

**STATES OF JERSEY**  
**ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY PANEL**  
**WASTE PLANT REVIEW**  
**St. Mary's Parish Meeting**

**MONDAY, 11th FEBRUARY 2008**

**Panel:**

Deputy R.C. Duhamel of St. Saviour (Chairman)  
Connétable K.A. Le Brun of St. Mary  
Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier  
Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire of St. Helier  
Deputy C.J. Scott Warren of St. Saviour

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

A couple of words of housekeeping first of all. A few introductions. We are the Environment Scrutiny Panel and on my right we have Constable Crowcroft, Deputy Le Claire, Deputy Celia Scott Warren. I am Deputy Duhamel and the Constable, who needs no introduction I am sure, of St. Mary and one of our officers, Mick Robbins, and Charlie Ahier. Before I start off, I would like to ask Mick Robbins just to give you a couple of words about safety procedures just in case the fires are too hot.

**Mr. M. Robbins:**

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Housekeeping first of all, as is usual with these things. There is no expected fire drill tonight so if the alarms do go off they will be real. There is a way down where you have come and there is an emergency exit through that door, there. The toilets are downstairs. Later we will be talking to you via a microphone. This meeting is being taped for our records because we value what you are saying and we want to be sure we have it. So, if you could, when you have something to say, give us your name, please, and use the microphone, we would be grateful.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

This is the second of 5 meetings. The first meeting was held at Grouville Parish Hall the other week and was fairly well attended. One of the things that the Environment Scrutiny Panel are quite keen to do is to roll out presentations to the public from time to time in order to try and engage public support or otherwise, and to test the water, dip our toes into the water, and see whether or not the discussions that we are having on the committee are reflected by public opinion. So, the nature of this evening's meeting is to discuss waste, the burning issue, and for us to be told what you think. But before I open the meeting to the floor, I would just like to say a few words in order to set the topic in context. The Environment Scrutiny Panel has already done 2 scrutiny reviews of varying lengths in order to address what is, probably, going to be one of the most important debates that is going to take place this July when the Island will be, finally, told whatever the Transport and Technical Services Minister's thoughts are in terms of what the Island should be moving towards in terms of his recommendations and his department's recommendation for the treatment of the waste that we produce in this Island. Waste is a bit like weeds, you know. Weeds are plants, nonetheless, in the wrong place. Some people love to hoe them down or whatever. Waste is pretty much the same thing. It is all about resources, really, in the wrong place. We know the general sayings; there are a whole load of proverbs about not being wasteful and things like that and, really, what the Island has to face up to is whether or not burning the materials that people could otherwise recycle or otherwise derive value from -- whether or not a burning process is the best process out of all the processes that could be undertaken. From the Environment Scrutiny Panel point of view, we have been privy -- and we will be sharing our results at a public exhibition to be held at the St. Helier Town Hall on 14th and 15th March, we will be sharing those results with the public and other States Members. As far as we can see, the established waste management policy that we have at the moment, is only to recycle up to 30-odd per cent of the Island's waste materials for the next 25 to 30 years. We think that that, in itself, is a waste. A lot of these materials are finding secondary values and we have some quite interesting things. Marks and Spencer, for example, have just recently - perhaps you have seen and read about it in the paper - introduced a local scheme to the Island whereby they are going to be taking some of their plastic bags and taking them away to be turned into plastic garments. You might say: "Well, so what? That is not special." But if you think about it and look at the labels on your clothes, you have polyester and nylon shirts and a whole stack of other things, and the

materials that we are wearing at the moment are made out of plastic waste materials. So, for us, it is a tangible example of a local company backed by their U.K. (United Kingdom) business, waking up and wanting to promote themselves in a greener fashion along with the rest of the world. There are a whole host of other examples but I think I will move on to those as the evening progresses. So, just a couple of words. We think, from the Environment Scrutiny Panel, that only recycling 30-odd per cent and then burning everything is incredibly wasteful, even if it means that an element of electricity is going to be generated. There are a whole host of other examples as to whether or not, from a carbon dioxide point of view, we should be displacing electricity that is generated by carbon-free methods. Most of our electricity comes from the nuclear power stations in France and, indeed, the Jersey Electricity Company are suggesting that next year or the year after they move into providing a third connection further down the coast to another power plant which will be nuclear to provide most of the Island's electricity. Some of the technologies that we have seen could provide energy from waste but from a slightly different point of view. Anaerobic digestion, which is basically taking food waste and things like that to produce a gas -- the Environment Scrutiny Panel were in Sweden recently looking at housing schemes, among other things, but Sweden is a pretty good go-ahead country in terms of its green credentials. As an example, they take a lot of their food waste, which we could do over here if we have the incentives to do it, and they produce through the process of anaerobic digestion a bio-gas and they run their buses on it or their cars and taxis. Now, this is something we can be doing ourselves and, indeed, as part of the exhibition at the Town Hall on 14th and 15th March we are hoping to show the public a number of companies who could, for the sake of example, take our plastic waste, and there is something like 6,500 tonnes of plastic which is basically oil-based. Those plastics can be re-cracked and turned into a synthetic diesel fuel and we think that, perhaps, that might be a more sustainable way of dealing with the Island's plastic waste, to turn it into a synthetic diesel to run our buses or to run our cars, to displace an element of the petrol and other fuel imports that come to the Island and to do it in a way which is probably more carbon friendly than just going ahead and burning and generating an amount of electricity, most of which will be used for the running of the proposed incinerator plant. I could go on at length. There is a whole host of really, really interesting ways of adding value to materials which, otherwise, people would think are totally useless. As I say, it is a little bit ironic that before Transport and

Technological Services were so named they used to be Public Services. But before that they were the Resources Recovery Board and, indeed, the nature of the game at the moment in waste management is recovering those resources. So, we think, certainly from the Environment Scrutiny Panel point of view, that perhaps a backward look at the way Jersey was 30 years, which was probably ahead of the game, is probably one of the things we should be doing before the Island finds itself signing up once and for all to a policy which is looking more and more outdated. Incineration is not necessarily the best method. From the facts and figures that we are being given from various consultants, a lot of these processes only become efficient when you are dealing with substantial tonnages of material. The Island is being seduced into thinking that a plant of 126,000 tonne capacity is the right way forward. We are told, on good evidence, that these plants only begin to become efficient at 250,000 tonnes or greater. The Island last year only burned 72,000 tonnes. So, in terms of capacity planning we are at what has been suggested, potentially, by the Department, way, way over the mark and we think that before the Island commits itself to a huge expenditures of the order of £80-odd million, we think that all avenues must be thoroughly looked at. If, indeed, other or more environmentally friendly methods can be found, then those methods should be properly considered by the States when they come to make the final decision. So, that is probably enough from me. I do not know if that was inside 10 minutes but I have not been kicked under the table as yet so it probably was. So, this evening is mainly to hear the public, that is, your point of view and for us to take away any feelings or thoughts you have on where the Island should be going in terms of its waste management policy and, indeed, to tell us if there are any other views that we should be considering that, perhaps, we have not looked at as yet. So, without further ado, we will throw it open to the floor. We have a roving microphone so if you put your hand up and identify who you are. We are taping the whole of the proceedings because we take your comments seriously and we want to have an opportunity, at a later stage, to go over what is said to make sure that we have properly heard and we are in a position to act on any of the advice that you are, hopefully, going to give us this evening. So, if you put your hand up I will take the first question, or comment, from the floor. Yes, over here. Eve?

**Ms. E. Perchard:**

My name is Eve Perchard. I would like to say that in Havre des Pas, where I live, I do not quite remember when we started but there has been no publicity or anything else and yet the public in Havre des Pas are still continuing to recycle. So, that should tell you an awful lot about how keen the public are to recycling because of the amount of people in Havre des Pas still doing it. I do not think anybody knows this but once you get started there is no doubt about it, it just forms its own pattern as a part of your, you know, your sort of weekly rubbish, sort of getting rid of it. So, I really cannot see -- I really think that leadership is needed to get the whole Island doing it. I think the Constable should really feel that he is -- and be confident, that once you start it, if you can get it started off, then everybody will automatically follow because we are doing it, even now, almost a year later.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Yes, thank you for that. A couple of comments before I pass over to, perhaps, the Constable. A number of countries have picked up on this concept of zero waste. So, as we were mentioning earlier, it is not a case of saying that waste materials are a waste. It is how you think of them. Paper can be recycled. It can go around the loop a number of times. There are a whole load of extra things you can do to add value to a paper material. One of the companies dealing with paper products takes ordinary paper of varying quality and turns it into cardboard packaging. You might say: "Yeah, well, so what? How many times can you do that?" But the whole point is that by sending things around the loop a number of times you are saving energy, you are saving on materials and instead of chopping down virgin forests, you are using materials in a sustainable way and having a second or perhaps a third use out of them. The panel went to visit a company in France called Eco-Emballages, and basically, they have the capacity to take all of the Island's paper should we wish to bale it up and send it to them to turn it into egg cartons. It is a very large plant and the egg cartons are being sold, not only within France but within Europe and sent out worldwide. That plant is virtually on our doorstep. It is not far from Rennes and it is an example of something that could be done with our paper products. Another use would be for insulation. Part of the energy strategy that is coming forward by the Environment Minister is the suggestion that homes should be made to be more efficient in terms of insulation. One of the proprietary products on the market is a product called Warmcel, and Warmcel is, basically, shredded newspapers of different

descriptions that have been impregnated with various chemicals in order to make it burn-free. It has fire retardants and things like that. But, bearing in mind there is also a strategy suggesting that the Island as a whole should be encouraging more people to insulate their houses rather than just paying more and more money for their fuels, whether they be burning oil or burning gas or even electricity, then it does strike us as being a little bit ironic that if a product of that nature, which is basically shredded paper, impregnated with a fire retardant chemical, could be used to insulate our properties, then why not? We are not saying, from our point of view, that necessarily that is going to provide a long term, and I will use the word “disposal” route, a rather diversionary route, for all of the Island’s newspapers but it gives you an indication of some of the products that can be made if you start to think outside of the box and how you can add value to something which would, otherwise, be thrown away. The zero waste trial in Havre des Pas was very successful as it has been in the U.K. and other places. The Constable would probably like to say a few words because he is thinking that, perhaps, now is the time to roll out the scheme not just from the Havre des Pas district but to other outlying districts of St. Helier and/or perhaps, of course, the whole of St. Helier. But I will pass you over to the Constable to say a few more words on that.

**Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier:**

Thank you, Chairman, and thank you for the question. It is important to clarify that zero waste does not mean that you are going to recycle 100 per cent. The term has been adopted in many communities who have ambitious plans to recycle and, certainly, it is use in New Zealand and communities who are looking at recycling before they reach for the incinerator, before they reach for landfill. They are saying: “How much can we take out of the waste stream before we commission an incinerator?” That would seem to be the sensible way of doing business. The trial scheme proved 2 things. First of all, it proved that the public is willing to recycle. In fact, as the questioner said, once you start doing it you become hooked and you really want to keep on doing it. It also proved that already we were having more than 50 per cent of recycling rate which was in excess of what the States have given us as a target and upon which figure they have based the size of the incinerator. So, if the Havre des Pas trial scheme is anything to go by, the recycling rates agreed by the States are already out of date. That means that the incinerator that is being commissioned is

going to be too big, which is a waste of money and a waste of space down at La Collette and is a disincentive to recycling. As far as the rest of the parish goes, and this is St. Mary's and I have to be careful, in my recent election campaign I made a pledge that I would roll out recycling schemes across the parish. Whether we do exactly the same as we are doing in Havre des Pas or we try some different trial schemes first, we have not quite decided but, certainly, it is our plan to have the whole of St. Helier recycling and once that happens, of course, St. Helier produces I think about one third of the waste, perhaps slightly more than that, that again, would have an impact on the States plan to commission this very large incinerator. So, my view is that, clearly we are worried about Bellozanne and what is coming out of the chimney but that can be dealt with, to some extent, if we were to stop burning the worst things that we are currently putting through the incinerator. Particularly, if we withdrew plastic and rubber from Bellozanne tomorrow, there is no doubt that the amount of nasties coming out of the chimney would be far less than it is at the moment. So, I am very keen to see more recycling and I think we should not be commissioning future waste disposal plants based on figures that may well be out of date.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Another question or opinion?

**Ms. E. Perchard:**

The Connétable has already said about the recycling at Havre des Pas. Now, that has proved to be successful because we find we automatically do it. We do not even think about it. We just do it. So, I think that if you really want to get started and this has worked for Havre des Pas -- maybe it would be a good idea, Constable, if you were to do the same thing again. Take it street-by-street, like you have done. The whole circle of streets otherwise you are going to have people saying: "Oh, there is 28,000 people. You cannot do it." So, you are going to have all this sort of negative answers and replies. So, I feel that you stand a far better chance -- you proved it with Havre des Pas. Take it street even by week. So many streets per week and work it right through that way. I think we will stand a far better chance.

**The Connétable of St. Helier:**

That is one way, yes. Thank you. That is very helpful.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Another comment? Up the back?

**Mr. Le Brocq:**

Mr. Chairman, I am on the Working Party, the Community Liaison Group, with the proposed energy waste ponds at La Collette and I attended the last meeting and I put a number of questions to the president, or the Minister, for that department. We talked about keeping people out of La Collette. Where is the long-term plan for La Collette? Because one moment we are told that we do not want people down there because of the safety yet we continue to send something like 300,000 tonnes of inert material down there. We are still going to have a green waste plant down at La Collette. They say that by moving the green waste to Bellozanne it keeps a number of people out but we are talking about 50 per cent. If you think about it, 40,000 trips down to La Collette is what happens now and they are talking, well, only 20,000. But 20,000 cars going down means 20,000 cars coming back and I am saying to myself, and I asked the Minister: "Where is the long-term plan for La Collette?" because at the moment they showed us plans and layout of the proposed incinerator down there. It is a very, very large building. I do not know if people realise, but it is as high as Mt. Bingham. That is what we are talking about and I have to agree with the Constable of St. Helier. Do we really need this on our doorstep, our gateway to the Island? I put it to the Minister, I said: "Well, where is your plans for the new harbour?" And he sort of looked at bit puzzled at me and I said: "Well, there is an intention --" I do not know if the public are aware of it because it has been kept very, very quiet, but the Elizabeth Terminal site and the area behind it where the freight lorries go, is all intended for housing in the future. Now, the other thing that they talked about was: "We need to move the fuel farm." The fuel farm is going to be moved to just beyond where the ships berth now. So, when I came to the question of: "Well, where does the harbour go, the new proposed harbour?" I received a sort of dumb reaction. I was not supposed to ask that question. That is the impression I had. I think this Island is being conned because we all create waste whether we like it or not. There are ways of dealing with waste and I have to support the Scrutiny Panel completely but we really do need to get on with it. I would have thought that if we had said: "The green waste plant is coming back to St. Mary's," this place -- you would not be able to stand in



here tonight. But, unfortunately, a lot of people are putting this at the back of their mind. It is somebody else's problem. St. Helier, at the moment, deals with all the Island's green waste. It deals with all the Island's sewage. It deals with all the incinerators, the stuff that has to go to the incinerator. The people of St. Helier are having to put up with quite a lot and I only live about 150 yards from the incinerator. The point I would make is that the incinerator plant would not have been moved -- I think it was an election ploy by a Deputy at the last election: "Let us move it down to La Collette." To convince the people in the district that he represents that this would be a good idea, a good vote catcher. Now, until that suggestion was made the incinerator plant was stopping at Bellozanne. There is no real need for it to be moved from Bellozanne. If we are going to put in a new plant that is going to deal with all the nasties that come out of the stack, why move it? Now, the Minister also went on to make the statement: "We will move the incinerator plant down to La Collette. We will move the whole of the sewage farm down to La Collette. We will move the scrap yard down to La Collette." I asked: "What sort of money are we talking about?" Between £160 and £170 million. They have not even the money voted for it yet. So, really, I would like the people in this Island to really start taking an interest in the environment of what is going on around them because they do not seem to be at the moment and that is very regrettable.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Very good. [Applause] Yes, there is quite a lot in that. I think the question at the back from Bob Le Brocq is absolutely right. One of the things the States do not do very well, in my view -- and I have been there a while to know the ropes, is that we do not plan long term particularly well. I think Bob is absolutely right that the proposals that are starting to creep out of the woodwork at the moment are the back of a fag packet ideas. It is people finding that there is a domino effect and I think the domino effect has really been primarily caused at this point in time by the Buncefield recommendations. We are being told that the fuel farm is in the wrong place if, indeed, we want to have other things down at La Collette. So, if you look at the safety recommendations that are coming out at the moment, there is a suggestion that we have to be working -- there is a cautionary working radius of some 400 metres from wherever the principal focus of the hazard is. If you take your rulers out and have a look at a map, 400 metres goes quite a long way in Jersey and if you have

secondary disturbances which would occur at the berthing terminal where the deep water ships come in to unload the fuel, if you run your 400 metres from there you do start to get very, very close, if not on top of, the Marina Terminal on the other side which is the Elizabeth Terminal where most people are coming into the Island. Part and parcel of the long-term planning was thought about an awful long time ago. In 1977, I think it was, before I came into the States, there was a proposal for a deep water harbour and the deep water harbour was way offshore, past the Dog's Nest and it was quite a revolutionary thought at the time because it was going to provide a deep water harbour facility which mean it could be approached at any point in the tide. Secondly, it was based on a wheel. It had a hub centre in the middle and different piers coming off like a wheel and a causeway coming back to the La Collette area. Had we gone ahead with those proposals, and they were kicked into touch as being too fanciful at the time, then I think the -- I am not quite sure which harbour revision we are up to at the moment, I think we are up to about 6 or 7, and we spent an enormous amount of money playing around with the harbour facilities and not coming out with any proposals that remotely do provide the facilities that could have been provided by this one site. So, in effect, the fuel farm is in the wrong place, things are going to have to be done. This is, principally, why the Minister at the moment is suggesting that the reception site for the green waste, the shredding site, is moved because under the Buncefield Regulations you cannot have too many members of the public coming down to within a hazardous area. So, there is really only 2 ways you can go. You can either tell people they cannot come down there anymore which is the way the departments are starting to move and the D.V.S. (Driver and Vehicle Standards) Department will have to be moved and the buses will probably have to be moved and other facilities down there will have to be moved. That begs the question as to whether or not it is the best policy. Otherwise you have to rethink perhaps the unthinkable as to whether or not the fuel farm should be moved long term but the costings involved are in the tens of millions and the figures that are being spoken about maybe as much as £40 million. We still do not have proper harbour facilities and the difficulty is that if the fuel farm were to be moved half a mile further south, it still does not solve the problem because you still have your 400 metre radius and you still have to have a harbour to be accommodated. So, I think the question is absolutely right in trying to pinpoint this. We are not thinking ahead in any sensible shape or form at the moment. We are certainly not doing it in a comprehensive

fashion and some of the things that we had promised that we would have for the La Collette area, which was going to be marine leisure facilities -- at one stage there was going to be a spine(?) hill in order to screen the industrial and commercial areas from the leisure marine areas that were going to take place on the Havre des Pas side of La Collette. If, indeed, the fuel farm was still there, then members of the public will not be able to come down to do any leisure pursuits because if you cannot bring your green waste for shredding because there are too many of you, then quite clearly you are not going to be able to go down there to participate in yachting or what other services that were being thought about to turn the area into a recreation area. So, I think it is absolutely right. It is a huge problem and things are going to have to be sorted out. But, with all these things, we are entering into financially difficult times. We do have a black hole. We have had to think ourselves into different tax structures to try and fill that black hole. We have cut back on our capital spending. There are calls by the public to cut back even further in terms of the revenue spends that are going on to run departments. We quite clearly cannot do everything if we are going to keep the taxation systems the same. But at the same time we must have an idea of whether or not large expenditures are going to have to be thought about and worked into the future and, certainly, a new harbour is being spoken about seriously. Relocating fuel farms is being spoken about seriously. New road infrastructure to service, and energy from waste plants or whatever technology is chosen. We must be clear about this. We have not determined that we are going to have an incinerator replacement as yet. That debate is still to take place in July. So, all these things are starting to add up and the noughts at the end of the figures are just building and it is a real worry. But coming back to the original point, I think there is no substitute for long-term planning. I called for it a number of months ago in one of the States propositions but, unfortunately, my colleagues did not agree that it was a sensible way forward, to come out with a master plan for the area. I have since heard that work has been undertaken behind the scenes to provide an element of this work. But at the back of my mind I am wondering whether or not all of the i's are going to be dotted and all of the t's crossed and whether or not all of the issues are being looked at collectively, in an integrated fashion. They must do or we are going to find ourselves committed to extra spending having implemented very expensive schemes that do not fit the picture or fit the bill. Any comments from the rest of the panel?

