

**STATES OF JERSEY**  
**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**BLAMPIED ROOM, STATES BUILDING**

**WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

-----

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

**In attendance:** Professor Chris Coggins (Waste Management Consultant)

-----

**EVIDENCE FROM:**

**HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES**

Senator Stuart Syvret (President)  
Mr Steve Smith (Assistant Director Health Protection)  
Mr Duncan Nicholson (Acting Medical Officer of Health)

-----

on

**Monday, 10th January 2005**

**(09:31:59 - 10:38:31)**

-----

(Digital Transcription by Marten Walsh Cherer Limited,  
Midway House, 27/29 Cursitor St., London, EC4A 1LT.  
Telephone: 020 7405 5010. Fax: 020 7405 5026)

-----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Good morning Senator, good morning Gentlemen. Could you please

introduce your team, Senator, so that, for the record, we know who you've brought with you?

SENATOR SYVRET: Sure, yes. This is Duncan Nicholson, the Acting Medical Officer of Health. This is Steve Smith from the Health Protection Department.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. I will introduce you to the Members around the table for the record. It is Deputy Hill, Professor Coggins, myself (Deputy Rondel), Deputy Duhamel, Mrs Kay Tremellen-Frost (the Scrutiny Officer), Senator Vibert and Senator Le Maistre. I have to read to you the following. It has to be read out prior to any Scrutiny Panel hearing.

It is important that you fully understand the conditions under which you are appearing at this hearing. You will find a printed copy of the statement that I am about to read on the table in front of you.

Shadow Scrutiny Panels have been established by the States to create opportunities for training States Members and Officers in developing new skills in advance of the proposed changes to Government. During the shadow period, the Panel has no statutory powers and the proceedings at public hearings are not covered by Parliamentary privilege. This means that anyone participating, whether a Panel Member or a person giving evidence, is not protected from being sued or prosecuted for anything said during the hearing. The Panel would like you to bear this in mind when answering questions and to ensure that you understand that you are fully responsible for any comments you make.

Senator, you are a member of the Waste management Steering Group?

SENATOR SYVRET: Yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: You are. And could you tell the Members, please, what you consider your job to be within that group?

SENATOR SYVRET: I am to represent the health perspective. I sit as a Member of the group that is pertinent to the Health and Social Services Committee. So the rôle of me on that Committee is to ensure that human health considerations are being taken into account fully in determining the Island's waste strategy and resultant measures.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes. Senator, your green credentials as a politician are well known. To

what extent do you endorse the waste hierarchy, and in particular waste minimisation and recycling, as a part of any waste management strategy?

SENATOR SYVRET: I endorse that absolutely. That's got to be the correct way to go. It's internationally acknowledged as best practice. The waste hierarchy is the correct way of approaching waste disposal.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Are you aware that, within the Carl Brow Report on page H22 and page H23, indeed there were indications that the Island could achieve, through advanced recycling initiatives, the diversion of some 72% of the household waste stream away from incineration by recycling?

SENATOR SYVRET: I don't recollect the precise details of the relevant quotes from the report, but I'm generally aware of those kind of recommendations certainly.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: And you support them?

SENATOR SYVRET: Yes, I do, yes.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Does it then not strike you as somewhat odd that within the Waste Steering Group the emphasis has not been placed as part of this strategy on minimisation and recycling methods?

SENATOR SYVRET: Yes, it probably is unfortunate, but I suppose the driving determinants of the Waste Strategy Steering Group has largely been that there has to be a replacement for the incinerator so the technological engineering solution has been the one that's been to the fore. The Group is largely directed by the Public Services Department. The meetings take place up there and most of the advice given to the Waste Steering Group is from the Public Services Department or from consultants employed by the Public Services Department. So it's not perhaps particularly surprising that the engineering solution has been the one that's tended to be to the fore.

I mean, having said that, I do think there is no escaping the fact that the Island does need a solution to its waste disposal, because even if we were to achieve quite a high degree of the waste hierarchy recommendations for minimising and recycling and reusing our waste, still there would be an element of putrescible waste and other material that would need to go to disposal.

So some form of solution is still required.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: But is it not true to say that, particularly from the perspective of putrescible waste, that end solution need not be a thermal solution, i.e., some form of burning?

SENATOR SYVRET: That's a possibility. A variety of solutions have been suggested -- some by yourself when you were a Member of the Waste Strategy Steering Group -- including various autoclave-type mechanisms and composting for putrescible waste and things of that nature. The difficulty, I think, the Waste Strategy Steering Group has had is that certainly the group has never been presented with any hard, concrete evidence that these other disposal methods are in fact proven and workable, and we've not been able to see existing plants that would achieve that kind of disposal in operation in other parts of the world, whereas incineration is proven. That at least is the impression certainly that's been given to the Waste Strategy Steering Group. Whether that's totally accurate, I guess, is open to dispute.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Have you yourself taken it upon yourself to visit any alternative technologies around the world?

SENATOR SYVRET: I have not, no. I haven't had the time to do that.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: And one final question, if I may. You are on record within the final minutes of the Waste Strategy Steering Group to have said that RDF should not be exported for someone else to incinerate. Could you actually qualify your comments?

SENATOR SYVRET: I don't know that I actually said that, but I certainly think that the consequences of the Island's waste problem should be dealt with by the Island. I don't think we should look to simply exporting our material to other jurisdictions unless there is a very clear justification for doing so and it is clearly the correct way to dispose of our waste.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: So if the Island managed, by means of diversion through recycling and in-vessel composting, to reduce the overall quantity of their waste substantially, such that the residual component being heavily minimised could be made into a refuse derived fuel for further export to those companies who do actually take refuse derive fuel, would you yourself support that direction?

SENATOR SYVRET: Certainly I would be very open to persuasion about that. There are a

number of important factors that have to be taken into consideration. I think there is a significant strategic issue that the Island has to face in terms of security of disposal. If, for example, we didn't have on the Island a significant means of disposing of waste within the Island, we are then at the mercy of the decisions made by the companies and indeed authorities in other jurisdictions and we may not always be able to rely necessarily in years to come on a disposal route to other jurisdictions being open to us. So there is ... I can see certainly the attraction of the idea if there is in fact no need to invest many tens of millions of pounds into a major plant in the Island and we could have a reliable, better way of disposing of our waste in other jurisdictions; for example, France, where they might have better economies of scale and so on. I can certainly see the attractions of that kind of pathway. But there is an element of risk that you have to then factor in because the disposal option is then no longer within our control.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: So one final point then. Presumably you would disregard the comment that was made within the Waste Strategy Committee Group minutes as not being representative of your views since that time?

