

STATES OF JERSEY

SHADOW SCRUTINY PANEL

BLAMPIED ROOM, STATES BUILDING

WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Present:

Deputy Phil Rondel (Review Chairman)

Senator Ted Vibert

Deputy Gerard Baudains

Deputy Rob Duhamel

Deputy Bob Hill

EVIDENCE FROM:

Senator Philip Ozouf

Mr John Richardson

In attendance:

Mr Boyd Bennie

Mr John Rodgers

Mr John Rive

(Environment & Public Services)

on

Friday, 26th November 2004

(14:30:49 - 16:52:01)

(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: It has just gone two-thirty and I would like to welcome you all to this continuation of a hearing. Before we start, I will read the necessary paperwork which is read to all witnesses at the start of each 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 to you 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 of 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 hearings. 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 that you make.

That said, the President asked me earlier in the week if I could give him an indication of what questions were likely to be asked this afternoon, so I gave him a brief outline. It was sent to him via the Department. I will start off. In a recent press interview, you made comments about exporting waste to France for recycling, Mr President. Could you tell me -- and these comments are attributed to you in the *Evening Post* and I will read them out: "*Environment & Public Services President Philip Ozouf said that there was no plants within a viable distance in Northern France which could cope with Jersey's waste and from an environmental point of view he said he was against exporting Jersey waste to be dumped in a French landfill site. With the EU demanding a reduction in such sites, this may not be viable long term. Opposition in any case ...*" Could you explain what you meant by those comments, please, Senator?

SENATOR OZOUF: Okay. Obviously we are in the process of a ... I think there is a bit of perhaps a sort of a misunderstanding amongst States Members and indeed perhaps Members of your own Panel that we are ... we have not finished and we haven't got a Waste Management Strategy. We are working on one. We have issued a consultation draft and certainly during the course of the afternoon I am certainly going to take the opportunity of updating you where I can

as to where we are as to where our strategy may well be ending up. One of the aspects and, indeed, there are numerous aspects and numerous ideas which have been coming up following the consultation report, some of them have been generated by members of the public, some of the ideas have been generated by the members of the public and some of them have certainly been generated by, dare I say it, the work that you have been doing here on the Scrutiny Panel, and indeed I welcome that. One of the ideas has been is fact we should be ... in fact I think you questioned me here as to why I hadn't been to France previously and investigated problems. Partly because of your own questioning, but partly because we are investigating lots of different options for waste management, we actually went to France and we did a number of things when we went to France. We visited I think the same plant that you had visited yourselves when you had been over there on your own fact finding mission, and we went to the energy from waste plant that had been built in Le Havre and we met with management and we discussed practical arrangements and financial arrangements etc and we have certainly learned about the energy from waste plant in Le Havre. We have also taken the opportunity of visiting another landfill site, a recycling centre and what would be described in English as being a civic amenity centre, in terms of separating or a bring system for waste.

The results from our trip -- it was a very useful trip and I am pleased that we went -- are that certainly the energy from waste plant in La Havre not only is more expensive than had certainly been indicated, but it also has a capacity issue. We learned that it certainly doesn't have the capacity to take Jersey's waste. I am unaware of any other energy from waste plants in the Normandy area. There are, I am aware, some other plants in Brittany. We will continue to keep under review and we are going to review options for other plants potentially that are in the immediate vicinity of Northern France, but at the moment I think it is looking perhaps even more unlikely certainly that we could find a contractual arrangement with the operators at Le Havre.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Are you aware ... sorry, carry on.

SENATOR OZOUF: The second issue is that I am aware that in some quarters the option of exporting waste for sorting and potential landfill is being suggested. I don't know whether or not it is Members of the Panel, but I certainly heard it from other States Members. I think it is

important that, whilst we are open to a number of options to dealing with Jersey's waste and we are open to the option of exporting Jersey's waste for energy recovery, we are looking into it. We are still very sceptical about whether or not it is going to be permitted under the Basle Convention. We are looking into that. The prospect of exporting waste for landfill, certainly wearing my environmental hat, is something that I think is not right to consider as being a realistic option. Not only do I think it is going to be extraordinarily difficult to justify that under Basle, according to my own interpretation, but I think from an environmental point of view it is not acceptable and so I am quite ... I have said purposefully that I think we should rule export for landfill out.

DEPUTY RONDEL: I believe that the Panel would agree with you on that particular statement in general.

SENATOR OZOUF: It is nice to hear it.

DEPUTY RONDEL: In general. But are you aware that the plant at Le Havre in fact could ... in fact, there is space to put a third stream in or an additional stream in. Did they explain that to you?

SENATOR OZOUF: Indeed.

DEPUTY RONDEL: That could take out waste.

SENATOR OZOUF: We did investigate that and indeed we actually split ... we wanted to cover as much possible ground as we could on Monday and I spent a couple of hours at the plant and John and other colleagues behind me from Public Services spent the rest of the day, so he is probably in a better position to talk about the capacity issues and the third stream.

MR RICHARDSON: Thank you. The current plant, as I am sure you are aware, has a theoretical capacity of 192,000 tonnes and its current throughput, we were indicated on Monday, was 165. So it is limited. When we discussed the option of exporting waste to France for disposal, the operator was very clear that the existing plant did not have the capacity to deal with our waste and if we were to export waste to France, a proportion might go to that plant at a gate fee, which they indicated to us, and the remainder would be disposed of into other areas. "*Distributed*" I think was the word they used. So when we questioned that, as the President has said, it was to landfill sites, which clearly, as he has indicated, are not sufficient, not acceptable.

We did discuss with them the option of a third stream and whilst, yes, the plant is being built with the foundations there, the building and the essential infrastructure, obviously the boiler and the incinerator are not there and we asked what the likelihood was of building it. The indications we received were that it would take a lot of public persuasion there to convince the public to construct the third stream. When we then asked about whether the public in the area would be prepared to accept our waste, certainly the indication was that if there was an argument put forward it would have to be financially viable for the community, because clearly the gate fee they charge the community which contributes to the capital costs of the plant is very different to the gate fee they charge external customers. So if you then take the gate fee that they indicated to us as an external customer as being an indicative gate fee to repay the capital on a third stream on that line, so there wouldn't be any difference and certainly there was nothing other than that as an indication to us, then you have to start looking at the cost of export and that cost of export at the moment certainly appears to be more than building a plant in Jersey.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes. Can I just ask how much waste did you actually indicate to the French authorities that we would be sending, if indeed a contract were available?

MR RICHARDSON: We started off with the current tonnage of 80,000 tonnes and obviously spoke to them not only in their guise as a waste incinerator operator but as an operator of recycling facilities. So the figure which we spoke to them about was 80,000, but with the opportunity of saying recyclables. We haven't as yet gone into detail with them as to the exact split between how much recyclable and how much waste for disposal, but certainly the indications we have received from them is that that plant is very unlikely to have the capacity to take our waste.

SENATOR OZOUF: Maybe I could go actually and add to this and just give you some of the background of some of the sort of assessment that we are going through at the moment because I think it is important and it would be helpful to you to understand how we are examining this French export issue set against the other alternatives. Where we are now at, and of course this is an evolving issue, is we have done a consultation and we are developing our strategy. What I

have now agreed with the Department is that we are going to be effectively setting out three options for dealing with Jersey's waste: a Jersey only solution in Jersey; a Jersey/Guernsey in Jersey (and we can talk about that one perhaps a bit over the course of the afternoon); and an export issue to probably an energy from waste plant in France. We are actually looking at this. We are comparing and contrasting the unit costs of the gate fee of those three options and also making an assessment of the different risks and sustainability and environmental arguments of those three issues.

That French issue, I have to say, looking at the figures of approximately -- and they did quote us and this is an open hearing and I will say to you what we have been quoted because I think it is important for you to understand that -- the gate fee that we have been quoted is approximately €0 to €5 and we have put an estimate of approximately €2. There is tax on top of that of either 20.6% or 19.6% and at current prices in sterling that would indicate a gate fee of approximately £73.50 a tonne.

Now, I have to say to you that that does look a cheaper option compared to the Jersey only solution, but it looks rather uncompetitive compared to the Jersey/Guernsey option and so, whilst it is something we will keep under review, the option, the French option, and certainly we will meet with them when they are coming over to see you, we will meet them and we will discuss further what opportunities we have potentially with them, at the moment, based on the figures we have got, it doesn't look as though it is going to be as economically advantageous as the Jersey/Guernsey solution.

MR RICHARDSON: Sorry, can I just add for the record, just to be clear, the figure that the President has just quoted to you is the gate fee at the point of delivery. It does not include materials handling costs in Jersey, shipping costs, landing fees and transfer to the plant fees in France.

SENATOR OZOUF: That is absolutely right, so we are looking at a figure frankly for this, if it is a gate fee of approximately €2, at something which is coming out pretty well at the same cost as the Jersey only solution and so, given the option of the three, the Jersey/Guernsey one is the front runner in terms of economics at the moment, and that is where we are. These figures may

change, they may evolve, but that is where we are at the moment.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Continuation from Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. I wonder if you could tell me how you arrived at the transportation costs?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, we haven't finished that yet.

SENATOR VIBERT: I thought you had.

SENATOR OZOUF: We are ... obviously the most important significant figure in the assessment of option A, B and C, the biggest component is the gate fee, and that is the one we have just been talking about. We have done some preliminary work on the freight figures, and certainly the joint study which we are now doing with Guernsey about the Jersey/Guernsey option is also going to give some more light on freight costs. We can only do an estimate of that at the moment, but certainly the figures that we have at the moment are that the shipping figures look in the region of ... this is an estimate at the moment, but it is in the region of approximately £24 a tonne. That would be an estimate of the shipping charge, plus crantage, plus VAT and then a haulage figure to the actual ... it is not very far, as you will have seen, from the port to the energy from waste plant. Of course, on top of that, we have got the necessity to build a transfer station here in Jersey. We have estimated those costs to be approximately £16 per tonne, but these are very preliminary figures. They are very much early estimates of which we will be working on the detail in the coming weeks.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I put it to you that in fact it is almost impossible to do the transportation costs, bearing in mind that at the moment there is no transport links that you could use and they would have to be developed?

SENATOR OZOUF: Not at all. In a previous life, I have an experience in shipping, and indeed I worked for one of the largest shipping companies in the world. I am very familiar with shipping issues. In fact, Panel Members may remember, that in fact I chartered three boats to bring fertiliser and hay in a previous life to Jersey, so I am well aware of the costs of transferring and shipping. So I know the right questions to ask of our officers and I am confident that they have now put in train the necessary lines of enquiry in order to get accurate shipping costs.

Certainly I know that Department officials are following up a number of options in terms of shipping costs. That is ro-ro, ro-ro lift on lift off, bulk container, coaster and all the rest of it. Certainly from my own experience of shipping costs, these are very much in the ball park.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I move on to the Guernsey option? Can you tell us what that is?

SENATOR OZOUF: I am happy to tell you what that is. I have had a number of bilateral discussions with my number in Guernsey, with the Deputy Chief Minister, Deputy Fouquet, and we have discussed common issues on a couple of occasions and certainly we have shared experiences of dealing with each one of our waste issues and we took a suggestion to look into a joint Channel Islands' solution to the Joint Meeting of the Group of Presidents and the Council of Ministers of Guernsey that was held just a few days ago and we have agreed to jointly fund a project, each putting in £25,000, to actually work up an option for a Channel Islands' waste solution. That makes sense because clearly there is almost a sort of a minimum size of energy from waste plant or indeed alternative technologies if you believe that they exist. But, in any one of these technologies, but particularly energy from waste, there is a kind of minimum size, where there is a real almost if it is between 80,000 and 100,000 tonnes, you are dealing with a very similar kind of capital cost and so for a small island it makes sense to see whether or not that capital cost could be amortised over a greater tonnage. So it makes absolute sense to look to see on this occasion whether or not Jersey and Guernsey can't actually do a joint project. I am not making any promises about whether or not that is likely to yield a successful result, but certainly from the preliminary figures that we have looked into, it looks as though it is an option we should investigate further, and Guernsey's Council of Ministers have agreed, the Group of Presidents have agreed, my own Committee is agreed, and so we are going to do some work on it and report by the end of the year on that option.