**The Connétable of St. Helier:**

I agree with the questioner, with Mr Le Brocq, the future of La Collette is essential. It has not been agreed. The policy on importation of minerals never went to the States and that has been something we have not discussed yet. So, the future of La Collette is tied up with the future of Roné(?) and whether we are going to continue to excavate the north of the Island and deal with the importation of minerals in a more joined-up way. So, I think it is vital. We have already built a new bus depot at La Collette. That was before the Buncefield explosion. I think it would behove the States not to make any further major investment in La Collette until the States has had the benefit of a debate about La Collette's future. That may well be done as part of the new Island Plan that is currently in development but I would hope that the Council of Ministers will not continue to make these long-term commitments to a certain type of development in La Collette when it may well be, when you consider the opportunity costs, everything you build at La Collette, for example, a bus depot, is a development that could have been used for something which might have brought in a lot more income for the Island. I also concur with Mr. Le Brocq when he talks about the aesthetic impact of the proposed incinerator at the gateway to St. Helier. It does seem to me very short sighted when we are still trying to develop our tourist industry that we are not a little bit more sensitive to the needs of maritime tourism, maritime leisure. I know that the marine traders would very much like to get their hands on more land and for them, of course, it has to be near the sea. A bus depot does not have to be near the sea. So, I must ask whether that kind of use of La Collette is in the long term interests of the Island.

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

Good evening. I think that Mr. Le Brocq has hit the nail on the head, really, and as Deputy Duhamel said, when he bought the notion of a long-term strategy to the States, he did not receive the support he required. He did receive some support. I was one of the people that supported him and supported the view that we should have a long-term strategy. I think the comment about the aesthetic impact is very important and I am asking questions tomorrow. I will pass around this little piece of paper where I have done my little etch-a-sketch attempt. These are the pictures that were presented on the day that the application for the planning was presented to the Environment Minister. This is the scale of the building that has been approved in

principle, and this little tiny black mark down the bottom there represents a garbage truck. Now, if you are all familiar with the size of the La Collette chimney - and I will ask the man with the microphone to pass it around so you can have an idea of the scale - you will start to understand about the size of this building and, contrary to what people think, it making a difference to the gateway of the Island, it is an absolute nonsense. It is not going to make a difference to the gateway of the Island. It is going to make a difference to the southern coast of the Island. If you stand on the southern coast of Jersey in the next 50 years, your impression of Jersey and the skyline and the Island that you live on is going to be for ever changed. It is not going to affect what you think of the harbour, it is going to affect what you think of St. Clement and it is going to make you think about what you think about St. Ouen and other areas of the Island that are all along the south coast that you will see this huge building next to the chimney. So, we could argue all night long about whether or not we are doing the right thing and whether or not we are doing the wrong thing. If we lose the argument and if we sit back and allow them to do this, which we believe is the wrong solution, we are going to seriously affect how our Island looks for the next 50 or more years. I will pass this around, if I might, and just ask you to consider. These are not out of sync. These are an exact replication -- not the drawings but an exact replication of the sizes that were presented to the Minister that were never circulated, never circulated to the public. Can you imagine if you wanted to have an extension to your greenhouse and you had not made those plans available? These diagrams were never circulated to the public. No public consultation went into these pictures. When I asked why it was that they thought it was not important to do proper consultation in relation to the impact, they said -- the Transport and Technical Services people said: "We did think it was important. We held a meeting in the Ommaroo Hotel. The entire Sunday of so-and-so week, in such-and-such month, and on 2 separate evenings in the district. We were there for an entire Sunday and we were there for 2 entire evenings as well." Showing the people the wrong diagrams. Showing people diagrams that did not represent what they have, in principle, planning permission for which were presented the day they presented the application.

**Deputy C.J. Scott Warren of St. Saviour:**

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I think the thing that a lot of people do not realise -- and it has been said tonight, this will be a huge, a vast energy-from-waste

plant. As has been touched upon, the decision has gone and been taken by Planning on the energy-from-waste plant before the final decision has been made by States Members as to what type of energy-from-waste plant we should have. Similarly, a decision was taken by States Members that La Collette was the right place for this energy-from-waste plant whereas, obviously, we have a few exceptions but most States Members are not scientists and for them to be given the facts and to make that decision in -- the decision was made without a lot of thought and consultation, in my opinion. As I say, it is something that I feel we have to look at the whole of La Collette situation, what is going to be best for that area. We certainly do need a cohesive, joined-up approach from the States as regards what is best at La Collette. The other thing that ties in with the size of this proposed plant -- in my opinion, as has been said by the lady near the front, it will not encourage recycling. The 32 per cent that was in the original document we saw which, obviously, has been exceeded in trials. If we have a large incinerator, who is going to push, who is going to encourage people in Jersey to recycle? I think there are many issues here and we are progressing them as an Environment Panel within the space of, obviously -- what do we have? A few months before this decision is taken. Thank you.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Any further comments? Yes?

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

If anybody is wondering about the accuracy of these diagrams, I can assure you these are 100 per cent accurate to what was presented on the day that the in principle planning permission was given.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

I have the original drawings if somebody wants them.

**Mr. K. Le Maistre:**

Chairman, I have only questions and no answers. But 6 years ago the incinerator was on its last legs. I still keep reading about it being on its last legs, a serious situation. I have not heard any comment on that this evening at all, so far. So, that is one

question I could raise? And these other ones, with Deputy Le Claire, the height of the proposed chimney that I have just seen as compared with the present J.E.C. chimney.

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

No, that is the present J.E.C. (Jersey Electricity Company) chimney.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Yes.

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

In the diagram, this is the J.E.C. chimney and what I was circulating was a picture to show you the 40-metre building in relation to the chimney. That is the La Collette chimney that we are all familiar with. Yes.

**Mr. K. Le Maistre:**

I thought it was a new chimney.

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

No, that is the existing chimney and that is the proposed building.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

We will have to get into a few technicalities but tell me -- well, I will see if the eyes are glazing over. The incinerator that we have at the moment is not just one piece of kit. It is 3 separate incinerators on the same site. Two of those existing streams, as we call them, are fairly old and decrepit but they are pretty good workhorses. It is like an old car and the main thing about old machinery is that it does not necessarily have to become in a state where it does not work if you spend enough money on maintaining it. These things, if they are built satisfactorily, can last longer than their design life. So, 2 streams are fairly old. The third stream was built relatively more recently and has a number of years, in the order of another 8 years, left in its design cycle to run. If you look at the capacity of the third stream, the newer one, that capacity alone, operating within the maintenance schedule timings that the department are running, could quite easily accommodate burning 55,000 tonnes a year. Now, we have to be very careful here because, at the moment, the Island is producing 72,000

tonnes to be burned. But if you go and look at the materials that are being put through the incinerator, some of those materials weigh a lot and do not add anything to the burn quality because they are not necessarily a fuel or otherwise are detrimental in terms of what they add to the emissions or what they add in terms of toxic loading to the ash. So, we have been burning for a long while and I have to take my hat off to the department at the moment because the practices have since been worked upon and the department is starting to desist from the burning of things like waste electrical goods like computers and T.V. (television) sets. Metal cans, which you would expect to be taken out of the waste stream because metal cans do not burn particularly well. Food waste, which does not burn particularly well because it is generally wet, so that means that a lot of the heat energy has to go to dry off the water first of all in order to have some resemblance of a burn from the char remains once the water has been driven off. If you look, also, at the practices which are run by the department, half of the waste is delivered to a bunker and that is the household waste that is collected by the parishes. So, that is, in essence your black bags or your dustbins or whatever and they go into the bunker and if it rains they do not become any wetter. The other material is termed "commercial waste" or "bulky waste". So that is things like pieces of furniture, mattresses, plasterboard, plastic, cardboard, T.V. sets and a whole stack of other things. They are deemed to be commercial waste and they are delivered by an alternative route, by commercial operators, to the Bellozanne site and they are shredded. So, there is a piece of machinery there, it is just a grab and it crushes the commercial -- T.V. sets and stuff and it just kind of breaks it all up and puts it into a crushed, bulky heap. That heap is outside, so whenever it rains the material becomes wet and, as you know, wet material weighs more than dry material and water is quite heavy. When we come to measure the materials, it is all done on a weight basis. We have been arguing for along time for proper figures and assessments to be done in order to determine exactly what is being burned because T.V. sets, as you know, and electrical goods do not burn particularly well. Tyres do burn pretty well because they are oil based but they generally cause a whole stack of problems in terms of the emissions and the oils and the other things that are not necessarily burned off completely. There are other processes that could be applied to all of these materials individually to take them out of the waste stream and to only burn whatever is absolutely necessary. This really has been the main thrust of the Environment Scrutiny Panel's stance in that we are not, necessarily, anti-incineration by burning