SENATOR SYVRET: Yeah. I don't think that's a totally accurate reflection of my views.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Okay. Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Le Maistre?

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Just a continuation really. If we go back to the purpose of the Waste Strategy Steering Group, and you referred to the fact that it would appear at least that the main driver was coming from Public Services that incineration was the solution, do you recall whether at any time there was either a presentation or a discussion on the potential alternatives and the reasons why they may have been dismissed, or was it taken as a given, because I think it's an important aspect of the existence of the group as to whether the conclusions were accepted without debate effectively or whether there was any debate within the group and sound reasoning given as to why that conclusion?

SENATOR SYVRET: There certainly was debate at meetings of the group as to whether alternatives other than incineration could be viable. These questions were explored to some extent at meetings of the group. In fact, Deputy Duhamel was present on occasions. But the

impression I very much get is that, whilst the expressions of interest process that's been undertaken and the work done by the Department and its consultants has looked at the possibility of other mechanisms, I kind of get the impression it's been going through the motions, just to be able to say that "Well, we've looked at these things and they're not especially viable." Certainly the view that I have is that we haven't had sufficient information put before us to make a definitive decision one way or another whether there is another mechanism available as an alternative to incineration. But the question certainly was discussed by the Waste Steering Group, but the impression I got was very much that it was kind of a case of just going through the motions basically and that there was never really any kind of serious or determined effort to identify a viable alternative other than incineration.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: For the record, I would like to note that Deputy Gerard Baudains has joined the Panel at 9.40. Thank you. Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Can I just go back to Senator Le Maistre's point, which is actually the rôle of the Waste Strategy Steering Group, because in the minutes of the Environment and Public Services Committee of 7th July 2003 the Committee reconvened a new Steering Group, of which you were part, and approved the terms of reference. The terms of reference -- and I don't have to read them all, but I am going to read you two of them -- was to *"Receive and carry out a full evaluation of the expressions of interest received and recommend to the Committee the technologies that should go forward to the full tender stage. (4) As part of the preparation of the Waste Strategy, to prepare a financial statement which identifies all costs of the various initiatives that will have to be developed as part of the overall Strategy [and] (5) To prepare a draft Waste Strategy document for the Committee's consideration and approval."*

Now, in the light of all the minutes that we've read, I personally can find no evidence that the Waste Management Steering Group carried out that mandate. In fact, it appears to me that they were just a rubber stamp for the policies being put forward by the officials. I wonder if you would like to comment on the view that I have, having read all the minutes?

SENATOR SYVRET: That's probably a fair assessment, but I don't think that's a blame that you

could put particularly on the Waste Strategy Steering Group ----

SENATOR VIBERT: I don't intend to.

SENATOR SYVRET: ---- that is the culture of public administration in Jersey, I'm afraid. It's only really in recent years that politicians have started to be a bit more rigorous in questioning and robust in what they are told by departments, by officers and by staff. The political culture of the Island has basically been politicians turn up to committee meetings to rubber stamp what they are told by the "experts" (quote/unquote) and consequently, in many, many examples extremely poor and bad decisions have been made on behalf of the people of the Island. I mean, the idea, the culture in years gone by was very much that politicians were amateur in every sense of the word. I, myself, as a member indeed of a former Public Services Committee when I was first elected as a deputy and the other Members of that Committee merely accepted blindly whatever they were told by the officers, even when it was demonstrably untrue.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I in fact put to you that the way in which Guernsey has gone about the matter of dealing with an issue to do with waste, which is to hold an enquiry for a decision on an incinerator, where they formed a panel who are all experts in waste management from the United Kingdom -- there are four of them on that panel -- headed by an independent lawyer was in fact the way in which this matter should have been properly dealt with, because it would appear to me, looking at the membership of the Waste Strategy Steering Group, that in fact there is only one person on it, who was the Fichtner consultant, who had any real knowledge of waste and waste management? I wondered if you would think that the Guernsey way of doing the thing appeared to be the right way of doing it in terms of getting professional expertise?

SENATOR SYVRET: It would appear to have merits and some advantages over the approach that has been adopted in Jersey, although I think one has to sound a note of caution, in that one of the risks of getting local experts or people with specialist knowledge involved in developing these kind of policies or practices is that there is the potential for significant conflicts of interest to arise.

SENATOR VIBERT: These were professional people from the UK, not from Guernsey. They were members of waste management steering groups in the UK, the Department of Waste

Management and they were all UK based.

SENATOR SYVRET: Well, that would sound ... that would appear to have a lot of merit going for it. Generally speaking, Guernsey would appear to have a better culture of political enquiry than Jersey has. I think that is probably a fair observation, although I think, in fairness, because Guernsey didn't adequately address their waste disposal problem whilst they had these giant quarries that they could simply landfill to, they have rather been forced into taking a more robust approach to waste minimisation and recycling. I think there could be an element of making a virtue of a necessity in the Guernsey position.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I just ask you, in your knowledge of being on the Waste Strategy Steering Group, whether you were aware that in July 2000 the Policy & Resources Committee actually carried out a report on waste and it was recommended by the Chief Executive, Mr John Mills, that a task force should be set up to establish and drive forward planning for a new incinerator and it laid out what the job ought to be? I would like to put this comment to you, which was the report put to the Committee, which the Committee could read: "*It is important that the Committee is appropriately involved*" -- and that is the Policy & Resources Committee -- "*in this process from the start for there will be significant strategic and political matters involved from the start.*" Now, would it surprise you to know that that Committee never ever met, even though it was minuted in an Act that that Committee, that that task force should be set up? I just wondered whether (a) you knew about that on the Waste Management Steering Group and (b) what your views are about the fact that that task force which was strongly recommended to be set up, and agreed to be set up, actually never happened?