SENATOR VIBERT: So what you are saying is that there will either be a plant of some sort either in Jersey or in Guernsey?

SENATOR OZOUF: Yes, and I have said up front, because I think it is important that we don't raise expectations that can't be met, I could not, I can't personally see the sense in transporting the greater amount of waste from one place to another, so that is why I have almost volunteered

the issue that I don't think it stacks up unless it is in Jersey because why would you move the greater amount of waste?

SENATOR VIBERT: So in fact we are talking about a bigger incinerator in Bellozanne to do the two islands? That is the option?

SENATOR OZOUF: No, that is not right. No, that is not right. First of all, we have not said it is an incinerator, because of course I would ----

SENATOR VIBERT: A waste plant.

SENATOR OZOUF: I would refer you to the comments that we have made previously, that we haven't closed our minds to other technologies -- and maybe we will come on to talk about that - - but, yes, it would be one plant. It would be one plant. It would be, I think, in Jersey, but I don't think it would be in Bellozanne.

SENATOR VIBERT: Hmm hmm.

SENATOR OZOUF: I think it would be ... it would be ... it is obvious to me that it would need to be near a harbour in order that there could be an absence of transporting Guernsey's waste across Jersey roads. I think that would be unacceptable. But there are serious challenges there, because clearly we are suggesting and have been thinking all the way along that the best site for the energy from waste plant is in Bellozanne because of the existing facility there. There are certainly additional costs which we would face in choosing a location that wasn't Bellozanne, but I think it is important for us to look at that in the context of our joint study and we will be doing so.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could you give us an indication of where you would be likely to put it if it wasn't Bellozanne?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, I mean, I can't forecast what the review is going to look at and we are going to have to do a lot more work on that, but certainly the very early indications are that it would be somewhere in the vicinity of the harbour. I received a number of correspondence in the last few days that have suggested that we should be looking at Ronez in the Parish of St John, but clearly we would need to look at a number of locations, but the front runner, if there was going to be a joint plant, certainly looks though it is somewhere in the vicinity of La Collette, but

where we are going to have to do a lot more work.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: The indication from the answer is that you took quantities of 80,000 tonnes. Bearing in mind that the French incinerator doesn't actually burn everything, to what extent would you be able to reduce that amount substantially by advanced recycling?

SENATOR OZOUF: I am sorry, but I don't necessarily understand what that comment is about "*doesn't actually burn everything*".

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: They don't take unsorted rubbish.

SENATOR OZOUF: No, I see. They don't take unsorted rubbish. That is certainly the law. Certainly there is a law. We learned and indeed we were just reminded when we went on Friday (because we were unaware of the French legislation that requires a certain level of separation of all municipal waste) that there is certainly the theory that the Le Havre incinerator doesn't take unsorted waste, but let us be clear about what one is talking about as far as unsorted waste. We learned ... John you can jump in if you want.

MR RICHARDSON: Thank you, yes. Certainly from when we visited Le Havre, to be fair to the site, they had had a major breakdown only the week before, so the bunker was looking in a very poor condition because they had ... in fact it was full right up to the level where the crane operator sits, so if you have been there you know how much material was there. If you look at the volume of the material and the nature of the material in that bunker and that they have got separation at source in their localities and you look at the nature of the waste in that bunker, it was not different to the nature of the waste in the Bellozanne bunker, which is unsorted. So I think to say they don't take unsorted waste, when you then look at the constituency and the nature of that waste would need some very careful clarification. I wouldn't like anyone to believe that the nature of the waste going into that bunker was materially different to the nature of the waste going into our bunker, when there are clearly two different operations: one in France where they have a degree of separation at source and in Jersey where we don't. I think it must be very clear that the nature of the material in that bunker, the calorific value and constituency looked to us almost identical to what we get in our bunker.

SENATOR OZOUF: But the other site which we went to, which was very interesting, is that we went to the landfill site outside Cherbourg. I forget where it was -- Montebourg -- and that was very interesting because we learned from that operator there how the local authorities and villages around there have been engaging in separation and kerbside collection and separation and certainly (and I don't know how you got on with the head of the Constables Committee who was here this morning) but certainly one thing that has come loud and clear from the consultation exercise that we have carried out is that I need to go back to the Constables and I need to convince them that we need to do some form of kerbside separation, and I am determined to achieve that. I know that when the original proposal, when the original Carl Brow Report on the collection system was published, I think, although I wasn't here myself, it got a fairly rough ride at the Constables, and I understand that there are some issues there that we need to certainly understand that there are some insensitivities there and we will be working hard to find a solution to get the Constables on board with some sort of co-ordinated separation system. I think we can do very well from learning from villages around Normandy that are going through the same experience.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Can you answer my question? I said to what extent could you actually reduce the 80,000 tonnes by advanced recycling techniques, which from our discussions with the French is the way are looking at this?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, we know, of course, that you can in theory recycle ... I don't know what the figures are. I think there was a report in Denmark which said you can recycle 85% of rubbish in theory, of domestic putrescible waste. You can recycle and separate lots of things out. The key question which we have rehearsed and we keep on rehearsing and we keep on talking amongst ourselves about is what do we do with those elements of recyclables. What can we do with them? It is all very well separating out these issues, but what do you do with them? Is there a market for them? Certainly, yes, we do think there are some elements that you can separate out. Paper is one thing that we are keeping under active review, but there is a point up that chain where you start questioning, where you seriously start questioning, whether or not you should be engaging in separating at that level. My experience in France has taught me more

about exactly where that level might be. Your fundamental question is how much can we reduce the input into a plant from 80,000 tonnes at today's tonnages, and I am saying to you that there is some erosion that we can do into that figure, but we are going to have to do and we are doing more work on the elements that make sense to recycle.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: So you do actually accept that an "*erosion*", as you put it, into those tonnages could actually be met?

SENATOR OZOUF: Yes, but I think ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: If that is the case, could I ask you then why was it not within the Draft Strategy document which we are being told now is only a draft and not a final strategy? Why is it then that there isn't a higher priority for kerbside collection services, which, for example, just for putrescible collections, would actually bring about a huge reduction in the amount of materials which don't burn particularly well in any incinerator or any other treatments?

SENATOR OZOUF: Okay. I think the first thing to say is that I am sorry if we haven't made this clear to you in the past, and perhaps I assumed that you had already taken on board that this was the case, but that green document, that document of which there is a thicker version, is a draft solid waste strategy. It is not our strategy. It is a document that is the first consultation draft of an emerging issue, and I understand that this may be a difficulty for you, but you can't take it as though those are our final conclusions because they are absolutely not. We have been speaking ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: I am not saying that. All I am saying is ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Let the witness finish, please.

SENATOR OZOUF: We have been working hard on putting out a strategy and listening to consultees and stakeholders and, goodness me, have I been impressed and delighted with the response on the consultation. The strategy that we will come out with in the early part of next year and the report and proposition to the States, will it look different from that strategy? Absolutely it will because if it wouldn't look different, then clearly why have bothered to have consulted? Certainly I have been impressed and delighted with the response from the consultation exercise of how keen people are to do more in the area of recycling and I fully

intend to make recycling an even greater part of the strategy as result of the consultation and I am really pleased about that.

SENATOR VIBERT: Can I?

DEPUTY RONDEL: A continuation?

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Carry on.

SENATOR VIBERT: This leads us into some timescales, doesn't it, because we have a draft document, which is out for public consultation, we have Guernsey options, we have French options, there are alternative technology options which we need to be pursuing, so how could it possibly be that this could all be put together by February?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, that is a very good question and it is a very difficult question, but I must be clear to you, and I think it is only right that I am clear to the general public, that I believe that the most important date for us to work on is the closure of the Bellozanne plant at some point in 2008. If we are serious about shutting down Bellozanne in 2008 and if the option that we go for is an on-Island plant, which I have to say I still think is going to be the front runner, either whether it is the Jersey only or the Jersey/Guernsey, nothing that I have learned in the last few weeks has given me any serious confidence that we are going to find a solution to the export issues, but we will just set that one aside, if it is a Jersey solution, then there is a two year, at least a two year, build period from the period of time when we start building it to when you actually have the plant operating. There is a lead-in time of at least six to nine months in getting the necessary tenders, planning permissions, environmental impact assessment, finance and all the rest of it and that means that the decision about what you do is taken at some point in the early part of next year. February is too late for me.

SENATOR VIBERT: But is it possible?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well it means that we are just going to have to work very hard; and that is what we are doing, we are working very hard and we are working extraordinarily hard in making sure that all the options are set out for people to make their decision. I am determined and I am going to shout from the rooftops of the fact that the timetable must be adhered to. What

I think is important for the Panel to understand, as I am sure you do understand and appreciate, is that there has already been a great deal of work done on this and there is already a great deal of preparation work for the option that does include a Jersey only plant, and that means that I am able, as President of the Committee who took over in March and recently reappointed, I am able to hit the ground running in terms of dealing with this issue. I have to say I am extraordinarily critical of previous Committees in actually having ducked this issue and not made a decision. I am not going to stand by and see the States dither and dally and allow a situation where the Bellozanne plant continues to operate. It is an environmental disgrace and I want it shut down.

SENATOR VIBERT: Even if it costs us 85 million, which will be much more than perhaps alternatives will cost?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, I have no evidence whatsoever. I have no evidence whatsoever that that is the case. There is a cost that the Island must bear to deal with its waste whether or not that involves doing a deal with Guernsey, doing a deal only in Jersey or exporting it. There is a cost and we have got to square up to that cost and we have got to meet that environmental challenge because it is not right that Bellozanne continues to operate. There is environmental damage being carried out. It is an embarrassment to Jersey that that plant is still operating. It should have been shut down earlier than 2008, but we are where we are and there have been delays and prevarication from successive Public Services Committees of no fault of the officers at all. There has been political prevarication and delaying and I want to put an end to that delay.

DEPUTY RONDEL: On the 2008 deadline, which is one of the items we can move on quite nicely on to, because of the alternative energies and because there is still a measure of life in one of the streams, the most recent which came into being, I think, in 1991, would you tell us, please, how much capacity that one stream can cope with?

SENATOR OZOUF: Okay. I am going to hand over to John on the details of the third stream because he is in a better position than anybody to answer the detailed questions on that. I have been briefed on the whole issue of the third stream and I think it is extremely important for us to understand from the very outside that it is not a separate plant, it is a plant which is inextricably linked with the operation of the rest of the plant and, therefore, the issues to do with the chimney,

the issues to do with the crane and the bunker cannot be separated out. But John will deal in detail with these issues. What I do know from a political point of view is that the Committee of which I think either one of you or both of you were a member of and maybe even three of you did ask for a complete assessment done by the engineers to Public Services as to the opportunity of extending the life of the third stream, and this issue has been dealt with comprehensively on a number of occasions. I am happy to get John to answer your questions in relation to its viability about whether or not we can use that third stream any longer than 2008. I would start by saying that the short answer is no, but he will explain why.

MR RICHARDSON: Right, thank you. I think in our previous discussion we started going through the plant. I am quite happy to carry on that discussion.

DEPUTY RONDEL: We can continue from where you left off, if you would.