methods or any other methods but what we are saying is that the Island should, first of all, see to what extent it can reduce the problem, first of all by recycling, by reducing, by not committing items to the waste stream. Then, once we have done everything that is possible in that respect, and we are a long way short of what is possible by best practice compared to other jurisdictions, then and only then should we be asking ourselves the question: "What do we do with what is left?" At the moment, if we follow down the waste management strategy that has been suggested by the department, we will only be taking out, as I said earlier, 30-odd per cent of the materials from the waste stream and committing the other 70 per cent to incineration. Guernsey, our sister Island, took a decision in their States very recently and they said, like other jurisdictions, and the U.K. is one of them, that they would like to move to 50 per cent recycling by next year or the year after. Our argument is quite simple. If Guernsey can do it, why cannot Jersey? And that is moving from only 32 to 50 per cent. If you look at other places, and other places have been more successful than Jersey is hoping to be, we could possibly achieve much, much higher rates of recycling and then that means, consequentially, the size of the equipment that you need to deal with the materials that are left, whether it be by incineration or other methods, can be massively reduced. At the moment the department do not agree with that and they are suggesting that we should, instead, be going for, as I said earlier, 126,000 tonne capacity. You have to ask yourself why, if we are only producing 72,000? If you go back over the last 3 or 4 years, in common with the U.K. and other jurisdictions, as the general population recycles more, the amount of materials being left to incinerate should be coming down. Those figures were coming down but there have been glitches in terms of the reporting of the materials within the waste stream. Glass is still being put into the waste stream which is absolutely ridiculous because glass does not burn particularly well at the temperatures our incinerator works at and it just takes energy out of the system. It heats up, it passes through relatively unchanged and it takes energy out of the system that would otherwise be going to do some useful work elsewhere. So, the key issue is not that the Scrutiny Panel does not think that incineration might be useful to deal with an element of the waste that is left. What we are saying is that it is a scale problem. We think 126,000 tonne capacity is far too large. It will not provide any incentives for us to reduce the 72,000 tonnes that we are delivering to Bellozanne at the moment to be burned and we already know -- and we have had people from the French organisation SITA, and other recycling

companies who are operating in the U.K. to assist the U.K. in developing its recycling policies, come over to the Island, look at the conditions at Bellozanne and they are aghast, basically, because we are burning things that we do not really need to burn. So, the key issue is not how much can we burn but how much can we recycle first, in order to reduce the requirement for any further treatment. The irony is that a lot of these things, if you play your cards right, are worth money. As I mentioned earlier, there is plant available which, instead of having large subsidies of States money or taxpayers' money to be put into the system to keep it going, would make money. As I said earlier, these people will be coming over in March. There is equipment on the market which would take the 6,500 tonnes of plastic that we produce, re-crack the plastic and produce 6,500 million litres of synthetic diesel which could be used for running our cars and displacing the petrol imports that we have at the moment. I checked the price of diesel the other day and diesel is 98p a litre. So, that is £6.5 million potential that could be coming in as a business, just on the plastic, by buying the right plant. We are not saying that is necessarily the plant that we would punt for because it is not our decision per se. It will be the States decision but what we are saying is that the department and the States Members and the Island really need to open their eyes to the alternative possibilities that are available to deal with our waste in an environmentally sustainable fashion. The kit at the moment will last for, maybe, another 8 years. If you do not feed it with as much material that causes the stress and the problems -- so, if you do not feed it the T.V. sets you are not going to have the metals in the ash to render the ash toxic and we spend quite a sizeable sum of money at the moment taking that toxic ash, once we have tried to burn our electrical goods, to lined pits down at La Collette. So, you have a knock-on effect. There is extra money spent on doing things that if you took those materials out of the waste stream first of all, you would not have to spend those monies thereafter. So, we are just saying: "Look at it sensibly. Look at it dispassionately. Do not make up your mind too soon and see, to what extent, you can minimize your problems up front, first, before you commit to any burning route or any other route." On the scale of alternative technology, it is also worth mentioning that some of the alternative technologies -- you have seen in the pictures the 40 metre building which is mainly to house gas cleaning equipment. If we go for other alternatives, the height of the plant need be no more than one-fifth of the size. That is, 7 metres tall. Seven metres tall on a smaller footprint would mean that a plant of a different type and capacity and technology

would quite easily fit down at La Collette and you would not see it because it would be lower than the existing spine hill. By going for this particular type of plant at the capacity that is being suggested, we are moving in a direction of committing ourselves to going for a bigger envelope than we need, on a bigger site than we need and, in my view, encouraging the Island not recycle as much as it could do which would minimise the effect of those burns. The chimneys on the alternative technology plants, again, they are of the order of 7 metres as opposed to the 100-metre chimney that is being proposed, which is a recycled La Collette chimney. So, it is scale, and as I said in some of my earlier preface remarks, if we were dealing with all of the Channel Island's waste and some of France's, then, fair enough, a plant of the order of 250,000 tonnes or 300,000 tonnes is fine. That might well be the best solution. But from our perspective at the moment, there appears to be better, cheaper options on the market and we are hoping that the public will be able to see some of these things before we get to the debate.

**The Connétable of St. Helier:**

Can I just add one little point to what the Chairman has said? In the old days, when we developed our U.V. (ultra violet) treatment on the sewage works at Bellozanne, Jersey was ahead of the game. We were in the vanguard of developing technology and people, I believe, used to come over and look at our sewage treatment works and Surf Against Sewage famously surfed in the outfall. I am afraid that if we pursue our path towards an incinerator, we will be investing in old technology. Councils across Europe are buying up incinerators and we are frequently criticised in the States for delaying the decision which has forced up the price of an incinerator. It is probably true now. It is more expensive to buy an incinerator because demand is now very high for them. But my view is that Jersey should still want to be in the vanguard. We have this eco-active initiative of the Planning Minister. We should really be keen on being seen as a green island. That is, in the vanguard that is looking at developing technologies as long as it can be shown to be working somewhere. I would much rather choose a piece of treatment for the waste that is left, choose a technology that has people coming to Jersey to see what the Island of Jersey is doing to treat its waste. Because I can assure you no one is going to come to Jersey to see an incinerator.

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

Just a couple of questions if I may, Sir? My name is Basil Jeunne, for those of you who do not know me. Basically, one of the things said just now was that all the televisions sets are broken up and destroyed and put in the incinerator. Are you not aware that for the last 12 months or so we have been recycled all of the televisions at Bellozanne and shipping them out of the Island. They also ship out all of the iron works, the electrical works, all the computers are taken to the prison whenever they need to be stripped down and sorted. So, I think you should be pretty accurate about saying that because that does not happen.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

I think he did say that.

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

Because the unfortunate thing at the moment is, as I understand it, the recycling company that does take the televisions on the mainland has gone bust. Computers going to the prisons to be recycled, I think they are probably pay them slightly less than the minimum wage and I think in Jersey this is one of the big problems you will have, is trying to generate cash from waste or recycling. I think, if government is going to save immense amounts of money on having an incinerator of a smaller size then it will have to dip into its pockets to pay a subsidy or incentive or anything to people to allow that to happen. Because I do not see that we can get waste off this Island, or recyclable goods off this Island at a profit. At the moment, one of the easiest plastics there are around in the Island is agricultural film which everyone loves to bits but it is picked up, collected and shipped out of the Island at agriculture's -- at the farmers' cost, they get billed. They have to pay something like in the region of £200 a tonne to ship it off out of the Island. That is what they do now with the polythene. I would assume that some pretty astute businessmen that are possibly running the type of industry today, if they knew they could turn it into fuel they would be on that trick already. Now, unless that is not suitable plastic, and I think you have to be clear here there are a lot of unsuitable plastics that are around, I think that we could do with looking a little further into those areas, really, as to whether we can make money or not. I am not saying otherwise. Constable of St. Helier has probably got the biggest amount of cardboard circulating around his parish. I wonder if he could tell me how many tonnes of cardboard he ships down to reclamation at this

moment in time for recycle because that must be a key issue in St. Helier, to have cardboard collections from all major multiples and shops. Another point is, within the States themselves they operate a high pressure plant which cuts up all its tyres and puts them through the incinerator. As government, I would have thought that would have made an instant impact by banning that arriving at the incinerator and shipping it out on a boat. After all, they do that with old scrap metals and cars. So, there is another simple solution to the tonnage that is generated in there. The only reason you end up with a lot of bottles in the incinerator, in my opinion as a refuse collector, is St. Helier has a glass collection when you take it to a certain area. They probably have less bottles going into La Collette now than any other parish per head of population because most people put it in the rubbish because, believe you me I spend a fair bit of time out at Bellozane with a dustcart and so you can tell how many bottles are coming out of the back of somebody's lorry and the one that rattles quite a bit is St. Helier. So, there are a lot of areas that things can be improved. I think the Constable of St. Helier has looked to reduce his cost by having several collection points of bottles and directly put it straight back in the dustcart. It is simple; there are a lot of other areas within government that can address and I know I was 10 minutes late, but so far the Scrutiny Panel seem to be telling me a lot of negative things about this and has not told me a lot of positive ones about the alternative that they have seen and looked at or where we are going to go with all that. That is the bit that we really need to be hearing a lot about. Thank you.

**The Connétable of St. Helier:**

Chairman, can I come back first of all because a few specific things about St. Helier have been mentioned. First of all, glass. St. Helier has moved to eurobin collection of glass rather than domestic. The actual reason was not to save money. It was because our guys were lifting very heavy hand-bins of glass and with our mechanised collection our staff now collect everything with eurobins which are lifted up by the vehicle. So, there was a health and safety reason for moving to glass collection from eurobins. We have also introduced commercial collections so that all companies who create a large amount of glass, like clubs and pubs and so on, they have to pay the parish for their glass collection and again that is done in a mechanised way so our guys do not have to lift heavy bins into the back of a lorry. I am aware that the private sector still operates a hand-bin glass collection which is preferred by some

restaurants and pubs. But we are trying to be competitive and to bring our prices to a level where we can attract more commercial glass. I am aware that there still is glass in refuse, but I would suggest that a lot of that comes into the eurobins which is still around the parish and I have made no secret of the fact that I think eurobins are unsightly. They encourage vermin and of course they encourage indiscriminate dumping of waste. Nobody recycles or separates their waste when they pile it into a euro-bin. I think a lot of the glass that is being found in general refuse is coming out of euro-bins, not coming out of householders own bins because certainly the reports I have had back from T.T.S. (Transport and Technical Services) do not bear that out. Most St. Helier householders are as responsible about their glass as I would hope the parishioners of St. Mary are. Cardboard is being tackled in partnership with T.T.S. T.T.S. pay a subsidy to reclaim it for the cardboard and my staff are looking at ways of getting more cardboard out of the euro-bins which is mainly where it goes and getting it down to reclaim it. Whether the States will be able to cope with the subsidy is another question. If we gave all our cardboard to reclamation, we would very quickly use up the subsidy. Finally, tyres are mentioned and I fully agree. I think the sooner we take tyres out of the stream, the better and I suggest that it is one of the recommendations we will be coming up with. The States ought not to be burning tyres because the more plastic -- and the Chairman did say we have seen the T.V. and the computer facilities. We accept that the States are no longer burning T.V.s and computers, but there is still a lot of plastic going through the incinerator and we feel that all the plastic that it is possible to pull out, should be pulled out because it would be far less nasty as coming up the incinerator.