SENATOR SYVRET: I was aware of the decision of the P&R Committee to set up that task force, although I of course, as you may recollect, was ultimately expelled from the Policy & Resources Committee so I don't know what its fate was ultimately. So I was aware of the existence of that decision, but not as a result of being a member of the Waste Strategy Steering Group. That was not something I recollect ever having been brought to the attention of the Waste Strategy Steering Group.

Am I surprised that it wasn't progressed? No. I think the record of the senior



committees in the Island, Policy & Resources and Finance & Economics Committee, over the years -- successive committees I am talking about -- the record of them over the years is dismal and catastrophic for the Island in terms of dealing with the medium and long term interests of the community as a whole. It is pretty clear that the governing ethos of Jersey for some decades has been short term self-interest. It is difficult to find a more appropriate word other than "corrupt" to describe the way in which Jersey has been governed.

Indeed, the replacement for the incinerator, for example. If, for argument's sake, we do go ahead with the replacement incinerator at a cost of maybe £80 million, where's the money coming from for that? Why has there not been a sufficiently robust fiscal policy to have, for example, such basic measures of more taxation of these major engineering capital projects. We should have been writing that off and setting aside a proportion of money from the activity in the Island's economy each year so that when it reached the end of its life there was a lump sum available to build whatever replacement we decided upon. But the reason we haven't done that kind of policy -- it's the same with the airport and a whole range of other activities I could mention -- is because that would mean having a fiscal policy that took appropriate levels of revenue out of the economy and that, of course, would not be in the short term self-interest of the Island's business elite, which is why we haven't done it.

SENATOR VIBERT: So, in fact, you would agree that the matter was so important because that is what the Committee said "*It is important that the Committee is appropriately involved in this process*", because the replacement of Jersey's incinerator and the likely costs and the implications strategically for the Island are so important that it is something which should have been handled back in 2000 by a special task force involving Policy & Resources and all the major committees?

SENATOR SYVRET: Even in 2000 it is still too late. The point I'm trying to make is that these kind of medium and long term considerations should always have been a clear sighted part of the objectives of any responsible Government, and the fact that they were not is further evidence (as though further evidence were needed) that actually, certainly at least for the last decade, possibly longer, Jersey has been governed in a manner that's mind-bogglingly incompetent.

SENATOR VIBERT: Thank you. Can I change ... unless anybody else wants to come in?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Yes, Deputy Hill wanted to come in.

DEPUTY HILL: Can I just carry on in this line, if you don't mind.

SENATOR VIBERT: Sure.

DEPUTY HILL: It's regarding the meetings of the Strategy Group and one sees that, although it was considered to start off around the year 2000/2001, nothing really got going again until, it would appear, July 2003, when it was reconvened, as we have heard. We have got the minutes here of meetings. In fact, we've got four meetings, it would appear. I'd like to look back at the third meeting of 15th December 2003. You were then due to have a meeting on 13th February 2004. I'm looking at ... if you've got your minutes there, I'm looking at the Waste Strategy Group meeting and item 4.

SENATOR VIBERT: Is that the third meeting?

DEPUTY HILL: 15th December 2003.

SENATOR SYVRET: Yes.

DEPUTY HILL: Under (4), which is on the last page, "JR", which I assume is John Richardson, "*said that it was intended that a draft Waste Strategy be prepared for the meeting on 13th February*" -- that would have been last year, 2004 -- "*and be issued to Members before the meeting.*" It would appear that you have never met again from that meeting you had in December until September 2004, now it is, because remember that we are now 2005 here. So at any time did you ever look at what was being proposed as regards a Waste Strategy, because you were asked ... It says, you know, that it is "*intended that a draft Waste Strategy [would] be prepared for a meeting in February 2004*", but you never met.

SENATOR SYVRET: No. The Committee never met. I guess why that would be I'm not sure. I mean, it was chaired by the then President of Environment and Public Services Department and a lot of other things, I think, were going on at that time that we're all familiar, of course, that might have been significant distractions to him. But certainly the draft Strategy did come before the group when it met last year, towards the end of last year, and it was approved by the group then.

DEPUTY HILL: Can I just get the ... when you say "*the end of last year*", because we have a

minute ----

SENATOR SYVRET: The fourth meeting.

DEPUTY HILL: It was December that you were told you would be looking at it in February, but you never looked at it.

SENATOR SYVRET: Hmm hmm.

DEPUTY HILL: Then your next lot of meetings, the fourth meeting would have been 8th September.

SENATOR SYVRET: Yes.

DEPUTY HILL: And that's when you looked and approved. Was it this green one or was it a draft one?

SENATOR SYVRET: It was a draft. It was more substantial than that. That is just the précis of it.

SENATOR VIBERT: Babbie Fichtner?

SENATOR SYVRET: Pardon?

SENATOR VIBERT: The Babbie Fichtner Report?

SENATOR SYVRET: It was the draft Waste Strategy.

DEPUTY HILL: Yes, yes. So that's when you approved it.

SENATOR SYVRET: Yes.

DEPUTY HILL: Can I just ask were there any alterations or amendments to what was presented?

SENATOR SYVRET: There were. I don't recollect them all off the top of my head, but there were a few minor amendments that we made reading through it. For example, one of the amendments I made was, for my taste, too specific about the funding régime for example, which was going to be simply a gate charge for disposal at the incinerator and I wasn't in favour of that. I thought we had to look at a variety of other, perhaps more appropriate, fiscal mechanisms for making the strategy pay for itself. Personally, I would favour some kind of AMPO duty or excise duty on waste products being brought into the Island that may end up as waste because charging for disposal at the gate is a recipe for causing fly tipping and things of that nature.

DEPUTY HILL: Can I just ask, it is said that you were having a meeting in November 2004. Did you have that meeting?

SENATOR SYVRET: Not that I recollect.

DEPUTY HILL: You met on September 8th.

SENATOR SYVRET: Hmm hmm.

DEPUTY HILL: Have you had a meeting since September 8th last year?

SENATOR SYVRET: Yeah, we had ... I don't recollect the exact date. We met a few weeks ago before Christmas. Steve, do you remember the date? We did have a meeting.