MR RICHARDSON: Right, the third stream, but there are a number of issues we will go back to. If we just look at the third stream, it was built with the theoretical capacity of seven and a half tonnes per hour. Its actual capacity is currently about six and it runs at about six tonnes an hour and then outages for maintenance. Its annual throughput varies from about 38 to about 40/42,000 tonnes a year. I am looking for the figures, but, over the last few years, that is what it has been running at, 38 to 42,000 tonnes a year throughput. It is very unlikely to increase and, if anything, if you push it any harder, it will decrease very rapidly. It has had quite a few significant problems throughout its life, in that when it was being run in the early days at a higher rate, we had significant problems with the grate, which is the bed that all the refuse is burnt on, to the point where that had to be completely replaced with a different technology, different type of grate after about five years. So realistically it is not going to produce more than about six tonnes an hour, even if you continue with it running.

The plant itself, the third stream on its own, is probably, in comparing it to the other two, which are the older ones, the other two are far more reliable, apart from the corrosion and tube leakage. In terms of operating ability and capacity, this plant has never been a particularly easy one to run, but it was the cheapest one that was tendered.

In looking at the longer term and trying to keep it running, by the time we get to 2008 it

will be over half way through its life, well over half way through, so we have got to then look at the consequences of running that stream on its own at about 38 to 40,000 tonnes a year and what happens to the rest of the material? Can that be disposed of in an alternative way? So that is the capacity of the plant. You have no other standby available to you. So if you can reduce your current 80,000 tonnes to 40,000 tonnes, and I think as the President has said (and we can discuss it in detail if you wish) and certainly one of your experts has already alluded to theoretical and realistic and achievable recycling targets, 40,000 tonnes is probably unrealistic to get down to. So we would be left on the Island with in excess of 40,000 tonnes. The existing plant, the third stream on its own, would not cope with that. So you would then need to consider the logistics of how you would put something else in to supplement it. How do you do it? I will go on to that. But, before I do, I just want to continue with the existing infrastructure.

The plant on its own, with proper maintenance and adequate funding, would probably continue to run for the remainder of its life. It wasn't fitted with secondary burners. Therefore, if we were to try and keep that plant running and ensure that it conformed to the EU emission limits that are the current and 2005 limits, it would need a considerable retrofit of flue gas cleaning, which is about £10 million. It would need a secondary burner fitted to it ensure we maintained temperature at all stages during the light up/shut down and any fluctuations during the loading and it would just about conform to limits. It is a mark II design. We are on about mark V now. The one you saw would be a very modern plant. The existing, the original one and two streams were mark I designs. This is a mark II and we are up to about mark IV or V. So it would conform to limits with the gas cleaning kit fitted to it, but it would have difficulty probably if the limits came down even further in the future during its life. The remaining infrastructure which we started with, I have already mentioned to you the bunker wall and the bunker is in a very bad state.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Yes, you covered that on a previous occasion.

MR RICHARDSON: We covered that. The cranes, I am not sure how much I covered with the cranes, but the cranes would need to be replaced completely and you have got to then look at the logistics of how you do it while you are trying to keep the plant running. The other major

defect in the plant is the chimney. The chimney would have to be replaced by 2008. So there are very significant capital investments required: gas cleaning, chimney, cranes and bunker. You would need to consider how you would keep that plant running during the period of outage whilst you refurbished it. You would also then have to start looking at what would you do to balance your capacity and provide you with some backup, because I certainly would never recommend to my Committee that we should run with a single stream running at maximum capacity when you have no backup, no landfill as an emergency and no alternative and it is very difficult to get an alternative quickly and at very high cost.

So the question is how do you go about either keeping No. 3 running, retrofitting it and then removing Nos 1 and 2, or do you build No. 4 alongside and then when that is commissioned take out Nos 1 and 2. That is highly impractical because you are then encroaching into Bellozanne Road and you run out of space. So the only practical way of doing it would be to run No. 3, refurb No. 3, in which case the Island is relying on 1 and 2 during that refurb and the chances are you wouldn't get through that period of time because they are the old ones. Assuming you took that decision, you would refurbish No. 3 with gas cleaning, with new chimney and you then have to find a way of doing the bunker and the crane and I think you would be looking at months' outage in order to do the bunker certainly and certainly weeks' outage to replace the cranes. All of this time you would be building up. You would have a backlog which you would have to find a way of dealing with. It is an interim construction period.

Once you had No. 3 rebuilt and running again, you would then take 1 and 2 out of service, decommission them, demolish them and then you would have to build something else in their place. What you would then end up with is No. 3 running and a new plant of some description sitting alongside it to cope with the excess and as your backup. You would end up with an extremely difficult plant to operate, and certainly our experience of trying to run Nos. 1 and 2 and No. 3 alongside as a combined facility has been a very difficult experience, manageable but difficult. You would then be faced with the extremely difficult decision that you would have a new line running or available to you with a 20 year life, 20 plus year life, and half

way through that life the existing No. 3 would be at the end of its life and you would then have to go through the whole cycle again, decommission it, demolish it, reconstruct something else. So all the time you would be doing this, swapping over.

In the long term of the Island, for 20 year lifecycle costing and analysis, I haven't done the figures, but I would suggest to you that (1) the risks are extremely high doing it for the Island to have a sustainable disposal route, (2) the costs would be extremely high, and (3) the availability of plant in order to deal with the Island's waste would be very limited. I suspect, although I have no figures to support it, that it would probably end up costing the Island more than a new plant. That was certainly the indication from the consultants when we looked at refurb versus new, and that was stated at the last meeting by our consultant.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: Of your 80,000 tonnes that we are talking about, how much or what percentage of that would be putrescible waste, household waste?

MR RICHARDSON: Right. I will pick up on your Professor Coggins, who, when he gave a lecture at the Société Jersiaise room a few weeks ago, the figures that I believe he gave us was something in the order of recyclable elements of household waste, theoretical recyclable elements, household is 60%. Realistic as maximum achievable was forties.

SENATOR VIBERT: I was actually meaning your percentages.

MR RICHARDSON: I was coming to that. Yes, I am coming to that. The problem Jersey has is that the collection service in Jersey is a mixed collection service of household and commercial. So we do not have a direct figure to say "That is the tonnage of household and that is the tonnage of commercial." We have three waste streams coming into Bellozanne: household, commercial and construction/demolition. Household and commercial are mixed in the refuse truck. We also get commercial coming in through their own deliveries and we get commercial/demolition -- construction/demolition, sorry. If you take the deliveries to Bellozanne in the parish refuse carts, which is the mixed commercial and household, that is approximately 50% of the 80,000 tonnes, about 40,000 tonnes. It fluctuates a bit, but it is in that order. If you try to analyse then the exact nature of how much is pure household, how much is

commercial and how much is a mix of commercial and household when you look at the catering industry, hotels etc, which would be classified as commercial, but the nature of the material would be very similar to household, food waste etc, it is difficult. Our estimate is about 70/30 -- 70% household and 30% commercial -- but I cannot say it is more than an estimate.

SENATOR VIBERT: So your estimate of 80,000 tonnes would be, what, between 40% and 50%? Would you go lower than 40% putrescible?

MR RICHARDSON: Sorry, I am not commenting on putrescible here, I am trying to classify between household and commercial.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes, I know. I am trying to categorise ... can you not categorise it as an estimate as to how much is putrescible and how much isn't?

MR RICHARDSON: I haven't got the figure in front of me, but I will see if one of my colleagues has got it for you.

SENATOR VIBERT: Even if it is an estimate.

SENATOR OZOUF: Just whilst that figure is being found, perhaps it is worth saying here ... I mean, I am not sure where this line of questioning is going. If the issue here is ... I have already explained to you the tight timeframe that we have got to work with. What I am worried about is I am worried that we could be going off on wild goose chases. We could be going off on wild goose chases of refurbishment. I accept the official advice that I have had about the refurbishment option. I don't think that is a viable solution and I don't think we should be spending time or money looking into that. I understand that there is a line of argument which says you could be reducing down your 80,000 tonnes, and there is a debate to be had about that and there is a trade-off here: how much money do you want to put into recycling, are we going to get the constables on board to do a co-ordinated, massively important separation, should we set up a sorting line to separate everything out and have, you know, 30 people on a line to separate lots of waste? Okay, there is a debate to be had on that, but what do you get down to? You get down to still the fact that you have got a residual amount of waste, which I would suggest at the very least is going to be at the size that Guernsey has, at the very least I think. I mean, I think that is at the bottom end of the scale. We accept that you can recycle. We know that. We know

that we are going to be investigating different options for investigating options for recycling various different commodities out, but the point is that you still have to ... you can't duck the issue that you have got to find a solution for that residual and I am looking at a plant to deal with that residual and what I need ... the bad news is that the marginal cost, whether or not we are dealing with a plant at 65,000 tonnes or 90,000 tonnes, the cost of the plant isn't that much different. It is not directly proportionate when you get at that level. And so I am concerned and, yes, we are going to vigorously pursue over the next few weeks and indeed the coming months and indeed years to find ways of where it is possible to separate some form of waste and, where there is a market for it, we will do that. But it doesn't duck the issue that you need a plant and that you need a plant for a certain critical size.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, we accept that that is your view. We understand that that is your view. We have questions to ask.

SENATOR OZOUF: Great, but I just think it is important that we explain what the background of our thinking is.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, I think you have explained it to ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could you please do it through the Chair. This is all being taped and I think it is important that we don't have interjections from one another.

SENATOR OZOUF: Sorry, Chairman.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Through the Chair and let the witness finish before you come in with any supplementaries, please?

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, I was just going to ask if we could have the putrescible answer.

SENATOR OZOUF: Right.

MR RICHARDSON: Yes, we have the putrescible answer. I knew we had the figure. It is in the report that you have received, the draft Waste Strategy Report. The figure that has been given in there, the total putrescibles is 38.6%. Now, that is taken from UK data and statistics, which is the composition estimated by the EA Analysis 1999 Hounslow.

SENATOR VIBERT: And would you accept the fact that, in the event of breakdowns and everything, it is the putrescibles that basically cause the problems because that is rotting and it is

festering, whereas paper and tyres, they are not causing a day to day problem?

MR RICHARDSON: The very simple answer to that is an absolute emphatic no.

SENATOR VIBERT: No?

MR RICHARDSON: Absolutely not. The condition of our Bellozanne site is not one that I would be proud of. It is one that I think our staff do an absolutely tremendous job in running and managing. They have to handle the material up to nine times, and that is the materials such as tyres, mattresses, carpets and non-putrescible. It is an exceptionally difficult site to run. It is an extremely good example of if you don't get your waste management plant sized correctly you will have serious problems. It is a health risk, it is a health and safety risk and it is a fire risk to this Island. It is important ----

SENATOR VIBERT: But isn't it mainly because of the putrescibles?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please let the witness answer the question, Senator.

MR RICHARDSON: There are no putrescibles in that material, Sir, no putrescibles in that material which is stockpiled. It is a disgrace. It should not be there. The Island should not have a facility where you have a 3,000 to 5,000 tonne backlog of shredded tyres and mattresses which are in a dreadful condition when they arrive. It has timber and plastics all contaminated material. It is not putrescibles.

SENATOR OZOUF: And actually I would like to take this opportunity of saying what a great job I think our staff do do in Public Services in working in a very difficult plant, because that is the point. The line of questioning which is asking us to actually look about refurbishing and putting plasters and Band Aids on the existing plant, I am not prepared, as President of this Committee, to countenance a continuation of a plant which is inefficient and ineffective for our staff to be working on. I would love our staff at Public Services to be working in the kind of facilities that I saw at Le Havre, which is a well functioning, efficient plant. Our staff do a great job in extraordinarily difficult circumstances and, frankly, the quicker I can put an end to their difficult circumstances in trying to keep the plant running past 2008, it is not only a health and safety aspect issue, but it is just about being a good employer and I don't think we should be asking our staff at Public Services to be continuing to operate that plant at Bellozanne any longer

than 2008, and that is something else that I care about.