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

There are glass vehicles available that will lift wheelie bins on a one to one basis, not necessarily commercial ones. We use them.

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

I think one of the things that we could do is we could focus on some of the areas that we have seen as a panel and some of the ideas that we have got, although we obviously do not want to show everything we have got all at once because we have got to be doing that during our display at the end of all of these meetings. We are trying to get the feelings from the parishes during these meetings as to what people

think. But to give you some ideas as to the sorts of things we are looking at, and it may not answer all of the questions, but I will just take a couple of minutes just to tell you about one of them. It may or may not be appropriate for Jersey to introduce a sorting system to sort through the black bag waste, but according to the investigations that we have conducted so far, there has been no analysis of what is in the black bag and the analysis of the various make ups of the waste has been done in the crush bulky waste stream. So, there has not really been an in depth analysis of the black bag waste and the waste arisings there. This is what we have been told by the department. But also what we have been told by our consultants is can you ever really judge what is going to be in a black bag in any case. You know, you can never really tell from one minute to the next what is going to be a black bag. But what we could do, as one of the suggestions, is we could introduce a system similar to something that they have got in Cardiff which is a modular sorting system. What they do there is they have a collection system that separates and encourages recycling and with certain types of product that arise in the front of this building, they quickly go through a process of conveyor belts and sorting stations and machinery and within about 40 minutes of it arriving in the front of this building, it is sorted and separated by people, some of which have got low skills, but are gainfully employed in meaningful work and they are all unionised. They have got more workers now. They thought they would lose some and they ended up with more. At the end of it, they end up with these cubes of the various waste stacked and sorted and they all represent cubes of money. For example - I got this one wrong last time - I will get the Chairman to tell us the exact figure - but tin cans in cubes, you know. I mean, they come in and it is just on the floor in rubbish and then it goes up this conveyor belt and 40 minutes later it is a cube of tin cans, like the Hunt Brothers do. That was worth something, they told us, like £1,400 per tonne of that and you have got a process where a very modular system in a small building is sorting through the refuse, giving people jobs that need jobs that otherwise could not be gainfully employed and deriving a value for that material at the end of it. They were employing, I think, on that process about 8 to 12 people to do that and they were handling 300,000 people's waste in Cardiff at that plant. We have been to see this and we have looked at this stuff and it is really a great shame and a great pity that we cannot all go and look at it, especially the politicians. Because once you see it with your own eyes, your view of the world changes completely and it is that type of investigation that we have been

doing that we hope to encourage to come to Jersey and put on displays for you all so that you can see with your own eyes what we have seen and that kind of technology, I think, needs to be incorporated into it. It may be at the end of the day there is a certain type of burn technology that is required. Maybe it is gasification; maybe it is incineration. But the very first thing we have got to do is to break down as much as possible at the front end and recycle as much as possible before we are left with what we are left with and that is where we have been failing for years in Jersey. So, that is a positive side. We have been away; we are investigating the opportunities; we are looking at the companies. They want to come; people want to come and do public and private partnerships with us. It does not necessarily have to be £140 million of States taxpayers' money to solve this situation. It could be something like £30 million and it does not have to be 30 per cent of recyclable materials. It could be 50, 60 per cent. It is just a question of how we convince politicians and the public that these alternatives are out there.

**Mr. K. Le Maistre:**

Surely the £30 million was the Hayden Taylor gasification plant. He was prepared to build it for £30 million. What ever happened to him?

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

No, I was not referring to any particular person's technology. I was talking about a process. When I said gasification, I was not referring to his process. I am not referring to Mr. Hayden Taylor's process. I am not referring to Mr. Hayden Taylor. I was referring and what I was speaking about was the Cardiff materials recycling facility which handles 300,000 people's waste on a daily basis and I was saying that that could make up a part of the solution. Another part of the solution could be a small incinerator or a small gasification plant or recycling or something like that. I was trying to introduce the fact that we do not need just one tool in our toolbox.

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

Obviously you went to Cardiff and you had a look at the machinery and the equipment and the processes and the people and everything. Did you come across any figures for what sort of profits they were making from that at all?



**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Yes, we did. The plant is extremely cost effective and for the investment that has been made, it has paid for itself inside 4 years.

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

How does that equate to putting the transport costs from here to the selling --

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

It is extremely cost effective and there are a number of companies from the U.K. and indeed France who would dearly love to be given the opportunity to do something similar in Jersey.

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

Is there anything stopping them from doing it?

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

At the moment, probably no, other than there is this uncertainty as to whether or not the States are ultimately responsible for dealing with whatever waste the Island produces or indeed whether or not that responsibility is a little bit closer to ourselves. I mean, one of the interesting things we have in Jersey is that in the absence of laws which specifically state that any containers or waste materials, cardboard packaging or whatever, that a person has bought, having bought them they are then owned by the States and the States must use taxpayers money to dispose of them and we do not have that law in Jersey. I think it is up to anybody to be in a position to be dealing with them. So, it is quite interesting because the parishes themselves could be in a similar business. The parishes do the bidding of the parishioners through the Parish Assembly. Parishioners buy their materials. They tell the Constable to use some of the rates to pay for a collection service either done in-house through parish contractors or outside as in the case with yourself and then those materials, once they have been collected and the collection has been paid for by the parish, they then go to Bellozane to be disposed of with taxpayers money. But there is nothing in the law that says that that has to be the case. So the interesting argument is that should the parishioners and a parish assembly decide that having collected your metal cans or whatever - your aluminium cans - and you are getting around about £1,000 per tonne

at the moment; all your plastics - and you are getting around about £400 a tonne top end once they are sorted; all your textiles - and they are coming in at silly prices as well, £400, £500 a tonne for textiles - old clothes; should the parishioners themselves decide that those materials, once you have paid for their collection, should preferentially be sent to a recycler for export or for some other treatment, it is entirely within your rights and powers to instruct your Constable to do that with your materials; right?

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

Yes. What you are saying is there is no ownership right to the refuse of the States --

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

There is no ownership right. That is right, yes.

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

Because that is a debate that is going on in parts of the mainland at the moment; it is who owns the rubbish.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

On the mainland it is different. Where in Jersey if we wanted to get community schemes for recycling, and there are a lot of organisations that would dearly love to get involved, we could through a parish assembly just instruct the Constable, go and collect it, use our rates to pay for the collection, but instead of sending it to be burnt, can you send it to Mr. A. Recycler who in the main might even pay you, right, for the intrinsic value of some of the materials. Now, if you are collecting -- and this probably has not escaped a lot of people who think about it, the collection containers that are put in parish halls or around the Island for the collection of aluminium cans, you know, this is not some kind of selfless gesture on behalf of the company who is recycling them. It makes them a £1,000 a tonne. If you put your own aluminium cans out at your own parish hall or you said to all your parishioners: "Right, we are going to collect aluminium. Get your school kids to collect it at schools, bring it back home" or whatever, but do it through the parish, you theoretically could be in a position to sell that material just as the recyclers do at the moment to any further distributors and it is worth money.

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

Are you at liberty to disclose whether Atlas(?) or any other recyclers, apart from wreckers, get an incentive from the States in view of the price of aluminium and the steels as they presently stand?

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Ask me afterwards. I do not think I should tell you that openly. Subsidies are paid across the board and it is an element of the scrutiny process at the moment that we are looking at whether or not those subsidies are justified.

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

I just wondered if they were paying for the transport out of the yard or where they were taking (8:13:39 several inaudible words) where we are in the future or --

**Deputy R. Duhamel:**

Transportation is another interesting thing. I mean, if you look at the statistics and we have a company called Oxera, who are States consultants, look at shipping into the Island and indeed it is published as part of the *Economics Digest* every year. The Island imports around about 450,000 tonnes or thereabouts of goods into the Island every year, in ships. The Island exports around about 50, 60, 70,000 maximum tonnes. So, there is obviously you are getting on for a 400,000 tonne surplus in capacity for the incoming ships compared to the outgoing ships. So we have had discussions through the Scrutiny Panel with the shipping companies and as far as the shipping companies are concerned, empty space on the return journeys is worth nothing, right, but to the Island, if the Island wish to export recyclable materials, then there is a ready market and a deal that can be done in order to broker a cheap rate on the return journey because otherwise the company will be making nothing. So, again economically - if you look at the economics - it is cost effective as a potential solution to suggest that the Island could be in the business of exporting recyclables at a cheap cost, contrary to what the public think at the moment, back to the U.K. or indeed to France. It is economic as I said for the shipping companies to offer a reduced rate because you are filling up empty shipping space. In fact this is what is happening with a lot of the trade to China at the moment with the U.K. and Europe. Europe is

sending out large quantities of recyclable materials, not to be burnt in incinerators, but to be used as a resource so the plastics go back to be re-cracked or to be turned into other plastic products. Papers are stopping them from chopping down their own trees in China. It is being used as a resource on the back of the slack capacity of the ships that are coming from China with all the manufactured goods. We can do exactly the same thing in a limited fashion with the goods that are coming into the Island. It is cost effective; it is economic; we have got the figures and people will be amazed when they see the substantially reduced prices that you can broker to send recyclable goods for further processing back to the U.K. or Europe.