DEPUTY HILL: So there is some impetus going now and looking at things?

SENATOR SYVRET: Yeah.

DEPUTY HILL: Okay. Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Thank you. Within the green document under "*Timetable*", it actually indicates that the new energy from waste plant needs to be commissioned by the end of 2008, which is when the current plant gets to the end of its useful life. Are you aware, and perhaps could you describe for this Committee, the reasons why 2008, other than what has been stated in the timetable, is the cut-off point, because, as you know, the incinerator is not just one stream, it is three streams, part of which -- one-third of which -- is of a more recent origin than the other two?

SENATOR SYVRET: The desire to get the existing incinerator shut down as soon as possible is entirely correct. It is without question a human health hazard. Anywhere else within the European Union it would have been shut down 11 years ago. It is without doubt a human health hazard. It pumps out very high levels of pollution, particulate matter, dioxins, furans, PCBs. It's a disgrace, frankly, that the Island still has this incinerator. It comes back to what I was saying before. It is nothing other than, frankly, a corrupt failure of the Island's whole body politic, its public administration, that we still have, 11 years after this was outlawed throughout the European Union, this polluting, toxic pile of rubbish spewing out this filth across the island.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Bearing in mind your comments on the pollution aspects, to what extent

have you, or indeed your Committee, actually pursued through the political channels means or methods whereby funds can be attracted to your Committee, to be spent through Public Services for flue gas treatment equipment?

SENATOR SYVRET: Well, it is not the job of my Committee. My Committee is a regulatory committee from a health point of view. It is not our job to actually seek money to fund capital investment in the incinerator. That is the rôle of the Public Services Committee. In terms of studying the pollution, we have a study underway at the moment by a consultancy firm called Hazards and Poisons. Is it Hazards and Poisons? It is Chemical Hazards and Poisons, who are investigating the present toxicity and pollution impact of the existing plant.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: I am aware -- it is on record, but I don't have it available at the moment - - that there was a dioxin report done for Jersey a substantial number of years ago.

SENATOR SYVRET: Yes.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: In the intervening period, have the Environmental Services Department or the Public Health Department actually commissioned any other reports in the interim?

SENATOR SYVRET: I think there have been two dioxin studies, and I have got some reference to them here. There was one in Jersey's soil -- dioxins in Jersey soils -- and there was a second one that examined dioxins in milk, I think, and grass. The results of both of those studies were, I think, not of cause for concern. They were below the national and international recommended levels. If you want to ask perhaps Steve about the specifics of the toxicology.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: It is not that. The bit I'm interested in is you have made a statement that we are the dirty old man of Europe, so to speak in respect of the equipment we're running, but I'm just asking perhaps for documentary evidence as to the nature of the polluting problems, the pollution problems. I'm just asking for the nature of the evidence in order to back up that viewpoint that you have at the moment.

SENATOR SYVRET: Well, there is the Warren Spring Report, which was done into the emissions of the incinerator, which clearly shows the degree of pollution that it emits. That is unlikely to have got better. It will only have got worse, probably as the incinerator has deteriorated with age and the volume and mixture of refuse going into the incinerator has

increased. So it's an entirely reasonable assumption that, if anything, the present level of pollution coming out of the incinerator is worse than that identified in the Warren Spring report. There were the two reports I have already referred to that dealt with dioxin contaminants in the Island's soils and in milk and, more recently, we have the Chemical Hazards and Poisons Consultancy investigating pollution at present.

There is no escaping the fact that the existing plant is polluting to a very unacceptable degree. What I have done about that is made the point repeatedly to the Waste Strategy Steering Group meetings that it is not acceptable to have that incinerator operating any longer than necessary, and there was indeed a degree of urgency required in getting it closed down and replaced.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: So to what extent is your department happy that, within the current strategy, monies will not be spent on independent flue gas treatment equipment to upgrade the third stream?

SENATOR SYVRET: Well, I think our view is that it's throwing good money after bad and that the existing incinerator will never be brought up to the required specification and the best thing to do is to get it replaced with whatever means we settle upon as the most appropriate, to get it replaced and get it shut down as soon as possible. I think my view would be that if we are going to disperse significant sums of capital, we are best doing it on a more appropriate medium and longer term solution rather than just trying to patch up the creaking and failed system that we have at present.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: I wonder if I could ask you when you expect that report to be complete into the health hazard of Bellozanne?

SENATOR SYVRET: Steve?

MR SMITH: Yes. The work is ongoing. I'm expecting to be able to have an interim report probably in about a month's time. Obviously, I'm in close liaison with the people doing the work, so we have an idea of where they're going, but we've asked them to undertake some extra

stuff because of what they've found.

SENATOR VIBERT: Thank you. Some of the evidence that we have received actually indicates that if you alter what's going into the incinerator you'll alter what's coming out of the incinerator; and some of the evidence is clear that if you put in plastics, rubber tyres etc, you are actually causing more pollution, which, in the Panel's view, highlights the need for recycling and not putting that in the incinerator. In view of the fact that there is this health concern, it seems extraordinary, personally to me as a Panel Member, that more hasn't been done to ensure that that sort of stuff is not put in the incinerator, including car batteries. We all know that that's happening, that it is still being burnt. I just wondered what your view was, as health people, about making sure that what goes in that incinerator is not continuing to cause even more problems.

SENATOR SYVRET: Well, as I have already said, I support the ... **[Pause for mobile phone]** ... classical waste hierarchy, which of course means minimising the amount of waste you produce and then diverting material for reuse and then recycling and so on and so forth. So it's entirely fair to say that if you prevent polluting, toxic material going into the incinerator you will reduce the amount of pollution it emits. There have been schemes which were put in place some years ago; for example, battery collection schemes by people like photographers in photographic shops and things of that nature. But, simply as a lay person, I cannot recollect for a very, very long time seeing any publicity about that because the disposal of batteries into the incinerator stream, of course, is one of the main sources of toxic heavy metals, both in terms of stack emissions and in terms of the residual pollution in the ash. So I think, without question, the Island could and should be doing more to minimise its waste stream.