SENATOR VIBERT: Can I continue my ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR VIBERT: Can I continue the line of questioning?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: So basically are you continuing to say that there must be one solution for our waste situation, there must be one plant that is going to solve the whole of the situation?

SENATOR OZOUF: I don't say that there is one solution. The plant and the dealing with the residual waste is an important aspect. It is almost the bottom most important decision, but does that mean (and I think there is a misnomer) that because we are really concerned about putting in place a facility to deal with that residual amount of waste, somehow we have forgotten everything else? Absolutely not. We will be working vigorously to pursue all reasonable recycling and other reuse opportunities.

SENATOR VIBERT: As from which date?

SENATOR OZOUF: As from past, present and future and we will be using ... and I am not going to use the opportunity of sitting before the Panel to reveal and to give media an opportunity of revealing an issue, but you will be seeing in the next few days just how serious we are about recycling, and I will demonstrating to the public that we are serious and we are going to do something about it. We have already done some good work, but there is a lot more work to be done, but it doesn't change the issue and you can't duck the issue of the need to find a solution for the residual amount of waste and to shut down Bellozanne.

SENATOR VIBERT: Can I now continue? As far as putrescibles are concerned, it is possible, is it not, or have you not looked into this, to actually solve that problem through in-vessel composting?

SENATOR OZOUF: Part of our proposals are absolutely to deal with composting. Indeed, one of the things in the draft proposal ----

SENATOR VIBERT: This is green waste you are talking about?

SENATOR OZOUF: Absolutely, now ----

SENATOR VIBERT: We are talking putrescibles.

SENATOR OZOUF: You talk about dealing with putrescible waste and I am sure my Chief Officer is going to come out with a stark reminder of exactly what we are talking about when dealing with composting. Yes, we have looked at this issue and the answer is no, we don't think it is an option. I think John can explain in a visual format exactly why not.

SENATOR VIBERT: Good.

MR RICHARDSON: Thank you. I think you need to look at not only composting for putrescible waste, but you need to look at all the other options for dealing with putrescible waste. Composting is one. Certainly dealing with putrescible waste in compost requires far more stringent control conditions, which are all achievable with modern in-vessel systems, there is no argument about that. You then need to look at the nature of your incoming material and the export and disposal routes for that material. If you look at the nature of the incoming material, if you receive that material in a separated condition, what guarantees do you have about its level of contaminants, its cleanliness and any foreign objects in it.

SENATOR VIBERT: Hmm hmm.

MR RICHARDSON: Because unless you can get that element at the front end right, the back end, the digestate or the product that comes out is effectively for our local situation a non-useable product. It is useable in the UK or in France or anywhere else where they run landfill sites because it is classified as landfill top cover, which does not attract landfill taxes, but it is used as part of the process. If you lose your quality control on your in-vessel composting operation you will end up with a product such as **that**, and I will pass it round to Members. I would urge you to look at that photograph and go to La Collette or recollect when you were at La Collette with us looking at our compost and compare the two. What you will find is that that product -- and it is not only this plant, but I have also visited one in France near St Brioux, which took putrescible waste, composted it in an in-vessel rotating compost system and then moved it out through the normal process for disposal -- is a heavily contaminated material. Now, if you end up, if Jersey ends up, with a contaminated compost of that nature or less (and that is full of plastics, for Members to see) you would lose immediately the viable export route or the viable

reuse route that we have for our compost which we are selling successfully into garden centres, domestic markets, landscape architects etc.

So there is a very serious question to ask here. If we divert putrescible separated at source into composting, the quality control at point of entry will have to be extremely high because if you don't get that right you will lose the back end market for it. So it can be done -- there is no arguing about that -- but for Jersey you would need to assess very carefully the risk, you would need to assess the method of quality control you will put in at the front end and how you would do it. In reality, although I am aware of one Italian plant, but I have never seen it, you would end up with manual sorting. Now, if we are going to ask manual staff to physically sort food waste, which has been collected from source to ensure that all plastic contaminates are moved out, then that is probably the solution you would have to employ.

SENATOR VIBERT: That is very interesting information because in fact I was at a plant only a week ago and I am afraid that much of what you have said is absolute nonsense.

MR RICHARDSON: Sorry?

SENATOR VIBERT: Have you visited the plant at Cambridge? Are you aware that it is the first licensed plant in the United Kingdom to turn putrescibles into a rough form of compost that can be used by the farmers on the land?

MR RICHARDSON: Right, I am not using that plant in Cambridge as an example of that plant's performance, so please do not say that I am castigating that plant, I am not. I am using that as an example of the quality control issues you have to put in place. If the quality control issues are appropriate, then it will work. You have just mentioned rough form of compost that is going to fields.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes.

MR RICHARDSON: We obviously would like to see that material before we can assess the condition of it and as to whether it is acceptable for agricultural land only, whether it is acceptable for agricultural land and domestic use. So that is all I am saying, but please do not take it that I am castigating that plant, I am not.

SENATOR VIBERT: So in fact were you aware of that plant in Cambridge?

MR RICHARDSON: I am aware of many plants in the UK that ----

SENATOR VIBERT: No, are you aware that this is the first plant licensed by the Department of the Environment under new regulations of animal health to be able to produce useable compost for farm land from putrescible waste?

MR RICHARDSON: That particular plant, no, but I am aware of many plants in the United Kingdom ----

SENATOR VIBERT: This is the only one licensed by the Department of the Environment to do that.

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, may I ----

SENATOR VIBERT: And all I am asking you is are you aware of it?

MR RICHARDSON: Of that particular plant, no, but I would question to you whether that information about the only plant in the United Kingdom is accurate.

SENATOR VIBERT: The only licensed plant by DEFRA is what it is.

MR RICHARDSON: We will investigate that.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can we move on?

SENATOR OZOUF: We will investigate, but let me just say that, again, we can easily go off on numerous goose chases about finding ways of reducing to some extent the issue of the amount of waste that you will have, the residual waste. I am afraid that nothing moves me yet. If there is evidence that somebody can come forward with that there is a way of reducing all of the residual waste so that we don't have to have some sort of plant in Jersey, I have no evidence that that is the case. We are aware, of course we are aware, and one of the lines of questioning you are going to do later on this afternoon is talk about alternative technologies. We are absolutely aware that there is a viable and active market in waste management. There is an active market in alternative technologies which will develop. I am quite sure in 10 years time the way that incinerators looked 20 years ago is different in 2004, we will see an evolution and the plant that we will procure next year will be out of date in 10 or 15 years time as new technology raises. This is the real issue: when do we decide we have got enough information to make a decision to deal with Jersey's residual waste? We can carry on being diverted on alternatives,

but we can duck the decision, put the decision off in Jersey and let that plant go on. Frankly, it is a decision that should be made for 2008.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Well, we have covered this ground. Could we move on?

SENATOR OZOUF: But it is important. It is important that, whilst we do accept and I accept that there are alternatives that may well be emerging -- Professor Coggins and Professor Swithinbank explained at the last hearing that there are other alternative technologies -- they are going to emerge and they will exist. They will exist in greater confidence in the next few years, but the decision in Jersey has to be made around the decision about the closure of Bellozanne. I don't care whether or not I go blue in the face with the amount of times I need to repeat it, but I need to carry on repeating it. There is a time limit in which we make a decision, and I fully intend to repeat it very often because it is important.

SENATOR VIBERT: Before we leave this subject, because it is important that I make this point, the point that you made, Mr Richardson, about rough compost, in fact it has two streams. It has its green waste, which deals with all garden waste etc, which is producing compost of the same quality that we produce here approved by the Soil Association, and it has another form of compost, which is the putrescibles turn into a rougher form of compost, which is used on farmland and they pick it up in bulk and take it away.

SENATOR OZOUF: Right. We will look into it.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: I would like, if I may, to go back on to the third stream because a lot of what the Chief Officer told the Panel was actually predicated on a refurbishment option of the existing equivalent which is actually running satisfactorily for most of the time. This year, if it is some 12 years old, the design life was of the order of 20 years, so that, according to my reckoning, gives us at least eight years of life left within that plant. As far as I am aware, and I would be grateful if our guests could actually indicate if any work has been done in this particular area, what work has been done to actually look at the continuation of running the third stream but in using not the unsorted MSW as a fuel stock as at present, which has inherent defects in terms of the operating temperatures and the burnability in terms of pollutants, notably

plastics, which don't get treated properly? What efforts have been made to actually look into the possibility, as I say, of running the plant to the end of its design life, but perhaps in giving it a little bit of assistance in reducing the fuel input to allow it to burn things which would not be as polluting as the existing feedstock?

MR RICHARDSON: Can I seek some clarification because I don't understand part of your question.

SENATOR OZOUF: Nor do I.

MR RICHARDSON: You mention temperature. Could you clarify your concerns about temperature?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: A lot of the concerns have been given, certainly from the information we have in our packs, that the requirement for the flue gas treatment would be in that the operating temperatures for burning plastics aren't high enough and a lot of the equipment to be bolted on in terms of refurbishment options would be actually to mitigate the effects, the polluting effects, of burning plastics at too low a temperature.

MR RICHARDSON: I am sorry, but I think you have misunderstood something, Deputy. Any incinerator plant, its combustion control system is set to burn at a temperature. Its furnace temperature is set to burn at ... in our plant, I think it is 850 degrees. There is not a problem with burning at 850 degrees in our plant, so I don't understand your temperature issue.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Well, okay, we will side step that issue and answer the question, if you could, please? I would like to know why, instead of actually putting forward a refurbishment option for an incinerator stream that is already running and running fairly successfully as part of the make up of two other alternative streams ----

SENATOR OZOUF: I am sorry, did you successfully?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: It is, yes.

SENATOR OZOUF: I am sorry, but it is not running successfully.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please let ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: I am sorry, but you told me, an item we have on evidence, that we have got 38,000 tonnes, between 38 and 40,000 tonnes, that are being combusted by stream three.

That, in my book, 38,000 tonnes out of 80,000 is successful.

MR RICHARDSON: Right. I am afraid you have seriously misunderstood what I have said. Would you like to multiply it -- I have not got a calculator here -- but if you multiply 7.5 times 24 times 365 ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes, you get around about 50,000 tonnes.

MR RICHARDSON: Well, if someone would do it for me, please? Whatever that figure comes out at will give you an indication of the amount of downtime that plant suffers from.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes, I understand that.

MR RICHARDSON: If you then look at the figures which we provided you with in terms of cost and refurbishment, although I accept that they are not detailed as to exactly where the expenditure goes on individual streams, what you will find is that No. 3 stream, which is the one that is running at the moment, has outages for grate bar replacement on a fairly frequent basis now because the water cool grate is wearing out so it has to be taken out of service for replacement. It has super heated tubes that are wearing out and need replacing, so it has to come out of service for probably eight to ten weeks at any one time for super heated tubes to be replaced. The economiser is the original economiser and it has not been replaced yet and it will probably have to come out of service for replacement. The furnace refractory is coming to the end of its life and will need replacing. The existing grate structure, as I said, we are replacing elements of it but in the next few years the whole grate will need replacing again. The ash discharger has been replaced once and it has probably got another two or three years life left in it before full replacement is required. I can go on. Effectively what I am saying to you very simply is do not consider that plant can run as it is without significant investment over the remaining eight years life. It is incorrect. Thank you. It is incorrect to say that that plant does not need refurbishment, it does. It will need significant investment. In addition to that, even if you take out some of the plastics and some of the other materials, the residual material that is burning, such as shredded mattresses, shredded tyres, shredded contaminated material, will still need flue gas cleaning put on it.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: This is my actual point. From when we went to France we have actually

seen that there are alternative ways of actually diverting some of the fuels. For example you mention tyres. It is not best practice to be burning tyres in an open grate incinerator. Indeed, some of the problems that were caused by the incinerator steams at Bellozanne were due to burning tyres. We saw them shredding tyres and actually using them for play surfaces or whatever, which is probably one of the preferred ways to go.

