wrong manner and I do not want to repeat that, so I would welcome an opportunity, if somebody can --

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

We would welcome you along.

Mr. J. Richardson:

States' Members are very welcome any time.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I think, again, for the record, the criticism was not that we had not seen it. It was that we had not put enough mention of it in the report but we did acknowledge that these things had happened but that they had happened over the week that the report had been finalised.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Okay. Stage 3; we were working our way through I think and I think we had got as far as the last page which looks at the programme going forward and we were hoping to complete stage 2 during this month.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Has it been all your work?

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. W. Gardiner:

No, Sir, it is --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

I mean your department.

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Well, colleagues in Planning, Environment and Public Health and, indeed, in stage 3, we needed Property Services as well to do valuations of land values for us, both in the private sector and the public sector, so it is not just T and TS.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

In our compost report that we have submitted to the States from the working party, we made a number of recommendations. Now, I do not know if you are working towards that at all or whether or not you might want to remind yourself at some stage on page 4 because a lot of what you are doing - whether you intended to or not - is marrying up with some of the recommendations that we gave. For example: "Conduct health impact assessments and environmental assessments and check impact assessments in order to facilitate the different sites" which is what Will has just said. So a lot of the recommendations that we made - whether you have been intentionally trying to or not

Formatted: French (France)

- you are marrying those. I do not know whether you have been intentionally doing it but it is interesting that it is happening.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

We did do a response to your paper.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

But the departments - whether they know it or not - are actively meeting these recommendations as they conduct their work.

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. W. Gardiner:

That is right.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Because we had that positive meeting with you and your Chief Officer, Minister, and your officers at your offices, Deputy Duhamel and I, and from there the positive work has been going on behind the scenes and, unfortunately, that has not been coming across.

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. W. Gardiner:

There were certainly a number of recommendations from that original *Working Party Report* which were accepted in our response and have been incorporated in our work and we can refer back to that paper which I have got here which deals with them individually but there are certainly a number of them. There were some that we responded to that we did not agree with either, so remember that. Just to finish on stage 3 then, if we were able to complete stage 2 as hoped in August, we would commence stage 3 in the September and assuming a fair wind on that, we should be able to identify a preferred solution which we have undertaken to go back to the Waste Strategy Steering Group with during September.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Would it be possible to have, confidentially, a list of the names of the people that you have been looking at so that we can just make sure that the people that we spoke to

Formatted: French (France)

ended up being the ones that you ended up talking to? Did you get that? I do not know if you have got that, have you?

Mr. W. Gardiner:

The expression of interest list, you can certainly have.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Yes. Just the people that expressed an interest because I think there was an issue at the time. Somebody has mentioned to me that they had not been contacted and then I suggested that they did contact you, and I think they did in the end, but we just want to make sure that all the people that we saw, you ended up seeing and that would be confidential.

Mr. J. Richardson:

All the names that you provided us with have been contacted. Some of those did not though respond to the formal expression of interest, although they knew about it.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

Somebody said to me that the department had not got back to them, so I just wanted to make --

Mr. J. Richardson:

Every name that you gave us was contacted but the interesting point was when the expression of interest document formally went out. Some, but not all, did not respond to it.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Just for the record though, I had --

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

One of them -- because I rang around everybody to make sure that they had been aware of the advert and to put their money where their mouth was, so to speak, and one operator did suggest that he would not be interested and I think that was --

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

That was one of our big ones as well.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

It is fair to say though that one of the expressions of interest parties did contact me last month and said: "We have not heard from you." So I updated him on where we were with the process and they will, as soon as the ministerial decision is made, formally write to them and explain that they are either eliminated, they are on the reserve list because their site is in a green zone or it has been formally progressed to stage 2 and we will do a statement at the end of stage 2.

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Formatted: French (France)

A lot of what you have given in your presentation so far is very positive and I thank you for it. You have also offered to give background papers. If you can review the transcript, obviously some parts of it - and I thank you for that intervention, John - are going to be difficult to transcribe but if you can review your transcript of what you offered us, if it is okay - and you can run it past your Minister that we can have those things that you did offer - that would be very helpful including the confidential circulation that we asked for just then.

Mr. J. Richardson:

There are 2 reports which we are currently finalising which are the key reports which go behind -- what you have got today is a summary which we were happy to release today because the other 2 reports need finalising and they are not quite ready yet but will be within a couple of weeks, Will?

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Well, the stage 1 report, I believe, is finished.

Mr. J. Richardson:

Okay. So the stage 1 report can go to the Minister for formal signoff and, from that point on, you are welcome to a copy of it and stage 2 is --

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Stage 2, as I say, will be probably the end of August.

Mr. J. Richardson:

August. So as soon as it is done, you can have a copy.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Is there any way we can be included through a scrutiny process, either directly or indirectly with stage 3, in particular the financial criteria and the scoring?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

Sorry, what did you say?

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I said is there any way that scrutiny can be involved either directly or indirectly with stage 3 and, in particular, with the financial criteria?

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Yes, in short, we will find a way.

Formatted: French (France)

Mr. J. Richardson:

Once we get to stage 3, we do the first cut of stage 3 rather than going into detail. Then we will come back or meet with you to show you what we have done and where we are and how we are going into the detail and then do it in 2 or 3 stages in stage 3.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Yes, that would be fine.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

My only reservation is timing.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Well, we are ready when you are.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

I think it would be possible, for example, to share the stage 3 criteria and for you to look at those and see whether they are reasonable and then apply them and then come back.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Because certainly I have got some ideas on capital costing and operational costing which may be able to be used in order to bring about a betterment of some of the solutions rather than the normal conventional processes.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

Well, we would be interested to receive the information.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Okay. Right, well, I have not got anything else. Have you got anything?

Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:

No. I just really want to thank you for obviously what has been a very positive and constructive meeting demonstrating that the department is working behind the scenes to address the issue. It may not be as you say - and, as I said, I understand - the solution that we want at the end of the day and we have got political solutions to that, but from a scrutiny perspective and from a government perspective, the process has been followed and I would like to personally thank you and your officers for coming today and telling us the work that has been going on. It demonstrates to me - so I can demonstrate back to the people that I speak to on a regular basis - that the department is actively looking to come up with the best solution for Jersey that may not be everybody's preference but the evidence is there that the work is being done.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Thank you very much.

Formatted: French (France)

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I would like to endorse that and to thank the Minister in particular for coming along. I think it shows - certainly from my point of view and I think from Paul's as well - that if we can kind of bridge the gap between the tables, then I think our end result is

adding value to any decisions that they are going to be taking. It is not so much what the decision is. It is whether or not the decision that is taken was the very best that could have been taken having taken into account all the different factors when making that decision. So thank you for coming and I hope this is the first of many.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

See you next time, gentlemen.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

I take it you are away for the next 3 weeks, are you?

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

I never leave the Island.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Well, I was going to suggest we meet up at Green Island then with our bathing costumes and of course we will inviting you formally as well to have a follow-up session on your comments to the Waste Review.

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Formatted: French (France)

Fine.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

We are going to do that towards the end of August, if not, the beginning of September when you are back. Yes?

Deputy G.W.J. de Faye:

Yes.

Mr. W. Gardiner:

It needs to be at the beginning of September because I am away at the end of August.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

Are you? All right, well, the beginning of September.