My own view is that you have to use market mechanisms to achieve this adequately, which is why I favour using a front end cost mechanism in terms of minimising the amount of waste that the Island has to deal with and then encourage and reuse, i.e., through some kind of excise duty or AMPO duty or something, because the vast majority of material that goes through the incinerator is material that is imported to the Island -- foodstuffs, food packaging, you know, plastics. You know, the vast majority of it is material that is imported into the Island. Therefore,

there ought to be some kind of disposal charge or environmental charge on that practice of the importation of these goods. That way, you would have an appropriate market mechanism to help not only pay for the way in which the refuse is disposed of finally, but if you have a front end cost that makes waste material actually cost a bit more to acquire in the first place, then you have got a market mechanism that may encourage the minimisation of the production of the waste in the first place.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I just read to you what the Committee said about the reason that the energy from waste facility is coming to the end of its useful life? It said: "*Maintenance costs are increasing dramatically. There are serious problems with the internal flues of the chimney and the emissions do not meet standards required.*" Nowhere does it say anything about the health hazards, and I am surprised, in the light of what you've put to the Panel today, that, in view of the evidence that you have given about the pollution that's taking place, that that was not No. 1 on the list, that it was a health hazard. I just wondered what your views were that that is not included in the Waste Management Report?

SENATOR SYVRET: Well, certainly I have emphasised repeatedly at the Waste Strategy Steering Groups and so have officers ----

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes, we have seen those minutes.

SENATOR SYVRET: ---- the human health aspects of it. It is perhaps not entirely surprising that a document that is essentially a Public Services Department document should not focus the requisite weight on the health considerations.

SENATOR VIBERT: It is a pretty important consideration though.

SENATOR SYVRET: I think it is fair to say that it is the most important consideration. The human health impact has to be our principal concern in these matters. Regrettably it has not been in the past. That is the nature, as I have already said, of public administration in the Island. It is an important point, but, you know, anywhere else -- say, if we were a local authority in the United Kingdom -- for example simply disposing of many tens of tens of thousands of tonnes of incinerator ash into haphazard land reclamation schemes, you know, of itself you would be prosecuted. Any authority in the UK who had done that would simply have been prosecuted.



But here in Jersey every relevant public sector department that ought to have some kind of rôle in saying that “You can’t do that, you shouldn’t do that, you must stop doing that”, every department, it is probably fair to say, has been culpable to some extent in allowing it to happen in the first place and then in trying to cover it up over the years. Therefore, there is a shared vested interest on the part of all aspects of public administration in the Island in pretending that it’s okay and acceptable and not really a problem and that it’s all hunky dory. But, I mean, if you look at it from, say, what would happen anywhere in the United Kingdom, you could see that it would be completely unacceptable and in fact the relevant authorities that had done this dumping would have been prosecuted by the Environment Agency. So I make that point simply to illustrate the nature of how public administration in the Island works. When one allows the Public Services Department, who has such a dismal records in these fields, to run with the Waste Disposal Strategy, as they have done, then this is inevitably going to be the consequence.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Gerard Baudains?

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, on the same theme, Senator, I think we all realise that the chimney emissions are quite unacceptable at the present time, and you say that you want the plant shut as soon as possible. We have just heard that, with effective recycling, perhaps chimney emissions and ash quality and other such matters, in fact their volume, could be improved. What would be your Committee’s position towards running the existing plant a year or perhaps two years longer than is envisaged, with those improved chimney emissions, ash quality and that smaller volume of ash achieved by proper recycling schemes in order to allow research into these alternative processes to be investigated, which don’t appear to have been done so far?

SENATOR SYVRET: My personal view is that it would be ... I would be very reluctant to seeing that plant staying open any longer than absolutely necessary. It is without question a human health hazard. You know, it would have been shut down, as I have said, 11 years ago anywhere within the European Union. The fact that a community as rich as Jersey is hasn’t in fact made proper provision for replacing that plant with a better alternative at the appropriate time is just shocking and is a disgraceful commentary on the quality of public administration in

Jersey. As I have said, it is difficult to find any other word other than “corrupt” to describe how the place has been governed. But the fact is that it does pollute. It’s toxic. It’s a threat to human health. It shouldn’t be running now and, frankly, I would be very reluctant to see that plant run any longer than absolutely necessary. I think this is one of the ... I’ll be frank. One of the tasks that you face as a Scrutiny Panel is that you’ve got to do perhaps (and it’s not necessarily a fair burden on you because you don’t have the particular expertise and resources to do it), but realistically, if you’re going to succeed in persuading people that the existing Waste Strategy is not as good or appropriately focused as it should be, or not going in the right direction, you’re going to have to posit some workable, viable alternatives to that Strategy, if you’re going to expect ... and there has been a very degree of high debate about its merits.

SENATOR VIBERT:            Could I ... sorry.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS:            It seems to me, Senator, that the problem is flexibility is going to need to be required here, simply because the research does not appear to have been done, because otherwise the alternative is that, if we replace that plant as quickly as we possibly can, we will simply put in another incinerator which in the long term is probably not going to provide the environmental benefits that other processes can provide. So we will be trading off the short term against the long term.

SENATOR SYVRET:            As I said, I would be very reluctant to see that plant stay open any longer than necessary. I could be open to persuasion, but I would need some pretty convincing and robust evidence put before me that there was in fact going to be a better, viable, workable alternative at the end of the day rather than just a delay for maybe 12 or 18 months of kind of, you know, political argument and prevarication only going to end back at square one with the incinerator decision. So if I were to be persuaded that any delay was to be acceptable in terms of shutting down that incinerator, I would need some very robust evidence that there was in fact a realistic, viable, alternative way of dealing with our waste on the horizon.

DEPUTY RONDEL:            Just before I come back to Senator Vibert, could you explain to me why Environmental Services haven’t prosecuted Public Services if there is as big a problem as you state?