MR RICHARDSON: I need to challenge you, I am afraid. You have made a statement that says that burning tyres in the Bellozanne incinerator has caused problems. Could you clarify that, please?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: I said it has caused problems in the past and it is within the literature that the methods of dealing with the input of tyres had to change in order that they were shredded to a certain extent in order to achieve better combustion and a lot of the grate problems were actually caused by the imperfect burning of those tyres.

MR RICHARDSON: Could you point me to where it says that in the document, please?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: I can't put my finger on it, but I will come back to you with the page.

MR RICHARDSON: I am not aware of any of our documents saying that it is tyres that has caused the problem. The only problem that I am aware of that tyres have caused, which is why they are shredded -- and I have worked on that site since 1983 -- is that if you put tyres in whole, they tend to come off the feed table on to the grate. They can roll down the grate and then come out the other end just charred. I am not aware of any problems that plant has ever had with burning tyres and I would request confirmation.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can we come back to that for a future time because I would like to move on?

SENATOR OZOUF: Chairman, may I make a point? May I make a point? I think this is a good example whereby for the last two years Public Services, the previous Public Services Committee, have been diverted on, in my opinion, wild goose chases and we have been going down trying to find alternative ways of trying to put off the day where we need to make a decision to replace the Bellozanne plant. Frankly, whilst I don't mind my Chief Officer standing here, or sitting here, and answering questions about whether or not we could do this in theory or

whether we could do that, frankly I think that this is a further example of the fact that some people around the table, including Deputy Duhamel which is one, have frankly wanted to put off the day when we need to make a decision about Bellozanne. Bellozanne ---

SENATOR VIBERT: With respect, Sir ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please, I am stopping here. You are repeating what you said earlier. I am moving forward.

SENATOR OZOUF: Good.

DEPUTY RONDEL: I know Deputy Hill has a question to ask. Deputy Hill?

DEPUTY HILL: Yes. I just wanted to tidy up actually. We have looked at the French and we have looked at Jersey. Can I ask you about Guernsey?

SENATOR OZOUF: With pleasure.

DEPUTY HILL: Okay, because we all know that Guernsey doesn't want ours and we don't want theirs. That is what is said. I don't care where it goes, but how are we looking at Guernsey?

SENATOR OZOUF: Okay. Thanks for that question, it is a good question. I think the reason why it makes sense to look at the Jersey/Guernsey option is because, as we have already explained, there is almost a sort of a critical, almost a minimum size of plant that you would operate, and it has to be said that both Guernsey and Jersey are right at the bottom of the end of the sort of size of plant that you would operate. 65,000 tonnes you would push it on a single stream but the biggest stream you could get. For all the reasons that John has explained about backup and having down time and all the rest of it, it makes sense from a high level point of view to look at a slightly larger plant that is the minimum size of plant to bigger streams in order to.

The exciting option for Jersey and Guernsey is that spreading that minimum capital cost over the sum total of the two islands' waste that is why frankly, on paper at least, the initial view is that it could be millions of pounds of savings between the two islands, and anything that has the potential of saving millions of pounds, whether or not that is Jersey or Guernsey or both of us is worth looking into. I mean, that is the sort of starting point.

We are conveniently working also to a very similar timetable. I have got the problem about shutting down Bellozanne, but my colleague in Guernsey has got his problem, which is actually having no further landfill site. Actually both of us need to make a decision very soon, i.e., in the first couple of months of next year. If they don't make a decision one way or the other, they are going to end up by having no place to put their rubbish. So for a variety of reasons, for perhaps the first time in Channel Island history, we come to a point where we have a common problem where it is worth working on a joint solution.

DEPUTY HILL: Could I explore where it is going to be? It may make more sense to have the least amount being shipped to a big area, rather than the big area to the small. I can understand that. On the other hand, we are also looking at where it could go and we are talking about, you know, should we have it back at Bellozanne or somewhere up the coast? Knowing the situation in Guernsey, do you think it might be better placed possibly nearer to the docks or whatever?

SENATOR OZOUF: I think it is important to note where Guernsey made the decision if they build their Guernsey only plant. As I understand it, they have made the decision that the only place in Guernsey is at the Long Hougue site, which is a reclamation site. There doesn't appear to be anywhere else in Guernsey where an energy from waste plant could go. They are a small constrained island as we are. Certainly the disadvantage that they have got is that that reclaimed piece of land requires a huge amount of piling and underpinning -- it is not underpinning, what is it called?

MR RICHARDSON: Anchoring.

SENATOR OZOUF: Anchoring, because effectively it is a recently reclaimed piece of land.

In fact, I have been over and seen it.

DEPUTY HILL: It is too soon, in other words.

SENATOR OZOUF: Yes. So that cost is very heavy for them. Certainly if we were to be considering a plant on our recently reclaimed land we would be facing a similar kind of cost, although for both of us it would at least be a shared cost rather than a cost that they have to take. So for that reason the plant, if it was to be here, I mean, there are a number of locations, but one of the locations would be right up at the top of La Collette in the vicinity of the existing power

station.

DEPUTY HILL: If we could just get back to that, Guernsey looks to be a lesser option because of the logistics of where it would go.

SENATOR OZOUF: I think for two reasons. I think, first of all, it is the greater amount of waste that you shouldn't shift. It make sense from an environmental point of view. Secondly, I think it is important that we already run an energy from waste plant. We have got staff. We have got the experience. We have been through that learning curve. I think it certainly will be easier for us to switch our guys over from an existing plant to a new plant than having to start right from scratch.

Interestingly, one of the things I learned in France on Monday was don't build an energy from waste plant in two years and expect to have it up and running straightaway because certainly they have had ... so the thing that we have learned is that that plant opened in May and I offer no criticism to our French friends, they have built a really good plant, it is excellent and they have done a really good job, but let us not underestimate the start up problems that they have had. Energy from waste plants and any of the other alternative technologies that might be available are difficult technologies. It takes a while to get them up and running and certainly in a small island where you can't just, if your energy from waste plant is not working, go down the road and put it in a landfill, we haven't got that luxury here. We have got to have a plant that is absolutely well constructed and well able to deal with the waste from day one. One thing I don't want to do is I don't want to give my department an unrealistic timetable and an unrealistic challenge. I want that plant to be able to be operational with a sufficient ability to take the Island's waste from the date that we say it is. To put an unreasonable time frame on I think is actually going to be a dereliction of my duty in terms of efficient decision making.

DEPUTY HILL: Okay.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Baudains?

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: I do not have a follow up.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Sorry, okay. Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: We have unfortunately changed subject. Can I go back to the original

subject we were on about the existing incinerator? I just want some technical information and advice actually. If you were to take, regardless of whether it is possible to do it or not, if you were to take the plastics out and the tyres out, does that alter the amount of poisonous emissions that would be coming out of the incinerator? Does it make any difference?

MR RICHARDSON: It will certainly have an impact on acid gases definitely because plastic is a major contributor to acid gases, but the other constituents that go in will still have significant levels of contaminants that will need flue gas cleaning.

SENATOR VIBERT: It won't be as high as if you have plastics or tyres in?

MR RICHARDSON: No, it won't be as high because you are reducing the tonnage, but there are some equally nasty products which will still be in there which will need significant gas cleaning.

SENATOR VIBERT: That is it, thank you.

SENATOR OZOUF: The real political problem I have got is to put a plant that has got gas cleaning so that we don't carry on polluting the atmosphere to the extent we do.

SENATOR VIBERT: No, I understand.

SENATOR OZOUF: And I think the EU has got good reason in actually putting in emission controls and I think we should meet them.

SENATOR VIBERT: I understand.

MR RICHARDSON: I think ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes. When can the Panel receive a proper proportionate compositional breakdown of the waste streams labelled crushed bulky waste and miscellaneous waste? So far we have just received overall gross figures.

MR RICHARDSON: If we haven't supplied the information we said we were going to, I apologise. I will make sure we get it to you, but there are ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: I think what has been supplied, as I said, is overall tonnages, but there is no compositional breakdown and we would have requested that. I think we have requested that previously, but apparently you weren't in a position to provide it to us without actually doing a

survey.

MR RICHARDSON: Well, if you would like to ask another question, I will take some advice on that.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Right, okay.

SENATOR VIBERT: Can I ask another one on France, please?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Yes, okay. Carry on.

SENATOR VIBERT: Because we did touch on that.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Yes, okay.

SENATOR VIBERT: Did you actually discuss when you were in France the cost of building the Le Havre incinerator?

SENATOR OZOUF: Yes, we did, and that was very interesting. This is an open session, so you will forgive me if I am slightly guarded in that, because I think some of that information was given in confidence. But, broadly speaking, I was, I suppose, quite surprised at how expensive it was to build the plant in France. I was imagining that the energy from waste plant estimate that we have got here was almost as near as the equivalent would be in France. I also know ... I mean, it is a splendid plant in Le Havre. It has got lots of more reinforced concrete than we could afford here because of the price of concrete, but, I mean, certainly the point had crossed my mind about whether or not if Le Havre wouldn't have been an option, the thought had crossed my mind that somebody was going to suggest that somehow we actually ... Le Havre hasn't got the capacity at the moment, which we were told, but the thought crossed my mind of whether or not it would stack up to actually build an energy from waste plant in France somewhere and actually export both Jersey and Guernsey's waste there, but, frankly, because it is not that much more expensive to build a plant in Jersey than it would be in France because it is a heavy industrial sort of heavy machinery content ----

SENATOR VIBERT: I have to say I am surprised at that answer because the figure that we were given -- and I am sure they don't mind us saying -- was £63 million.

MR RICHARDSON: Yes.

SENATOR OZOUF: Yes, but that is absolutely about right. At 80.7 million, which is our total

strategy, only a proportion of that is the energy from waste plant. That reinforces absolutely the issue that I am saying, that there is almost a sort of minimum size of plant that you can build. So, I mean, I don't think ----

SENATOR VIBERT: It has got twice the capacity of the one we are planning to build.

SENATOR OZOUF: You bet, and that is the point. That is the point. The point is that there is the minimum cost of building a plant, which is not reduced that significantly ... sorry, not increased that significantly when you put extra capacity in, which goes to the heart of the issue that the Deputy of St Martin was trying to get me to answer, which is that that decision to build a slightly bigger plant for both Jersey and Guernsey has such huge potential to reduce the gate price and that is the reason why. It is entirely consistent with that. It is not double the price for a Jersey energy from waste plant if we take Guernsey's waste. It is not proportionally incremental.

SENATOR VIBERT: No, I accept that. I think everyone accepts that.

MR RICHARDSON: Can I just add to that that I would dearly love to have for my team a site such as they had at Le Havre: green fields, open space, plenty of air for construction plant equipment, set down etc. That would be wonderful for us. Our costs are high, there is no question about it, because we have had to take into account shipping, set down, transport, relocation of plant and bear in mind that our strategy, the difference between the equipment cost, which we emphasise very strongly throughout this programme, is our cost that we publish is the project cost. It is not equipment cost. There is a vast difference and a very big allocation of money for all of the relocation of infrastructure. If we move ... sorry, if we built the first ... start again. If we built the new plant at Bellozanne, the project cost at the moment allows for the existing refuse handling plant, which is where you go at weekends, to be fully relocated down to La Collette, with all the construction costs associated with removal of plant etc to La Collette, to reconstruct or construct the new plant at Bellozanne, then decommission and demolish the old plant, and bear in mind that there is a lot of ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can I say we covered this only earlier hearings, so that is already recorded. So can I move on please because I know everyone's time is valuable? Can I move on to parish collections?

SENATOR OZOUF: We are not constrained today. We can stay all evening if you like.

