

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE HARBOURS AND AIRPORT COMMITTEE  
BY DEPUTY G.C.L. BAUDAINS OF ST. CLEMENT**

**ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 9th NOVEMBER 2004**

**Question**

- (a) With regard to the tanker berth forward gangway, would the President confirm whether –
- (i) around February 1998 the tank supporting the gangway reached the end of its life;
  - (ii) the Harbours Department declined the offer of two replacement tanks costing approximately £10,000;
  - (iii) the gas supply ships required two escape routes, one for'd and one aft, but considered a boat alongside adequate;
  - (iv) in 1999 the Harbours Department replaced the old system with a facility consisting of six landing stages (originally three) which tanker operators refused to use because of its design, requiring up to 64 changes of gangway per day on a 40ft. tide; and,
  - (v) the six tier device costing approximately £180,000 required the supply of a safety boat on approximately 450 occasions at a cost of £125 each time due to its failure.
- (b) In light of the above, will the President explain to what extent tanker operators were consulted with regard to the six tier structure and, given that the original gangway forms part of the latest structure, why over half a million pounds has been expended providing an access route that could have been achieved by purchasing another tank complete with a saving of £10,000?
- (c) Would the President further confirm the existence of a loose lid, unmarked petrol storage vessel nearby and will he confirm whether the ship discharge hoses are in a leaky condition, and, if so, whether this is deemed unsafe?

**Answer**

- (a) (i) I can confirm that the tank and some of the ancillary steelwork supporting the bridge came to the end of its life at this time.
- (ii) I am not aware and cannot find a record that Jersey Harbours declined the offer of two replacement tanks at £10,000 and neither are the staff currently in post. If this were the case, it would not include the cost of the ancillary steelwork nor the cost of installation.
- (iii) All fuel vessels require two means of escape from the ship and a boat alongside is only considered acceptable where no safer means of access is reasonably practicable.
- (iv) In 1998, Jersey Harbours replaced the original floating bridge system with a 6 level landing stage (originally one level). This was to accommodate the current type of tankers operating, which were somewhat larger than those operating when the original system was designed in the 1970's. Certain tanker operators may have chosen not to use it and a boat was placed alongside their vessel as a short term measure, as a means of escape. It is estimated that there might need to be 36 gangway changes over a 24 hour period on a 40 foot tide, but the frequency of 40ft tides and tankers discharging at that time is small and they do not normally stay in port for more than 12 hours.
- (v) The six tier landing platform did not cost £180,000, but cost in the region of £70,000 to £80,000. There are no readily obtainable records of the frequency and cost of the safety boat at that time, although it is recognised that costs were significant and had a part to play in considering the purchase of the current

facility.

- (b) I am not sure of the extent which tanker operators were consulted, since staff concerned are not currently in post, but wish to point out the following. The six level platform is similar to the existing three level platform which is still in use at the aft end of the tanker berth, which requires frequent changes of gangway. The original arrangement at the forward end was not satisfactory and caused damage to the structure of the jetty and required significant maintenance. In view of my previous answers, I cannot agree with the costs and savings quoted in the question.
- (c) This area is operated by the Fuel Consortium. They have placed a thermal expansion chamber at the jetty which is not a storage vessel, but has an unlocked steel lid which can be removed easily. It is unmarked, as those who operate the equipment are trained in its purpose and use, and only authorised personnel are allowed in the area. The discharge hoses do not leak on a regular basis, if there are occasional leaks from flanges these are repaired.