SENATOR SYVRET: Well, the present Environmental Health Protection department, as it is called, I think would take the view that ... I mean, under our existing statutory powers I suppose we could invoke the statutory nuisance law or something of that nature against the existing incinerator because it's not adopting best practicable means, best available technology, in order to minimise its pollution. The question we have to face realistically is what's going to be worse from a human health point of view. I mean, suppose it were feasible and viable for some kind of action to be taken against PSD that would make that incinerator shut.? You are then faced with an immense build up, week on week, of thousands of tonnes of rotting, putrescible waste, which would rapidly fill the existing facility within Bellozanne Valley for storage. You would then be looking at putting it at La Collette. Who knows where else in the Island? You would then incur dramatic costs in terms of shipping it out in barges or ships, containerised units or whatever. That activity of itself would have significant human health risks. There would be all kinds of disease and pest and vermin risks from having that amount of putrescible waste building up in the Island without it being disposed of. So, running the existing incinerator is probably the lesser of two evils in terms of running it or shutting it down and just letting the Island's rotting waste build up. I mean, I don't know if Duncan or Steve wants to add anything?

MR SMITH: Yeah. In terms of the statutory nuisance law, there is clearly a need for us to have a burden of proof in terms of a breach of the law for us to take action. One of the difficulties, as my President has said, is we know that the incinerator emits a lot of nasty material, toxic materials and materials that are known to be cancerous. However, for us to be able to say that there is an issue, we need to be able to prove nuisance or prejudicial to health, and clearly one of the difficulties in doing that is getting the evidence together to substantiate that matters are occurring on the Island which are prejudicial to health. That is the difficulty we have and every jurisdiction has in being able to come up with definitives about the health effects of incinerators. Clearly, without that, it's very difficult for us to actually require some statutory action.

Now, on the other side of it, as the President has already said, the difficulty is that if we were to shut the plant, then there are major issues around health, with the implications for the

waste on the Island. That clearly ... it would be no good us taking action in one place for us to substantially cause a problem in another.

DEPUTY RONDEL: You don't believe that, by taking a prosecution, you would encourage changing the working practices at the incinerator plant at the moment?

MR SMITH: Well, I think the issue here is what action do you take to improve matters? The way to improve matters in terms of the plant is to change the emissions. In order to do that, it would require a very substantial capital investment in the existing plant in order to upgrade the emission stuff. Now, that money would be far better spent on a new plant, in our opinion.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel, continuation.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Could I just take issue with that? I mean, we have heard from various Panel Members that, indeed, one cheaper way of achieving the same end wouldn't be to bolt on expensive equipment to clean up pollution after it has been generated, but to actually move the process further back down the line and not burn batteries and not burn metals which cause the problems in the first place. That is the type of thing that we're talking about. If pressure were brought to bear by Environmental Services, there would be a change in working practices which didn't introduce those polluting aspects to the incinerator and presumably that would be a fairly easy thing to do?

MR SMITH: Yes, but what you're asking for is changes in ability of Public Services to control what is actually going into the incinerator. When you look at what is delivered at Bellozanne by the public in a mixed bag, which is not possible to go through, it is physically impossible for Public Services to actually address that, short of introducing extra recycling schemes and for the Constables of the various parishes to actually become involved in changing the way that refuse is collected in the Island.

Now, in terms of the statutory action which we could take, that would have to be limited to what Public Services can do and not in requiring the parishes to change their way of action in order to assist Public Services. That wouldn't be feasible for us under the law. We would have to purely deal with what Public Services do. Now, correctly, we could say that some of the material coming into the civic amenity site may be possible to actually segregate some more of

that material in order to change what goes into the incinerator, but, again, there needs to be a means of rewarding and dealing with that particular type of material. The difficulty for the Island is that we then run into substantial costs in terms of recycling things like tyres or whatever if it has to go off Island. Clearly, over the last couple of years, we have not been able to ship material primarily because of the restrictions placed by the UK Government. You know, that is the position that we're in.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. Before moving on to Senator Vibert -- I am coming to you in a second -- Senator, you mentioned the Warren Spring Report. We haven't a copy of it. Could you supply the Panel with a copy of it, please?

SENATOR SYVRET: Yes. The Public Services Department have it. They commissioned it in the early 1990s, so I am surprised they haven't let you have one already, but, yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. There are a number of matters that I want to raise. I am not sure whether you are aware, Sir, that we are not barred from exporting anywhere, including the United Kingdom, rubber tyres, plastic bottles or paper. We are permitted to export that to wherever wish. So this myth that exists is that we can't, but we're already doing it. We are sending it. Guernsey sends all its rubber tyres away from Guernsey and recycling ... I would like to put to you what the Jersey Environment Forum put to this Panel in a submission, which was that they disagree with much of what is in this document in terms of its emphasis, not its content but its emphasis. They believe that the Environment and Public Services Committee should rigorously pursue the waste hierarchy and take every opportunity to reduce the volume of waste that enters the waste stream and reaches the final disposal, which is in line with the current thinking that, if you're putting stuff like rubber tyres and plastic into the incinerator, you are in fact creating more dangerous emissions. So the improvements that can be made immediately would be if there was a change to what goes into the incinerator, and it is that which is getting bottom priority in the way in which this Waste Strategy is being put forward. That is the view of the Environmental Forum, who were set up precisely to do this kind of work. So I just want to correct you on this question of exporting waste, because it is a myth that's being put around by

Public Services that we cannot export waste.

MR SMITH: No, I'm not saying that we can't export waste, because clearly if the material is going for recycling, then the expression from the UK has been that they would be prepared to accept that.

SENATOR VIBERT: Hmm hmm.

MR SMITH: But clearly, if the material has to go for disposal, then ----

SENATOR VIBERT: That's another issue.

MR SMITH: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: But anything that's to do with recycling is permitted both to the United Kingdom or to France.

SENATOR SYVRET: The solution to all of this -- again, to pursue the avenue you've just described -- is it's all down to the economy and fiscal policies. It's all down to having the appropriate fiscal policies that will make this work. There is a cost to collection, to having sorted schemes, to having proper sort and collection for it to be disposed of, for it having gathered up, stored, bundled, containerised and whatever and then export it. But, of course, there is a cost to doing all that, which is why, I suppose, the States has never done that, because, again, that would require a more medium and longer term view to be taken of our fiscal policies so that there was a funding stream available for that kind of activity. That ought to be, as I have already described, some kind of front loaded excise duty on the waste as it is brought into the Island so that its disposal is ultimately paid for properly.