DEPUTY RONDEL: All right, okay, that is fine.

SENATOR OZOUF: And happy to talk about it.

DEPUTY RONDEL: The parish collections. Could you tell us what negotiations so far you have had with the parishes in relation to recycling and parish collections?

SENATOR OZOUF: Okay. I know you have met with the Chairman of the Committee of Constables this morning and I would be very interested to know what evidence he gave. I mean, I think the starting point from my point of view is that we, or the previous Committee, probably when you both were on it, commissioned quite sensibly a review of the parish collection system, and that was done by the consultants, Babtie Fichtner. That was their second or third job that they did. They wrote a fairly, I think it is fair to say, hard hitting report about the efficiency of the parish collection system. That was shared with the Committee of Constables of the day and, as I said before, I think it was not particularly well received. I think the Committee, my predecessor Committee, was maybe put off by an opportunity to actually work and find a solution to dealing with that. We think they thought that there wasn't really ... I cannot speak for the Committee and it is not fair to ask John to speak on political matters because you would have to ask the previous President, but I think the previous President was perhaps not thinking that you could deal or find a solution to this.

I am not necessarily of the same opinion. I think I've got to work with the Constables and I have got to find a solution which is acceptable to them. A few weeks ago, as a result of part of the consultation, I have made an appointment to go and see them and I am going to go and talk to the Comité again and I'm quite determined that we find some common ground. I am sure that we can help them in changing to some extent their collection system that not only meets some of their understandable efficiency, which the Constables are legendary in trying to achieve, but also in trying to meet some of our own targets in terms of actually getting higher levels of recycling and separation. Certainly we are not going to achieve higher levels of recycling and reuse if I don't to the more aggressive level than we would like to do get the Constables on board, and I am determined to work with them.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. In fact, we were given the minutes this morning of the Comité des Connétables, it would appear of the last time the Comité met. The time the representatives met with them was on 22nd September 2003. At that time, the minutes read: *“The final waste Strategy proposal will be available for consultation in October/November 2003 and all the parishes will be contacted regarding proposals and opportunities for green waste and glass collection services to increase recycling opportunities”*, etc, etc, and in fact it was Mr Richardson who attended that meeting. Now, there doesn't appear to have been any contact with them since that particular day, and we put it to the Comité Chairman this morning as to whether the Comité des Connétables had been asked to make any input into the Waste Strategy document, your draft document, and the answer to that was no, they had not been asked at all.

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, of course that strategy which Deputy Hill has, that draft Strategy, is the draft Strategy and the Committee has had its difficulties, Chairman. The Committee has had a very difficult time over the last 12 months. There has been two and a half Presidents. There has been shenanigans going on all over the place and, frankly, the Committee has not got on to deal with some of the work that it should have done and certainly if my time would not have been diverted into other matters, then perhaps I would have been able to see the Committee of Constables earlier than I have done. I have made an appointment to see them. They are absolutely vital as far as the Waste Strategy is concerned and I am determined to work with them in the forthcoming weeks.

MR RICHARDSON: Can I just add that we have got a Constable on the Waste Strategy Steering Group and we have also had a parish representative on the various Waste Strategy Steering Groups, who will be representing the parish at a technical level.

SENATOR VIBERT: But as far as the Comité des Connétables is concerned, which is the committee that we have to deal with, their position is no, they have played no part in the Waste Strategy.

SENATOR OZOUF: Well ----

SENATOR VIBERT: Bearing in mind in fact your very words at our last hearing -- I think it was

at our last hearing -- was that they were “*crucial*” and “*vital*” to the whole of your strategy, it strikes me as being rather surprising that they have not been met.

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, as usual, Senator Vibert, you are taking matters out of context. I think I need to repeat, if you did not hear it, what John Richardson just said. That is that there is a Constable ... we have got a Waste Strategy Steering Group because it is not only an Environment & Public Services matter. There are other important stakeholders in the States of Jersey and the parishes that must form part of the Waste Strategy. The Health and Social Services President is an absolutely key stakeholder. That is why he is on the Waste Strategy Steering Group. The Constables, they are important. That is why they have got a representative on the Strategy Steering Group. Now, I can't account for the Constable that is on that group or the Constables that have been on that group for not actually reporting back to the Comité des Connétables, but that is the reason why they are involved in it. But most importantly, the president of Environment & Public Services is going to talk to the whole of the Comité and I have got a Constable on my Committee too because I am determined that we do work together.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I put to you that would you not agree that the amount of time it is going to take between now and February to actually get a strategy together that the Constables can consider is almost impossible?

SENATOR OZOUF: I agree and I will repeat again that the timetable is challenging, but if I am to do what is right for the Island (and that is to find a solution and, again, Chairman, I am going to repeat again, if I am going to find a solution for the shutting down of Bellozanne in 2008) I have no alternative but to present for the States' approval a strategy in, at the latest, the beginning of next year for debate in February.

Now, I agree that it is going to be a long process to get the Constables working as a co-ordinated team to get the kind of recycling and kerbside collection that we would like. But in fact I can put that as part of a high level objective in the strategy and work with the Constables in the forthcoming months and years to achieve that. It doesn't stop the decision needing to be made that we need the replacement, so, you know, I don't think, as far as the Constables are concerned, I have a particular problem. In fact, the individual discussions that I have been

having with Constables is that they are very keen to actually help us.

SENATOR VIBERT: Hmm. In fact, I take it that the position is that you regard it that, because you have a Constable on the Waste Strategy Steering Group, therefore they have been consulted. Is that the position?

SENATOR OZOUF: No, of course it isn't.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, what is the position?

MR OZOUF: I will cite three ... we communicate not only in silos, but we speak constantly. I have a Constable on my Committee. There is another Constable who is on the Waste Strategy Steering Group and I talk to them. I am also the son of a Constable and I have got no particular conflict of interest in talking to my father about rubbish, because I do regularly and St Saviour is held up as a model of efficiency as far as collection is concerned.

SENATOR VIBERT: All the Constables say that.

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, St Saviour came out pretty well in the Babtie Fichtner Report, dare I say it? No, there is constant communication on all sorts of different levels and certainly, from an officer point of view, we also have the ... I have forgotten what his ----

MR RICHARDSON: We have the Technical Manager from the Parish of St Helier, who is obviously expert in waste collection.

SENATOR VIBERT: So, so far as you are concerned, you regard the Constables as having been fully consulted? (**Senator Ozouf and Mr Richardson conferred**) Can I put the question to you again? So far as the Constables are concerned, you regard the Constables as having been fully consulted?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, just like as the Constables are full Members of the States, just as I have shared the strategy with all States Members, Constables, just as all other States Members, must and can give Committee comments on their joint strategy. I have to say that the response that I have had from States Members on our draft plans has been poor. In fact, I have had a much better response from members of the general public than I have from States Members, but obviously I need to work harder to get States Members views.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I just ask the question again? Do you consider that the Constables

have been properly consulted?

SENATOR OZOUF: The Constables are, as I said before, important stakeholders and I haven't finished working on my strategy and the importance that I hold of the Constables is held up by -- again, let me repeat -- having a Constable on my Committee, having a Constable on the Waste Strategy Steering Group and me attending the Comité de Connétables. Consultation is going on at various different levels.

SENATOR VIBERT: Is that a yes or a no?

SENATOR OZOUF: It is a yes ongoing much more work to be done work in progress.

SENATOR VIBERT: Right, thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Hill?

DEPUTY HILL: If I can continue along that line because it is all very well saying (and I know we do it so often in the States) "Well, we have got a Member of the Connétables' Committee on that board", assuming that that Connétable then reports back to his group. That is one of the problems that we have with working groups, that, you know, there is no guarantee.

SENATOR OZOUF: I understand that.

DEPUTY HILL: You see, the reason that I am asking the question is, are you expecting, as I would, that the Connétable would go back and report his findings to his Committee of Connétables?

SENATOR OZOUF: I am not going to criticise the Connétables that have been on the Waste Strategy Steering Group. I have great faith in the Constables. I have great ----

DEPUTY HILL: No, I am not talking about the individual. I am talking about the process. If you have someone who is on a working party representing the Connétables, one would then expect the Connétables (or we can use it with any other group) would go back and report to his main group, like the person on Health would come back to the Health Committee and say "This is what I am doing on such and such" and one could expect that person to do it.

SENATOR OZOUF: I mean, I haven't checked. I don't go round, sniffing around looking at the minutes of the Comité des Connétables to check whether or not they have been reported and whether there has been an update. I am sure there is a lot of informal communication going on

and certainly I talked to Constables all the time and I am busy trying to persuade them of the virtues of doing more recycling and glass collections and all the rest of it. I am happy with my relations with the Constables.

DEPUTY HILL: I will come back to the point, and it is not only with your Committee because I think it is from our own experience -- I have been a States Member 11 years now -- and as often as not you represent somebody but you don't report back. If we are looking to improve a system, it may well be that we have got to improve the communication levels so that if someone is representing a Committee on a working party, you can be sure that that representative reports back because, you know, it hasn't happened here because I cannot see anywhere that the Connétables has reported back his findings. It is just ----

SENATOR OZOUF: I am not upset about that. I am not upset about that. I know that I have got a job of work to do in working with the Constables and I am looking forward to my meeting with them in the next few days.

DEPUTY HILL: Okay.

SENATOR OZOUF: You are not going to get a criticism out of me.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can we move on, please?

DEPUTY HILL: I am not looking for criticism. I am pointing out and making observation, okay? The other thing is can you tell me when this Babtie Fichtner Report was done on the waste collections?

SENATOR OZOUF: Do you want to take that? You have got it in your pack, I think.

MR RICHARDSON: It is in the chronology.

SENATOR VIBERT: We have got it.

DEPUTY HILL: I was looking for the Committee minutes, you see. **(Pause)**

SENATOR OZOUF: I think it was just when I came on the Committee.

MR RICHARDSON: April 2002.

DEPUTY HILL: 22nd May 2002 maybe. Okay, I have found it.

SENATOR OZOUF: One of the key issues I have got to deal with, which we haven't talked about yet in my interrogation, is of course the issue of the particular circumstances around St

Helier. That obviously is ... I have got to work hard with the Connétable of St Helier to deal with the particular challenging issues that were presented there and it is not easy and we have got work to do.

SENATOR VIBERT: On the question of waste collections, could I put this to you? When we looked at some areas in France, they clearly had some bank systems, whereby you brought this particular bank and I am sure you saw it when you went away.

SENATOR OZOUF: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: Is there some merit in suggesting to the Constables that, as part of the opportunity of reducing the amount of waste that is actually going to have to be incinerated, that a collection system could be set up simply for those banks, to put the banks in as a one-off operation to clear all the banks of the Island?

SENATOR OZOUF: The quick way of getting higher levels of recycling and reuse is a bring system and in our draft proposals -- perhaps we didn't shout enough about them -- one of the key issues there in certainly the capital cost, was a £2 million investment in a recycling centre. Now, part of that was to put in place a civic amenity centre, civic amenity facilities. It makes absolute sense to use the parishes as the sort of focus for that attention and certainly that is something which we want to do and we are doing. There will be more news on that. Just to demonstrate our commitment to that, I am wanting to see as far as possible early wins as far as reuse and recycling is concerned. We are going to be doing that and you will be hearing something about that next week.

Yes, we saw the civic amenity centre in France, we saw the way they do it and, yes, we are looking at options about where locations in the Island could be for bring systems and I am delighted that the *JEP* next week are going to be running a whole series on the recycling that we are already doing. I think some people think that we are not doing anything. Actually we are already doing quite a lot. We are already doing some and I am very impressed with the work that is being done by our particular recycling officer and certainly under John's leadership there has been a lot of improvement made, but we could do more and we will do more.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I also put this to you, that one of the major parts, it would appear

from the studies we have made, of a successful recycling operation and sorting and separation is actually the ability to persuade the public of the need to do it and funds to be committed to that on the basis rather than “Well, this is just funds set aside for recycling” on the basis of “These funds will save us money in the future.”