**Mr. D. Allan:**

I would like to ask you one or 2 questions and take issue on one or 2 other things. The green waste site is probably sited in the wrong place on the Island, but whatever we have done with it, we have never done it properly. I talked to the Chief Executive of Agriculture way back in John Rothwell's time and told him what not to do, which he then proceeded to do and since then we seem to have carried on in the same way. If we are going to recycle green waste, the final composting bit needs to be done in an enclosed building. Wherever, you must decide where. The other thing I would like to take issue with you on is the business of the incinerator. Yes, it has got 3 streams and yes, one is relatively new and has life. But unfortunately the plant on either end of it - in other words, the reception facility and the gas scrubbing and all the handling of the ash et cetera at the other side - is worn out and is due to break down at any time and I know for certain we have got refuse baled and buried at La Collette waiting for something to happen. We have got to do something and we have got to stop shilly-shallying and messing about. We have got to get on. I will ask you all a question. What is your goal for recycling? At one stage the States did not have a 32 per cent issue which they have got now. I was part of a group that helped get to the 32 per cent we have got. I would like to ask you all what you see as the ultimate for recycling, bearing in mind I think we can only compress it, bale it and ship it off the Island at a cost to the Island. So, we would need to have something to handle with what I think might be 50 per cent or more or maybe 40 per cent. We need a reliable piece of equipment that works. Proven technology, not Hayden Taylor's, Mr. Hayden Taylor has run away; not Sierra, they have disappeared. We have got lots of hair-brained people. We need proven technology in Jersey. We have not got a landfill site

up the road. We have got to do something that works and all the time the costs of the plants are going up while you people waste time.

**Deputy R. C. Duhamel:**

Yes, thank you for that. It is quite interesting to note that the department themselves - this is Transport and Technical Services - have publicised at various public meetings that they consider that theoretically 85 per cent of the household bin, right - and that is 40,000-odd tonnes that is collected by the parishes - is recyclable. All right. That is their figures. They are in line with what the U.K. are publishing in that regard. But they do stress quite strongly that that is the theory. The practice is something else and we probably agree with that. But where we part company is that where there is a will, there is a way and we think that aiming for such a high figure is certainly something that the Island should be doing, bearing in mind that Guernsey have set their sights at 50 per cent by next year or the year after and to want to ramp it up even higher, thereafter that. The U.K. government published a report in May last year - towards the end of June, July last year - where they said that they wanted to disconnect or decouple the production of waste with the economy. Now, one of the arguments that is coming forward is that the Jersey population will continue to be as profligate and as wasteful into the future as it is now and come what may, it does not matter what the rest of the world are doing in terms of greening their environmental credentials, we are going to resolutely stand apart from the rest of the world and we are going to grow our waste arisings and we are going to waste as much as we can. Now, we think that is fundamentally wrong. We have challenged it in previous reports and we are saying that we think that a substantially higher rate than 32 per cent is possible. It is certainly desirable. It is being achieved by other countries around the world. We have not set out what the figure is, but keep the 85 per cent of household waste in mind. The other 50-odd per cent of the materials that are being dealt with are commercial wastes. Now, in the U.K., unlike in Jersey, commercial wastes are paid for their disposal. Now, we do not charge and why we do not charge, I do not know, and it is certainly the departmental view that if we did charge then you would probably have a substantial driver for behaviour change in terms of the people who are delivering this commercial waste to Bellozane to have it disposed of, using our taxpayers' money. We had the some French people over the other day and we took them around to the Bellozane site and we had a quick look at the commercial bulky

waste - the ones with all the bits and pieces out of it just shredded outside - and the guy turned around and he said: "Well, I would come over tomorrow and I would pay you for these materials because I can recycle them. They are worth money to me." This is the central tenet of the philosophy that we are trying to challenge. Now, we think that a sizable amount of the commercial bulky waste can be taken out of the existing heap. A lot of those materials, when the machines are being maintained and the maintenance tends to occur around about Christmas time and has done for years because there is normally a peak after Christmas and you want to make sure that when your workforce go back after the Christmas holiday, that the machines are kind of in tiptop form and ready to go forward to deal with the small bulk with all the Christmas wrapping papers and things that we spend hours and hours, only to rip off and throw in the bin to be burnt or disposed of. So, the exercise of taking some of those crushed bulky materials and baling them and taking them down to La Collette for further treatment was on the back of the maintenance that had to take place over the Christmas period. Now, already - and we had an inspection of the site and a number of members of the panel went around to see the Bellozane site a couple of weeks back - and we were told that in-roads had already been made into the materials that had been stockpiled down at La Collette. In fact, you will know if you are an engineer and I suspect you might be, that if you have got your 3 streams working tickety-boo, then you can get through a huge proportion of materials providing those 3 streams are concurrently working. It is another issue to say whether or not they are always in the state of being able to work together and indeed there are efficiency issues about the generators and the turbine equipment being undersized and all the rest of it. But that said, we think that if you spent a little bit more money on the maintenance of the equipment and certainly if you were a little bit more selective, and we have spoken to the engineers running the plant, with the materials that are being delivered to the plant to be burnt, then perhaps a lot more could be got out of the existing plant and certainly a number of materials that are burnt that cause problems could be diverted to make the running of the existing plant a little bit easier or the running of any future plant, substantially easier. I mean, it is quite clear, if you are going to go for incinerator equipment, it is not the incineration that costs the money. It is the gas cleaning equipment on the back of it and you have got to say to yourself: "Well, you know, why are we creating a problem as a society." If I have got food waste and I have got tyres and I have got T.V. sets and I have got this, that and the other, if I keep them

separate they can be looked at separately and people will pay good prices to deal with those waste streams independently. If we choose to put them all in a black bag and give them to Public Services or Transport and Technical Services to dispose of, that causes the problem, right, because they then have to say, well, we have got a generalised piece of kit at a plant which is not designed to run on any one particular element of fuel. It has got to take whatever is thrown at it and this is where the expense comes in for gas cleaning equipment. If you have to deal with plastics and dioxin treatment and all the rest of it because the temperatures are too high or not high enough, depending on how you are burning them, then that is where we are going to spend the money and most of the plant that has been suggested at the moment the cost will be on gas cleaning equipment. If we separate out those materials and find neater ways, simpler ways to deal with them before we mix them, we help solve the problem. So, the public can play a very simple role in minimising the cost of whatever final solution the States go for just by insisting that we take a little bit more care over not putting everything into one black bag or one bin and trying to separate out the materials or at least commit the recycle of materials to a plant that can do the mechanical separation at a later stage. So, you have asked - and I have gone around the house on that one - you asked what I thought would be a reasonable recycling level. I would go for the 85 per cent mark, myself, but that would be me and that would leave us with 15 per cent and 15 per cent left to burn or left to dispose of in a different fashion would be entirely acceptable as an alternative. But I cannot commit and I cannot be encouraged to commit to sticking to 32 per cent into the future, knowing full well that other countries very close to us are already doing better and intend to do much, much better inside the 30 years of the running of whatever proposed plant we are going to have.

**The Connétable of St. Helier:**

Chairman, can I just quickly come in. I must say I used to have the same position as the questioner and when the waste strategy was originally debated in the States - and I have already apologised to the Chairman for this - I likened him to the dreamer in the play, Julius Caesar, and Julius Caesar goes past this man who says: "Beware the ides of March. He is a dreamer. Let us move on." Of course the dreamer, ironically, turned out to be right and Julius Caesar was duly murdered. Deputy Duhamel for many years has been saying the sort of things he is saying tonight in the States and I

have been persuaded, not just by Deputy Duhamel but by going off Island - that is the crucial thing - and seeing what other authorities are doing both in France and the U.K. to deal with their waste. The fact is, Jersey has been left behind and I think to say that we as a panel are wasting time, well, I do not agree with that. I think the prospect of the Island rushing into a decision - and people may say it is not rushing - but the prospect of the Island making a decision that will involve a huge amount of capital expenditure where the Island has a history of making mistakes when it comes to capital programmes and effectively sterilising the future of La Collette by placing this plant there, it can only ever be an industrial estate if we build the incinerator of the size that has been proposed on La Collette. I think some more time to make sure we get the decision right against the background of other local authorities are moving ahead very quickly into new technology, ambitious recycling targets. I think that would be a waste of money and a waste of an opportunity for Jersey. So, I do not believe we are wasting time. I think we are spending time this evening and in our scrutiny review, in a very constructive way and I think that, you know, let us hope that the Island by the time that the States does take a decision on its waste policy, the Island will be in the forefront of what is going on in Europe and not be in the back.

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

I concur with your first comment that, you know, in-vessel composting is the solution and whether or not it is done at the end of the day in one large building or whether or not it is done in a number of smaller facilities, that is a debate perhaps for itself. But as far as wasting time and delaying, I came on to this panel in January. I have been in politics since 1999 and when I joined the Public Services Committee in 1999 the first thing they did was sit down and brief me about the need to replace the incinerator. We are not the ones that are bringing the proposition to the States recommending the technology. That decision is going to be brought by the Transport and Technical Services Minister. When he brings it in July for debate that will be him bringing the debate. That is his timetable. That will be the States debate and the States will make the decision. I was criticised in the States by Senator Ozouf who later wrote me a personal apology and he said he had to withdraw his remarks because he said he could not lay the blame for the delays on the current panel. Most of the current panel are new and I think it is a question of looking at the available technology as we have been tasked to do. The kind of money that we are looking at here in terms of expenditure,



you know, in excess of £120, £150 million, when it is all done and dusted and whether or not we then have to levy environmental taxes or increase G.S.T. to pay for this kind of expenditure. Or are there, as we believe there is, a number of alternative solutions to this problem that will be far cheaper and far more environmentally friendly. Now, I do not argue, personally, that the incinerator at Bellozane needs to be shut down. I personally do not think that incineration is what we should be doing. I think we should put a stop to incineration, but I do not think that we are going to achieve anything in the long term by buying another one and waiting 50 years before we address this issue. That would be wasting time. Let us not waste 50 years and buy £130 million worth of gasification equipment with some technology on the front end that burns everything. Let us look at the other alternatives that are coming. Let us look at the other people that could be involved; the partnerships; the people that are interested that have not come forward yet, because in the last 6 months we have seen technologies that have not been seen. We have met people that have not been spoken with and they are ready and willing to come to Jersey and be a part of the solution. More than that, they are willing to come and put their money where their mouth is to reduce the tax burden. We are not saying there is not going to be an element of waste. What we are saying is let us not just throw it all in the fire. So, if you feel we are wasting time, you are entitled to that view. I think we are doing what we should be doing. We are looking at it responsibly. I have been on this panel since January last year, okay. That is a year. I have been in the States since 1999. They were talking about replacing the incinerator on its last legs in 1999. I am not bringing this debate, but I am certainly going to make sure that when it comes I am going to be informed about the alternatives and make the arguments for those and have done my damndest to make sure that the people out there that have these technologies and have the capital and have the equipment and have the background and have the knowledge and have the experience in these areas, are known to Jersey. They are in there right now in their countries doing this work. They are up and running. They are there for all to see and we are going to bring them to Jersey so that politicians and the public can make that decision. But is it not so simple as your argument, Sir: "Just get on with it. We are wasting time." I am sorry I could not disagree with you more.