SENATOR VIBERT: But if you put the position that funding for advertising recycling, changing the stream and you just put a hypothetical figure on of, say, half a million pounds a year for the next two years to get it up and running and you put that alongside spending 85 million on an incinerator, if you can reduce the amount going into the incinerator by 50%, which we have been told is perfectly possible, it is actually an extremely good investment for the Government to be involved in. What has surprised the Panel is that that's never actually been put forward, to set it against the cost of the incinerator. In other words, if you are building an incinerator to do 40,000 tonnes and not 80,000 tonnes or a method of disposal, the costs are going to be considerably less

than £85 million to do an 85,000 tonne incinerator. That should be offset against recycling and those kind of costs.

SENATOR SYVRET:            Hmm hmm. That's a valid analysis, but, as I have already described, the culture of the Public Services Department is such that it is always the engineering, technological kind of solution, the big capital bit of kit solution, that comes to the fore, I am afraid, rather than these kind of other analyses of the problems.

DEPUTY RONDEL:            Senator Le Maistre?

SENATOR LE MAISTRE:        I would like to go back, if we may, to the document that was issued in September by the Environment and Public Services Committee and the rôle of the Steering Group in perhaps the development of this document and whether the document was actually seen by the Waste Management Steering Group prior to its printing and whether it was approved effectively and the concepts within it being approved by the Steering Group. Can you recall whether that was done?

SENATOR SYVRET:            I don't recollect seeing that precise draft of the strategy, of that particular document, but the overall Waste Strategy, yes, did come before the Waste Strategy Steering Group. As I have already described, I recollect we made some minor amendments to it before it was approved for publication.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE:        The reason I point to it is that there are statements contained within it. It is very much a précis, obviously, of the document, we know that, but it says, for example -- and this, it seems to me, crystallises the issues between the short term and the long term and all the matters of recycling and separation and so on which we have really been discussing (and it seems to me that we have been unable, in certain areas of our debates, to separate what are the short term and what are the longer term issues) but it says, if I can quote -- "*Even if we were to achieve the ambitious level of around 29% of recycling and composting in the years to come [etc], that would still leave around 86,000 tonnes of waste a year to be disposed of towards the end of this decade.*" That's on the left-hand page.

On the right-hand page, we find that there are levels of recycling comparisons country by country and, interestingly enough, we find that Germany, in 1996, which is nearly 10 years ago,

was achieving 38%. So the question really is, these aspects are being put forward as being, it seems to me, a reflection of the thinking either of Public Services or the Waste Strategy Group. Are you happy with those kind of deductions and statements being made in this document, because it appears to us that the recycling potential is considerably greater than is being stated here? In fact, we have had it stated by a number of submissions that there is no reason why Jersey couldn't achieve 50% or more recycling?

SENATOR SYVRET: I think that is a fair comment. The actual detail of that document is, I think, all of a piece with the culture and the syndrome I have already described of the Public Services Department: looking for the big technological solution, the big engineering scheme at the end rather than looking at the detailed strategic approach to the whole waste stream, the whole waste issue in the Island. I'm not surprised that that is how it's come out. I think it is clear that there has been a lack of robust ambition on the part of the Island as to what we could achieve in terms of best international practice, in terms of waste minimisation and recycling. As I said earlier, whilst there have been examinations of some different options for waste disposal as alternatives to incineration by the Waste Strategy Steering Group, which, you know, have been put to that group by the Public Services Department and its consultants, I very much got the impression that it was kind of, you know, going through the motions and it wasn't being gone into with a sufficiently robust degree of enthusiasm and rigour.

The difficulty one faces as a lay person, of course, on these groups and committees -- and, again, it is a feature of public administration -- is that, as a lay person, as an ordinary politician, when you've got people who are international specialists in waste technology and waste disposal, it is very difficult for you as a lay person to argue against them and say "Well, actually, you know, what you're saying is perhaps not entirely the full picture" or that there are other ways of looking at it.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Could you, perhaps your officers, comment on what has been put forward here as being realistic objectives, because clearly, from a health point of view, it has a considerable impact as to whether we are ... I mean, the figures quoted for recycling in this actual table are 9% for Jersey. That, I think, excludes the composting, which is 11%, so the total



being 20%. But, nevertheless, if we look at Germany 10 years ago, it comes for composting and recycling at 48%. Now, all the comments that have been made thus far suggest that, you know, we can't really do anything. But, from a health point of view, is this situation satisfactory?

MR SMITH: I think, first, if I could just clarify in terms of this document, whilst it is a précis of the draft strategy, this document was not actually discussed by the Waste Strategy Steering Group and, to my understanding, the first surfacing of this document was actually at the first residents' meeting at Bellozanne last year, and that is the first time that I saw it.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Did it come as a surprise to you?

MR SMITH: I'd not seen it. I picked up a copy at the meeting.

SENATOR SYVRET: I had not seen that until it was published either.

SENATOR VIBERT: I wonder how you felt, the fact that it had been written by the Government's spin doctors?

SENATOR SYVRET: Has it?

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, in fact, in the States it was written by the Communications Division. I just wondered how you felt about that?

SENATOR SYVRET: Well, I mean, that speaks volumes. I wasn't actually aware of that. But, I mean, it just says it all, doesn't it? Here you have supposedly a key document dealing with the very important strategic considerations relating to waste disposal in the Island and the people who have prepared it and finalised it are the spin doctor department of the P&R Committee. That just speaks volumes, doesn't it, really about the level of intellectual rigour with which the whole process has been approached.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Vibert.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: But could we continue to pursue ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Sorry, my apologies.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: ---- because we hadn't really had a reply, particularly given the fact that you hadn't seen it.

SENATOR SYVRET: I think that, from a human health point of view, the minimisation of waste that has to ultimately go to disposal is of course better. If you can minimise the amount of waste

society produces and then reuse and recycle, then clearly that is going to have less of a health impact than the disposal mechanism, the ultimate disposal mechanisms. I think that is clear.