SENATOR OZOUF: Yes, I agree and certainly having discussed with the operators of the centre outside Cherbourg, it was interesting to learn that it has taken anything from three to ten years in order to get people to think about waste separation and recycling etc. It takes time and education needs to start. Education in the schools is a key way of getting young children excited and interested in what you can separate out and what you can badger mum and dad to take to bring systems, absolutely, and it will form an important part of our proposals. But this is a long term strategy. The Waste Strategy isn't just a case of making one decision and getting everything sorted next February. Long term strategy, education, it is going to take a long time.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes. In a similar vein, what are the key constraints associated with implementing an advanced recycling scheme sooner rather than later?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, one of the key issues is ... I think that we would probably not be entirely with you. I think you would be on the very, very high levels of recycling and I can't see that those are going to be possible for economic reasons for the particular circumstances of the Island's export problem. I don't think we will be reaching the kind of percentages that you would like us to reach. I am fully aware that Deputy Duhamel has very strong views about the percentage of recycling, but I think I am sceptical about ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes, but it is in terms ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please let the witness answer the questions.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: It is constraints.

SENATOR OZOUF: I think one of the constraints is certainly recycling costs money. I spent a lot of time on Monday asking the operator of the landfill site outside Montebourg exactly which of the commodities, which are all beautifully stacked up -- we saw stacks of papers, stacks of plastic, stacks of white plastic bottles, stacks of blue -- and we asked him “How much is that one

worth? How much is that one worth? How much is that one worth?" Well, some of them are worth nothing. Some of them were worth a bit. Of course, the problem for Jersey in having no stacks here is that we have got to pay the export price. Therefore, we are at a competitive disadvantage in actually starting recycling.

One of the constraints is the fact that you are already constrained in terms of what these things are worth and market prices fluctuate. Sometimes they are worth a lot of money, as we know with tin and steel, and sometimes they are not. So markets change. The paper market changes constantly. That is the first thing. Don't back a strategy on making sure that you can get for the next 20 years a certain level of income from a certain different type of commodity because you can't, it's a market base. The freight issue is a particular problem to us.

Another constraint is that we are not going to get a separation unless we get a coordinated collection system. So, I mean, those are three.

Maybe a fourth one would be that if you really do want really high levels of separation, which we accept is possible, you need to do things like set up great big gangs of people on conveyer belts and separate out, and I am not sure that Jersey is ready to employ tens if not a hundred people with rubber gloves on separating out egg shells from mouldy biscuit packets or whatever. I mean, it is particularly a nasty business and I think we need to examine very carefully whether or not we are prepared to actually embark down a road of employing a very significant amount of people in separating out conveyer belt loads of rubbish, because the thing I learned from in France is, even with a separation, where you actually separate out plastic and where you actually ask people to put plastic in a yellow bag and ... what was the other one, blue paper?

MR RICHARDSON: They had a yellow, blue and green system there and I think that is ... if I can pick up from the President, I think that is a very important point. Even if you have very good separation of source at household ----

SENATOR VIBERT: There will always be some rogues.

MR RICHARDSON: No, sorry, even if you have ... well, yes, there will always be some rogues, yes, but ----

SENATOR OZOUF: There are always rogues everywhere.

MR RICHARDSON: Even if you have very good separation at source where the public are very good at separating their plastic from their aluminium and their tin and their paper etc, that material then requires manual intervention in order to separate the plastics into their constituents PET, PVC or whatever. Until you do that, your value is virtually zero. It is only when you have your separate services or separate plastics that you start to get some value. As I said earlier, I am not aware of any plants where they can automatically separate PET from PVC etc. I have heard of one Italian plant, but I have never seen it. I don't know if it is running or not.

So, as the president has said, if we want to get to that level of recycling, we are looking at manual intervention in a relatively dirty condition. I have to say that from the outset of the strategy that I started off in 1999, we have always taken the view that whatever we recommend will be based on the Island having a limited labour workforce, expensive labour workforce, regardless of the public sector/private sector and whatever we recommend we will always pay due regard to that and we would have minimum manning requirements for the Islands waste disposal service.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you.

SENATOR OZOUF: I think I would be slaughtered. I think I would be slaughtered in the States if I came forward with a strategy that was going to employ 150 people on a shift basis sorting out rubbish and I think that any ... maybe I will get slaughtered anyway if Senator Vibert has got anything to do with it, but even if ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please let us not have personalities, thank you.

SENATOR OZOUF: All right, but even he made a comment. Even with a separation, I have seen it with my own eyes and I am pleased I have seen it with my own eyes, even with a separation, a collection system which separates, you still need to go through every single one of those bags and put them over conveyer belts and separate them out. I mean, it must be bad enough separating unsorted waste. Well, it is bad enough separating sorted waste. Separating unsorted waste must be one of the dreadful jobs around and, frankly, I don't think my Committee should be in the job of putting in place arrangements to separate out on a conveyer belt system,

employing tens of people this kind of job. It is not very nice.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can we move on? I would like to look at alternative technology. What has been looked at by your Committee to date, please?

SENATOR OZOUF: Right. Now, we have already chewed this subject quite a lot because we have spoken about the OJEC process and all the rest of it. If you want a list ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Not those we have already been told about by yourselves. Have you looked at any additional technologies since our last meetings?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, we are keeping under constant review ... I mean, my postbag is full of lots of correspondence, but I think one of the things I am getting most of is offers from salesmen selling their different waste wears. I think we could justify an incinerator just on the rubbish that I am getting through the post because there is lots of it coming and it is a case of separating out the stuff that makes sense to look into further and that really is just pie in the sky stuff. I mean, there is ... John can probably comment on whether or not there is any substantially important new technology that we have found in the last few weeks.

MR RICHARDSON: Right. I think I would just like to start off at a slightly higher level before we go to individual components and companies. The technologies we have looked at as part of this overall strategy are gasification pyrolysis, mechanical biological treatment (MBT) linked to refuse dry fuel, anaerobic digestion, mass waste minimisation systems linked to enhanced recycling that Deputy Duhamel has just covered and mass burn incineration. Those are the high level technologies and options we have looked at as part of this Waste Strategy. I can probably link one and two, gasification pyrolysis.

I don't know whether you want me to go into individual companies we have looked at. I would prefer not to because obviously some of them maybe involved in the bidding process and I think it would be wrong to do that. We have looked at those processes and I would draw your attention to the Juniper Report that you have a copy of that was submitted as part of the Guernsey Billet d'État that reviewed all of those technologies and processes. What they came out with was that within those there were none that were sufficiently advanced at this stage -- and that was a couple of years ago admittedly -- to take forward.

Looking at those technologies today, there are still very few that are running on a large commercial scale that would be part of our review, but they are options still there. There are one or two that we have had information from, but no more than information from, that are perhaps a mix between what you would term gasification and mass burn incineration. There are some fine lines to be drawn between the distinction of the two. That may -- may -- have some potential, but I couldn't say more than that. But there is very little technology in that bracket which is large, sustainable, running on municipal waste for two years to provide all the operating data we require in order to fully evaluate them.

Mechanical biological treatment we have looked at. One of the problems, although we have looked at it, but we haven't looked at individual companies or at specific plant level, and the main reason for that is when you start analysing one tonne in and what you get out of it, there is still a relatively high degree of residual that will require disposal. So we would end up with a fairly expensive MBT plant producing refuse derived fuel and residual and, as an indicator for you, for every tonne of waste that goes in, we would get approximately 450kg of refuse derived fuel out and 270kg of residue. That residue would have to be disposed of in some way, which I suggest would be some form of energy from waste plant of some description. That 450kg as a refuse derived fuel would then need to look at a sustainable market. One of the issues we have had when we have looked at this is can we find a sustainable market that can take that material from us over a 15 or 20 year life? The answer to that so far has been no, it is very limited. There are a number of MBT plants being built in the UK and certainly our consultants are involved in constructing a number at the moment and they have some relevance in the UK market, where they are diverting a significant quantity from landfill sites. But the problem is finding the market for the RDF and what do you do with the residue.

Anaerobic digestion we looked at fairly early on, but the anaerobic digestion problem is that it will only really deal with your putrescible material and you then have to deal with the remainder. As an indicator, for every one tonne going in, approximately 282kg goes for anaerobic digestion and 658kg is residue which will go to, probably, energy from waste or some alternative form of disposal.

I can go through these in more detail, but clearly the point we are trying to make here is that of all the technologies we have been reviewing throughout this four year period or so, what we have been finding is that there is always a residue of some description. Even mass burn has got a residue because it has got ash which needs to be disposed of appropriately. So there doesn't appear to be any one single solution. The big question, which I think comes out of it for Jersey or the Channel Islands' solution is because we don't have an alternative, i.e., if the plant goes wrong we can't drive 40 miles down the road to the next landfill site while we fix it, part of our criteria has been looking at very robust technology that will serve the Island or Islands, whichever way we go, well for the future. Of all of the plants that we have looked at, taking into account all the residue issues, it is very difficult to find one of the modern alternative technologies which will give us the risk-free or relatively risk-free disposal route, efficiency, robustness and reliability. I can list stacks of it, but that is a very simple analysis of where we have been.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. I just wanted to put this to the President. If, for example, a technology has been very successful in countries like Montreal, Japan, Norway, Kuala Lumpur would there be objections to Members of the Committee or your officers going to have a look at those technologies because they happen to be a long way away?

SENATOR OZOUF: The world is a small place these days and I don't think it's necessary to visit places in order to find out what is available. Certainly, phone and videophone and email allows one to find out what's going on in the other side of the world just by one sitting at one's desk and I certainly wouldn't be proposing that. I would quite like to go to Montreal, but I certainly wouldn't justify going to have a look at technology there. I think it is important, if the suggestion is that somehow we haven't scoured the world enough for the most up to date technology, I think I would need to repeat the fact that we put in an OJEC notice which is a designed, established process to get the expressions of interest for the problem from all over the world. I can't remember the geographical location of some of the people on our list, but Australia springs to mind.

MR RICHARDSON: Well, in terms of the location of the technologies we have reviewed so far, one has been Australia, one is based in Malaysia with Japanese influence, one which I have information here for is Japanese, so I think we have looked at a pretty worldwide trawl. If there is a particular technology we haven't looked at, I would very much like to know about it. Perhaps you could expand on that, Senator?

SENATOR VIBERT: It is simply that we have had evidence given to us here about a particular kind of technology. There are no plants in Britain using it, but there are certainly plants in Japan, Montreal, Norway and Malaysia.

MR RICHARDSON: Could you tell us which one it is?

SENATOR VIBERT: I don't know the title of it, but it is Plasma something or other.

MR RICHARDSON: Is that a company called Verno Plasma Technology? I am certainly aware of plasma technology. There is a company which I have a submission here from which is based in Holland actually which provides plasma technology. They did not go through ... sorry, they went into ... I can comment on this because they were rejected very early on because they didn't conform. They did make a submission in the expression of interest ... sorry, can I start again? They sought details from the consultants for the expression of interest and, when we evaluated the submissions that we received, they had not made in any way an appropriate submission. They merely had asked a whole series of questions and then a submission and, as a result of that, they were eliminated from that process, so I can comment briefly on that, I think. They are no longer part of it.

That technology was ... there is a plant running in, I think it is, Holland or Germany of that same type of process, but it is an extremely complex and complicated plant. I go back to what I just said a few minutes ago, I would question unless we can actually go and see one and see what the capital costs are, revenue operating cost and maintenance records etc, we would need to be absolutely convinced that it conformed to all the criteria to provide Jersey with a robust solution.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, this is the point that I am making. If a technology comes forward to you where they don't have plants in the UK but they have plants in far distant places and you

consider that technology is worth the merits of a very close examination, why should there be a problem with going to look at it?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, we have got a process designed to exactly achieve the expressions of interest. I mean, we have got lots of evidence of people coming to us. I am not sure that we need to be trotting around the world going to Japan.