**Deputy C.J. Scott Warren:**

I would like to say I am the newest member on the panel. I have been on the panel a matter of weeks, but I was a member of a former public services committee between 1999 and 2002. I do not believe either, with all due respect, that the panel is wasting time. I do believe that the current incinerator does need replacing. I believe it needs replacing and I do not think we need to put this off and off and I do not believe we are going to do that. As a States Assembly I believe we have to make a decision, but I do believe it is most important that we replace the current incinerator with what is the most appropriate technology for Jersey. Much has been said - and it is getting late - but on the question of recycling, I certainly believe that we should be aiming 50 per cent and upwards and if we can achieve 85 per cent recycling in Jersey, then that is the figure I would pump for. Thank you.

**Female Speaker:**

I have been a resident of the Bellozane area for the past 30 years. I should like to make a couple of points. I was very happy, at first, with the idea of the removal of the incinerator to La Collette, but now I believe that such a monstrosity should be hidden in a valley. But also, is there a hidden agenda here? If the incinerator is moved to La Collette, it releases the Bellozane covenant, making way for household or green tax.

**The Connétable of St. Helier:**

Can I deal with the covenant, as it has come up, first, Chairman? I am advised that the covenant is not affected by putting the incinerator at La Collette and that is simply because what the covenant provides for St. Helier or rubbish arising in St. Helier is the free disposal of that rubbish by the States of Jersey. So, if there was not an incinerator at Bellozane Valley, St. Helier could continue to supply its rubbish to Bellozane and the States would have to dispose of it at La Collette. So, the covenant would still apply, even though the disposal facility had been moved, for St. Helier residents. I mean, of course there is a whole set of issues around whether that is right or not and whether St. Helier parishioners should have that facility. But the fact is that the effect of the covenant at the moment is to prevent St. Helier parishioners being charged for rubbish, wherever the States decide to dispose of it.

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

Could I ask the question in public, does that mean that other parishes would have to probably start paying?

**The Connétable of St. Helier:**

Well, it would be very difficult for the States to determine, I think, where rubbish came from. There would probably be a fairly easy way around that because -- but the matter has not been looked at. Whenever the covenant has come up and the prospect of charging for waste disposal has arisen, the covenant has stood there in the way of charging for waste disposal, so the States has not yet decided to tackle that.

**Female Speaker:**

Does that mean that a green tax is unlikely?

**The Connétable of St. Helier:**

I think in respect of waste disposal it does, yes, but clearly there are other green taxes that the States could look to introduce or I am sure they have considered whether the covenant can be removed. But I certainly have not been approached.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

I think just one extra comment there. I think green taxes are still being thought about, but they will be dressed up in whatever colour ribbon to make them more acceptable and I think the suggestion at the moment is that perhaps there will be a tax to encourage you to recycle to pay for recycling. But it begs the question really that, you know, if people were recycling first of all then you are not going to be in a position of having to have such large expenditures on final disposal equipment. So, no, if we go for the right piece of kit in the first place, we should not have environmental taxes. I think if we go for the wrong piece of kit, then environmental taxes to pay for some of that in some shape or form are probably still on the cards.

**Female Speaker:**

Could I make a plea for elderly people without cars in St. Helier who do not get their bottles collected because bottles can get quite weighty and to have to carry them some several hundred yards is too much for a lot of elderly people.

**The Connétable of St. Helier:**

Yes, one of the things that has come out of the election - it came up during the election - and I have pledged to bring in recycling across the parish. Clearly one of the things about kerbside collection, it would not make sense to come to everybody's house and take away their kitchen waste and their mixed dry recyclables and not to take their glass. So, I think the introduction of greater recycling across the parish could well lead to a return of the glass collection for householders. I would not, however, want to see that coming back for restaurants, pubs and clubs. I think it is right that they should pay the parish to take away their glass, but we could certainly see a return of glass collection for parishioners as part of a recycling scheme.

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

The point the lady in front of me made before, was about the charging for a green tax. The fact is that we are all being charged now in the taxes we pay anyway to get rid of the rubbish, so it will only be an additional tax. Also, contrary to popular belief, I do think that the incinerator in La Collette would be the wrong place to have it and I think that if a bit more thought was put into it, then possibly it should stay at Bellozane and be revamped and possibly the workshops, that they are inevitably in bad shape now anyway at Bellozane, would be moved closer to where all the States vehicles are at La Collette which is a possibility. But if the fuel farm has got to be moved, then it is going to throw the biggest spanner in the whole works for everything or the area designated. You are going to have a discussion about something that will not happen if this 400-metre radius has got to be adhered to, then it effectively is not going to happen. Because as I understand it, the green compost site is only a reception area that is proposed to be moved to Bellozane because of that issue of people and the danger zone there is around that. That is correct, is it not?

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Yes, that is right.

**Mr. B. Juenne:**

Another reason, well, it is not the composting itself; not the making of the compost. It is only the reception area that will be moved to Bellozane, which is basically moving around a parish back to where it is. I do believe that there is not enough thought that

goes on to what is going to happen in La Collette, but a lot of damage has already been done to that site, definitely. Thank you.

**Mr. D. Rutherham:**

Some people appear to be saying that the alternatives are not proven technology. Well, I have been doing quite a lot of reading up on alternative plants over the last year or so, since this debate has been coming into the public domain and the modular plants are very proven technology. There were a wide number of alternative manufacturers with just little differences in their design to save stepping on each other's patents, but working on similar principles. They used a lot in America, a bit in Europe and they are a well proven technology. Okay, Mr. Hayden Taylor made a bad impression and I was talking to him, funnily enough, on the telephone the other week and he says he has now sold his stuff in 81 other places. So, even he cannot be that Mickey Mouse and he is not the only one doing the steam, sort, recycle and gasified technology by any means. There are plenty of other serious international engineering firms doing it and I am sure we can get at least one of them to quote for doing Jersey and probably a whole bunch of them.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Yes, well, that is certainly something that we would hope for. Yes.

**Ms E. Perchard:**

I just want to ask, I heard Deputy Le Claire say that his information was not made public. Can I ask what happened to the Buncefield Report that was not made public and yet we heard on radio: "We waiting for the report?" But the report was on the website a year ago. Why has that not been made public because when I read in the national newspaper about the explosion, Buncefield said they would never, ever do that again? Now, if you are going to put an incinerator where you are going to put it, in the Buncefield Report it does not say anything about having to put an incinerator there and yet we are proposing to put an incinerator, whether it is a big one or a small one, right alongside the most dangerous chemicals that could literally finish this Island. So, whatever you are saying, I cannot understand that you have got all the answers to the opposition of an incinerator. What is going on that the other side is so set on an incinerator and to put it where they intend to put it?

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

The Buncefield incident, where we saw in the United Kingdom the impact of what can happen in a fuel location, is still causing investigators in the United Kingdom to continue to investigate the issues. There have been a number of subsequent fires in other areas and it is true to say that the facilities at La Collette do hold an area that we need to concern ourselves with. But what the States has done is they have commissioned, in tandem with the *Buncefield Report*, a hazard management of the area and an analysis of the likely dangers and that work is ongoing. The *Buncefield Report* has been released and there is more work to be done and the *Hazards Review Report* which was given to us as a panel recently by the Transport and Technical Services Minister has been promised to be released to the public by the Minister in the States. He is up for questions tomorrow on the floor of the States, so perhaps it is a timely reminder that we could maybe ask him to provide the public with that information and then the public can appraise themselves as to the issues. I do not personally believe that there is a terrible great risk. I do not believe that there is a great risk. I think that there is an acknowledgement that we are storing material there that had we of known about Buncefield beforehand we would have probably not located so many facilities close to it. So there is an issue about the activity around the storage of these types of fuels et cetera and there is an issue about where we put them in the future. There is a dialogue beginning to occur about whether or not we need to relocate certain elements of fuel storage in Jersey. That is why we need to look at incineration and everything else. You know, you look at a plant that is maybe going to cost £60, £70, £80 million and then moving the fuel farm is going to cost another £30 million. So, it is all a very, very complex issue. But one of the things that we should not dismiss - and I think this is quite important and I believe the Transport and Technical Services Minister has initiated a consultation with the residents and Havre de Pas now - is the fact that we need to as a government take a responsible step to make sure that the people feel comfortable in the district and are well briefed about the issues and are well briefed about the emergency plans, and are well briefed about the operations and design and functioning of any plants that come there. I know speaking with you before, Eve, you have said to me it does not ever eliminate human error and that is something that you cannot engineer out. But I think you, as with other people that have expressed this concern in Havre de Pas, are putting their finger

on the nub of the matter, is that we appear to be putting too many eggs in one area; too many things that could potentially conflict with each other and I personally cannot understand how we can exclude, for example, residences within 300 metres or 400 metres and yet find it perfectly acceptable to empty out a building of States workers and rent it to the private sector within that margin. I find a lot of the logic in that just -- I think there are a lot of issues there that need to be thought of and this is where it comes back to earlier with Mr. Le Brocq's previous points is that a long term plan for La Collette is definitely needed. I spoke to the fire service yesterday to the senior officers and one of the senior officers at the fire department spoke to me and said that, you know, it really is time the States started to think about a dedicated fire officer down there employed by W.E.B. (Waterfront Enterprise Board). It is a recommendation that I have made to the Chairman and we are going to be putting it on the agenda of the next Environment Scrutiny Panel that we look long term at the safety of people in relation to these large areas of risk and we dedicate a fire-fighter on perhaps W.E.B. or on these areas that is dedicated to making sure that these areas are well managed and the people are well protected. I do not dismiss your concerns, but we are certainly not ignoring them. I will ask tomorrow in the States if that report is available for release to the public, but in the meantime I would just comfort you all by saying they have not been remiss and they have been working hard at looking at it and working hard at making improvements in the fuel company as well. But they recognise now that the world is a different place since Buncefield.