Whether the comparison between what Jersey might achieve and Germany is necessarily a totally fair one, I don't know. There are, I think, physical constraints in a small island that may make some of the recycling options, both in scale and in terms of type, less practical in a small island community than they are in a large industrial nation state like Germany. But nevertheless, having said that, I still think it is fair to say that the recycling ambitions for the Island are not sufficiently high.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Are the officers in your department aware of what is going on in our neighbour, France, for example? Has anybody looked at the achievements there in recent years, or has it all been north driven by what is going on to the north of us?

MR SMITH: In terms of our involvement in the recycling issue, that has been very limited. Mostly the issues of recycling have been addressed by Public Services because of their responsibilities for dealing with waste and, as you are aware, they have employed a recycling officer specifically, whose rôle is to increase recycling in the Island and to make people more aware. In fairness, with that particular document, it highlights the fact that there is greater recycling elsewhere, and this document was produced specifically for the public and, in that respect, I think it is fair to say that it shows the public how poor Jersey currently does in terms of its recycling. As I said earlier, the issue is that if we want to really increase recycling substantially, then clearly there has to be a change in the way that Jersey collects its waste in the first instance, because we have to get segregation at source, not at the point of disposal. Otherwise we will never make the gains and, clearly, all of the aspects around that are dependent upon you being able to do something with the material that you get people to remove from the waste stream in the first place. In the past, that clearly hasn't been an issue.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Is the Department aware ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: The time is now 10.30.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: And I will confirm with the Senator and make sure he hasn't any further

meetings. Would you give us another five or ten minutes, Senator, so we can finish our deliberations with you?

SENATOR SYVRET: Yes, sure, sure. No problem. I am free for the morning.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: The point I was trying to draw out is has there been any, by the officers and certainly the Department, any exploration of what is going on elsewhere, i.e., in France compared to what has been happening in the UK, because it seems to us that much of this is driven by what is going on in the UK, which appears to be a very poor performance compared to what certainly some of us have seen in France.

SENATOR SYVRET: I think, in fairness to my officers, it's not their job to look at what may be done by waste disposal in other jurisdictions, although no doubt that's a question that is perhaps more appropriately addressed to the officers of the Public Services Department. But, in terms of the general point you're making, do we look too much to the United Kingdom sometimes in these issues, I think the answer is yes, we probably do.

MR NICHOLSON: I suggest it might be helpful to the Panel to sort of focus on the appropriate rôle of certainly the Medical Officer of Health and the Health Committee, and that is two-fold, in my view: first of all, to point out that there are very real health hazards with the Bellozanne incinerator as we sit at the moment. Both independently and in support of my President, I have been making this point frequently in the meetings that we're dealing with. Secondly, it is to satisfy myself, the Health & Social Services Committee and the States that any proposal that comes out of this Strategy meets the highest standards of the health for the future of the Island. I think we would be unwise to try and pretend to be experts in waste management.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: Is that directed at the Panel, what you just said, that it is unwise to ... can you ... I missed that? Unwise to?

SENATOR SYVRET: No, this is us, us.

SENATOR VIBERT: Oh, I am sorry.

MR NICHOLSON: When we're health people and not waste management people.

SENATOR VIBERT: Sure, I understand. I understand. I am sorry, I didn't quite hear what you said.

MR NICHOLSON: I am sorry.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: One final one. As Members of the Waste Management Steering Group, are you completely satisfied that the resulting strategy that has been produced by Public Services represents and reflects best practice worldwide and it is something that we could wholeheartedly endorse as being the very best for Jersey?

SENATOR SYVRET: Probably not, no.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Any other questions?

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes, I have. I just want to read a quote from a document from the European Commission, which is directed at island communities, "*Strategy to Integrate Waste to Energy Policies*", and it's one of the problems that the Panel has been having about the dichotomy that the Committee are involved in in their Waste Strategy, because it states here that "*There are basic principles that island authorities should have in mind before engaging themselves in similar developments, i.e., incineration. Incinerators are designed on the basis of specific throughput and calorific value of waste. We cannot alter these parameters at a later stage, i.e., by introducing another waste management option such as recycling and paper or plastics without affecting their performance.*"

Basically the message that they're putting over there is that if you decide to incinerate you have to make that decision based on all of the waste that you have coming in. If you then start another waste strategy, i.e., we say "Well, we're going to have an incinerator, but now we're going to recycle, so we are going to reduce the amount of waste that's available", that's the wrong way of doing it. In other words, if you do it that way, you're going to end up with an incinerator that can't burn what's left because you have designed it in a particular way.

That's really the point that the Environmental Forum is making, which is that the most

important job is to minimise the waste. In fact, Babtie Fichtner say precisely that in their report, that the crucial element ... I will actually read it to you: *“The main objective of the strategy must be on controlling the quality of waste, first by reducing the rate of growth and in the longer term by reducing the quantity. Waste minimisation in recycling with realistic and achievable targets will be the mainstays of the strategy.”* So they are laying it down very clearly that this has to be done as the mainstay of the strategy, not as a by-product of the strategy. In fact, **that** document does precisely the opposite, because it deals with incineration and the need for an incinerator. I just wanted to put that to you and get your views, Senator, on that statement and how it differs with Jersey’s Waste Strategy as outlined in **this** document?

SENATOR SYVRET: Well, as I have already said, I didn’t see that document, the green document, until it was actually published. As I have learned this morning, it was actually prepared with the input and assistance of the P&R Committee’s spin doctor department. So it is not entirely surprising, therefore, that that green document doesn’t in fact reflect even the information that has been given to the Waste Strategy Steering Group, even considering that that information may not itself be sufficiently broad or complete. So I think something has gone badly wrong with the process.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator, on behalf of the Panel, I would like to thank you for attending. Have you anything further you would like to add prior to leaving?

SENATOR SYVRET: I think I have covered the general points. What I do need to emphasise is that there is no escaping the fact that the existing incinerator is a human health threat. It’s toxic, it’s polluting and it should have been shut down 11 years ago. It’s frankly disgraceful and it’s a shocking failure of public administration in the Island that it wasn’t properly planned for, its obsolescence properly amortised so that there was funding to replace it. It’s just completely unacceptable. So if there is to be some alternative put forward as an alternative to incineration, that has to happen and has to come forward quite convincingly and as speedily as possible.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator, on behalf of the Panel, thank you very much. There will now be an adjournment for 10 minutes.