**Ms E. Perchard:**

Yes, but there is also less danger having it down at Bellozane because Bellozane has already proved over the years, especially if you intend having a smaller incinerator, then surely the place for it is at Bellozane where you have got much more space than what you have got with 28,000 people in town.

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

I do not believe we need an incinerator, personally. I have seen enough to make my mind what I have seen already over the last year and a little bit. I have seen enough technology out there to convince me we do not need an incinerator at all.

**Connétable K.A. Le Brun of St. Mary:**

As always, toujours le politest(?) I allow other people over in St. Mary and I am the Constable of St. Mary so I let everybody else speak first anyway. But nevertheless it is because there is a lot of the, you know, there are just a few of our parishioners here, but just to put you in the picture what we as the parish have in mind and we are negotiation at the moment. I have got to be careful what I say because we have got our refuse collector there, so we are in negotiation with him at the moment. But one of the concerns I have had being on this panel is to make sure that if we do do the separation that it is going to be recycled in the correct manner as much as we possibly could, and awaiting the possibility of future technology so as to be able to do this as well. We have some of the recycling ones -- bringing it down to the grass level because it does seem tonight we have been talking an awful lot - I know it is the end product - with La Collette and also down in St. Helier, but it is a concern for the country parishes as well because as is heard, all our rubbish ends up down there or the majority of it does which is a very convenient situation. But we have got the recycling ones which are in the community centre at the present time and they will be changing, I am assured, next month to bigger - and I can see the gentleman right down the bottom shaking his head in agreement with me - we will be changing to them then. So not only will there be paper and cans collected there - because we have just got the aluminium cans there and not the whole of the cans - there will be the paper, the cans and there will be plastic bottles as well coming in the future. But I have always maintained that that is just the beginning because I am convinced that it is kerbside at the houses that is the necessity to be collected from households, not just to bring it there because it is a waste of fuel, your time and everything to bring it to the bring backs and it should be at kerbside. But as with everything with kerbside at the present time it has to be sorted out. St. John has been giving it a trial run as you are well aware. It is initially a good start to be able to do that, I think. But one has got to realise that generally all us folks we are as lazy as we can come, are we not really? We always take the easy way out and the easy way to do it is separated at the household rather than have to bring it up here and you have got to have the separations done specifically as well. Why I said earlier, they are negotiating with our refuse collector in St. Mary is that with the St. John ones it is a once a month collection per paper, glass, cans and in the future they expect to be doing plastic bottles. That is a long time, a month, because they have the regular weekly ones just for your general household rubbish. But they are not very big, the boxes, and the



plastic bottles they hope in the future will be collected in a bigger refuse sack. But then if you have got 3 or 4 of those 5 litre bottles, it will soon fill up that sack and if you have got to keep it for a month it seems an awful long time. I mentioned that to some of you and you said all you do is squash them - sit on them or do what you like to squash them down - but that becomes a problem for the elderly and other ones as well just to be able to do that. I know for a fact as well that some households find that by the end of a month the box that they have got to put all their papers in overflows and it gets too much and it is quite heavy as well. It is not the easiest ones. So, what happens is some of the householders they then just throw the extra papers they have into their black sack to be collected every week. So, it kind of defeats the purpose as well. But all of this as well is going to cost money as well as you say taxes, but there is the tax that you pay or there are the rates that you pay. That is another thing as well, one has got to bear in mind that there is always going to be a cost. We have got approximately 600 households, I think it would be -- would that be right Mr. Collector, around about the 600 households. Well, I am sure that to give a couple of boxes - and I say give because householders would not want to pay - and the new sack that is going to be produced to put all the plastic in, that is going to work out about £7 each for the 3 which has to be found for each household. So, that is another £4,000. So, that £4,000 has either got to be found by somebody to sponsor it, stick their name on or sponsor it or the parishioners have got to pay for it. We can give it to you free, but you will have to pay for it through your rates. So, all this has a cost as well. Also bearing in mind that it would mean there is extra collections then that would have to be done to pick up that one as well. Negotiation again have to go on with my refuse collector because he said, well, if I have got to come around, you know, every week and then extra times as well during the month to pick up, that is going to cost him extra as well; extra cost and so on. So, there is always a cost all the time that one has got to think about, you know, if the people have to pay. Whether you say it is going to be taxes or whether it is going to have to come out of the individual parochial rates. So, this is why I myself personally, and certainly a couple of my people within the parish and that, have been trying to make sure that it is done in the right manner as economically as possible and also possibly to get some money back somehow or other if we can. Because as well as I am environmentally orientated, shall we say, I think a lot of people do not necessarily -- because the incinerators are far, far exorbitant. But I think generally a lot of people would be happier to have a balance between doing

environmentally friendly as well as the cost. We would still rather -- I am sure, the majority of people feel that, okay the cost might mean half the amount, but it would still be a cost at the end of it. But I think the majority of people would be happy with just that slight extra cost to know that at least they are doing something all round, even if it is not cheap, half price or a lot less. Because I think one has got to accept the fact, I think, to be environmentally friendly does not mean to say that everything is going to be cheaper. I think that you have to pay a certain price for being environmentally friendly. But it is to get the balance all round and this is why, I know that St. John have tried it, but a lot of the other parishes have felt St. Helier are far different. They have got a loss and a bigger range and a lot more households to cater for. But I think this is why a lot of the other parishes we have been kind of waiting and seeing and trying to go down the right route without jumping in and finding that it has, you know, cost a lot in the end. Grouville were doing that and I know with some of you they had their big bins down at Grouville next to their mini supermarket down there. Well, that was fine and it was great in a sense. Everybody was going down there, but they suddenly found out that it was costing Grouville £200 a month, I think it was, to come and pick up the skips and such like and it was great. It was working well, but then half the people of St. Clement used to go and tip into the Grouville bins and Grouville had it coming out of their rates. So, one has got to look at it overall. I am sure it is the same here. We have got people coming in and putting in the papers and the cans and such like, but I know it is not just the St. Mary parishioners. It is people from St. Ouen and others; all those that are close in hand and some of you from St. Peter. So, as well as you have got to look at it individually from the parochial point of view, I think one has got to look at it on an overall basis as well and decide how we go about it. So, I think this is why it is good that people come in and are showing their interest tonight. We have got a couple more to go, but, you know, you are not all St. Mary parishioners and that is why I have not wanted to interrupt too often this evening. But by the same token, the end product is down where the incinerator is going to be, but then that is, you know, a big issue, more of an issue for the parishioners of St. Helier at this moment than possibly ours. The only thing I can say is that at least now that quite a few people of St. Helier realise what us poor parishioners at St. Mary had to put up with up at Crabbe for many years which was not the best of situations, but at least you are spreading it around a bit now, possibly. Thank you.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

Right, the time is going on and we said we would run from 7.00 p.m. to 9.00 p.m. It is just a couple of minutes off now. I will take one or 2 more questions.

**Mr. R. Le Brocq:**

I would just like to make a contribution. I have listened to everything you have said and I think the Constable - is it - to me was absolutely right. It is about balance. But I think everybody here ought to realise it has got to be paid for one way or the other. Now, we either pay for it through rates or we will finish up, we are going to certainly have a sewage charge and we will have a charge for getting rid of our refuse. Obviously, if we can turn that around and generate some funds from it, even if we just cover the costs - I am not talking about making a profit, I am talking about covering the cost. But the thing that I get concerned about - I am very concerned about - is what we are doing to this earth. Most of us here are perhaps in our 40s, 50s or 60s, even 70, but what we are doing to this earth, you know, rising sea levels and all that sort of thing, I am just wondering about the legacy I am going to leave to my children and my grandchildren. If I am going to be too mean to put my hand in my pocket now and pay for what we should be paying for then, you know, I do not think I am going to be a very good father or grandfather. I think we ought to reflect that. What kind of legacy do we want to leave when we leave this earth?

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

That is a sobering thought, yes.

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

I am not 50. I think that is it. Global warming is climate change and, you know, we are the Environment Scrutiny Panel after all so we feel a certain responsibility for the environment, I think. It is a case of recognising changes in our own lifetimes now that perhaps 10 years ago we would have quickly dismissed as nonsense. I think we are beginning to accept the fact that the planet is facing some major changes and we have got to stop thinking short term.

**Deputy R.C. Duhamel:**

You know as they say, I mean, it should not cost the earth to save the earth. Think about it. Right, okay, well, I would like to thank everybody then for your attendance and most certainly for your comments. We have learnt a lot and I hope you have too. We have taken a full record of your names and your comments and thank you very much for being open and expressing them. As I say, there are 2 further meetings before the big one at the Town Hall and that is on 21st February at St. Saviour and then there is a further meeting on 28th February - another Thursday - at St. Brelade and then the final one will be at the Town Hall around about 14th and 15th March. So, if you have not had a chance to say your piece by tonight or at the previous meeting, we are there at those other meetings. Feel free to come along and if you have any further thoughts, you can get hold of us on our scrutiny line. That is 441080, that is our telephone number and we are on the internet. Please get in touch. Please spread the word and thank you for coming. Thank you.