SENATOR VIBERT: And out of interest, rather than waiting for someone to reply to an advertisement, would it be in our interests to search out that technology?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, I think I need to repeat what I have said repeatedly, which is that I think there is a world of emerging technology which is going to develop over the next few years. The problem that we have got is that we need to draw a line in the sand at a point where we say we think we have got enough information, we think we have got a form of technology which is going to work and Jersey is going to have to make a decision. I wish we had the luxury of waiting months, years in order to wait for new technology to come forward. You know, it would be great if we could, but we can't. We have got to make a decision about Bellozanne, and that is the constraining factor. In the period up until we make that decision, sure, we're open, we're listening, we look at it. I handle all the stuff that comes in the mail. I get lots of emails. They are all processed. John looks at them. They are passed to Babbie Fichtner and they are all evaluated. I don't think ----

SENATOR VIBERT: I would think if it is not an incinerator with Babbie Fichtner, it goes in the waste paper basket.

SENATOR OZOUF: That is an outrageous suggestion and is just simply wrong. It is ill informed. Babbie Fichtner are a worldwide company with a reputation in all sorts of different technologies and waste management.

SENATOR VIBERT: For incineration.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please through the Chair, Senator.

MR RICHARDSON: I think we need to clarify ----

SENATOR OZOUF: It is just an outrageous comment of which I would expect nothing less from Senator Vibert. It is just ill informed.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please, gentlemen. Can we move on? Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: In view of the comments made about the general support by the President for the emerging technologies, which no doubt will mature, at least the UK ones, would it not be an option to consider export for a period of time in order to achieve a window of opportunity for those existing technologies to actually mature to the level that would satisfy the officers?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, I was waiting until that question was going to come up because it is, you know, one option. The Island has to be secure in its waste disposal. I don't believe the Island can take risks, contractual risks, in terms of a short term solution. I think the Island and I think Jersey needs to put in place a long term sustainable solution for its waste strategy. If the suggestion is that we should export waste for a couple of years and then, you know, in a couple of years time, decide that there is some form of new technology which is available, you know, I suppose that is one thing that we could consider doing, but where is the evidence that that is going to be more economic for Jersey in the future? Where is the evidence to suggest that if we close down a solution of dealing with Jersey's waste in Jersey and we export it, well we need to build a transfer station here. There is a capital cost that is going to have to be taken, which is going to have to be amortised over a few years, and what do we do, build a transfer station and then decide after two years "Oh no, we don't need a transfer station centre, we need to build a plant"?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: It needs to be looked at.

SENATOR OZOUF: It is the kind of knee jerk, short term thinking that, frankly, I don't think has a place in sensible decision making in Jersey. So therefore I am not in the game of finding a short term fix whether or not ... and this is the constant stream of stuff that comes from Deputy Duhamel. It is patch the existing plant ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please, I don't want personalities.

SENATOR OZOUF: But ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: This is all being recorded and let's keep personalities out of it.

SENATOR OZOUF: It is not personalities. It is just slightly ... It is just slightly ... I am slightly confused that a Member of the States can constantly try and find an alternative way of

dealing with something that is blindingly obvious. We need to find a long term sustainable solution for dealing with Jersey's waste and I think the sooner we square up to this issue and square up to the decision being made, square up to a long solution that needs to be made, the better. We can carry on with short term thinking, but I don't think the public has put us in place in order to make short term decisions. I think we need to make long term decisions which are appropriate. I mean, John has views on this as well, and I would encourage him to say them.

MR RICHARDSON: Can I, Chairman, just go back to Senator Vibert's previous question? I have found the information I was looking for on the Verno technology. I wasn't aware of this particular company, but I am aware of another company who provide this type of technology. What I was disappointed from this submission was there were no reference sites. I would have thought that any company who was putting forward a relatively new technology would be very proud of putting forward reference sites. Also, looking at the scale of the facility they are providing us just by photographs, it does look very small, which is why I am disappointed not to have reference sites with tonnages and throughputs.

SENATOR VIBERT: The company itself actually is a scientific company that is promoting the technology. It is the technology that they are promoting.

MR RICHARDSON: Right.

SENATOR OZOUF: So does the technology exist?

SENATOR VIBERT: Absolutely.

SENATOR OZOUF: And does it work?

SENATOR VIBERT: It is being used all over the world.

MR RICHARDSON: The critical question is do they have a reference plant which is burning or processing 50,000 or 80,000 tonnes per annum?

SENATOR VIBERT: Apparently in Japan and Montreal the answer is yes.

MR RICHARDSON: It is a shame they didn't put those as reference plants.

SENATOR OZOUF: If those plants exist, you know ----

SENATOR VIBERT: We have suggested that they make ... they have spoken to us and we have suggested that they make contact with you, which we do with all alternative technologies.

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, just like all the alternatives, they will be looked into and I will take those technologies to the Waste Strategy Steering Group for evaluation.

SENATOR VIBERT: With respect, it is not new technology. This technology has been around for over 20 years now.

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, it is very easy ... forgive me for being slightly sceptical, but, I mean, I get ideas of plants that are apparently operating that deal with waste all over the world almost on a weekly basis. We set up a process. We put in an OJEC notice. We have put in place consultants to advise us, independent consultants that are not only energy from waste operators. I am confident in their abilities to tell us about the alternative technologies. We have put in place a process and I expect to be advised of all the available technologies and all the different options.

I think it is significant that a person in Jersey who does have a particular interest in energy from waste and the components of energy from waste is our own Senator Syvret and he is a valued Member of the Waste Strategy Steering Group and I encourage you to call him for evidence because I think his own words to me have been that he is of the view that we need to make a decision for an energy from waste plant and he doesn't actually personally believe that there is alternative technology which the Island should use.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, he is entitled to that view.

SENATOR OZOUF: But that is an interesting view because it is a view of somebody that wouldn't be necessarily sympathetic to energy from waste, but he believes that the energy from waste solution is the right one for Jersey. I mean, I think that is significant.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Vibert continuation.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. Could I ask you if you do understand that the ... do you understand the position today with waste management to be that we are in fact on the cusp of new technology? In other words the technology that has been developed over the last few years is starting to come towards some form of fruition and that has been helped by the DEFRA move in the United Kingdom to back and help this kind of technology and that this is a very fast moving

and fast changing situation?

SENATOR OZOUF: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: In which case the point that Deputy Duhamel was making was that, by delaying, if one could find a way economically to actually export for the short period, it would actually give you the breathing space in terms of looking into the stuff.

MR RICHARDSON: I wouldn't disagree with you that alternative technologies are moving ahead very quickly. I would ask you the question, and I would ask it very openly, are we as an Island prepared to invest our only waste disposal route in a new technology which, as yet, has not proved itself as a commercial large scale operation? Can I give you an example of risk?

The Island built very successfully its ultra violet treatment plant on its sewerage works many years ago. It is a tremendous success, brand new technology, great success and it won us all sorts of accolades and awards. It was superb. But had that plant failed or not come up to specification, the Island would still have been able to treat all of its sewerage to Royal Consent standards without any problems at all. Certainly Senator Vibert you are aware and I think Deputy Duhamel, who has been on the Committee, that we have another process that perhaps has not been quite so successful. Now, had the ultra violet plant not been successful and that had been part of our mainstream process, could we afford to take the risk? Can we ----

SENATOR VIBERT: It means you eliminate anything new?

MR RICHARDSON: No.

SENATOR OZOUF: Anything that is not tried and tested.

MR RICHARDSON: Not new. What I am suggesting to you and I am asking is can the Island afford to invest in new, brand new, technology as a front leader ----

SENATOR VIBERT: That is a decision that politicians will have to make.

MR RICHARDSON: I am ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please let the witness answer.

SENATOR VIBERT: I am just stopping him from saying exactly the same thing twice.

DEPUTY RONDEL: We don't have interjections on account of the tape recording all our comments. Please continue and then we will go to another question.

MR RICHARDSON: I am asking the question quite openly because the question that goes with it is if you do invest in that new technology which is novel, then what level of backup do you want to have in place and where is the backup coming from and how much investment are you prepared to put into (1) the new technology and (2) the backup?

SENATOR VIBERT: You are asking ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: We are not here to answer questions.

SENATOR VIBERT: You did ask me the question and can I answer it as far as I am concerned, as a Member of the Panel? The fact that you have actually investigated export opportunities and opened up a line of moving waste from here to somewhere else actually is part of a backup. If you don't ... well, it has to be part of a backup and if you don't ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please gentlemen, I have to stop it here because we are not here to answer questions, we are here to ask questions.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, nearly two minutes was spent asking us the question.

MR RICHARDSON: Sorry, Chairman, I wasn't ---

DEPUTY RONDEL: We will move on.

SENATOR OZOUF: We don't mind you asking us questions or the other way around.

MR RICHARDSON: Can I just clarify? I wasn't asking you the question, I was asking those questions that we would then have to ask the public and obviously States Members would have to make the decision. I was asking the question, I said, "*in an open way*". I wasn't asking you for answers, but I think it is an important question. You have to address the risks associated with it, but can I just finish off, please? If the Island decided to go down that route of new technology and backup, that backup appears to be landfill.

SENATOR VIBERT: No, no.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Anyway, we will move forward. Deputy Duhamel?

SENATOR OZOUF: I just want to say something on this because, you know, is the decision going to be to hold a decision on whether or not we do have a plant in Jersey and seek permission from the UK in order to export waste for a period of time? I mean, you know, we are going to DEFRA ----

SENATOR VIBERT: Why the UK?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, we are not an international jurisdiction in our own right. We are part of the United Kingdom because we have had, or we shortly hopefully will be having, the Basle Convention extended to us. The UK is the competent authority that is the decision maker about whether or not they would allow a trans-border movement of waste. French regional governments may well want to do a deal with us directly, but the reality is we can't. We are not a nation state in our own right. We have to ask the UK.

Now, we are going to DEFRA. We are going to ask them about what the options are for exporting waste. The exporting waste option ... I mean, I am sceptical about it, but I am doing vigorous work and the Department and the Environmental Director is leading this particular job of work, together with colleagues in P&R. We are going to find out whether or not it is legally possible to export waste and, if so, under what circumstances, what the length of period of time is. Now, I think that both the Jersey and Guernsey ministers', the present ministers', view is that it is going to be difficult to convince the UK, but we are going to ask, we are going to see what happens and we are going to give it our best shot.

Certainly from a backup point of view, yes, it might be that the UK may say if there was a catastrophic breakdown in Jersey and the incinerator blew up or, you know, you really couldn't have an alternative and we didn't have a landfill, they could well say yes. I mean, I can see that situation. But on a long term basis, I think it is questionable, but we are going to give it our best shot and we are going to find out.

The legal issue is just one of the issues. There is the practical issue about the risk of actually setting up a whole export route, of being entirely dependent on a supplier in another country to deal with an important Island issue, i.e., dealing with waste. Are we willing to risk the fact that, you know, there are dockers' strikes in France? There is a change in political climate. There are movements in terms of environmental. Could it be that Greenpeace may not want us to export our waste and to put emissions over the Normandy Côtentin? There are a whole load of issues. It is a risk assessment that needs to be done on the realistic option of exporting and we are going to do that, quite apart -- I haven't even got on to the economics of it

yet. Frankly, from what I am seeing at the moment, the best economic solution for the Channel Islands is a Jersey/Guernsey plant in Jersey.

SENATOR VIBERT: Can I go back ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Right. We will stop there because Deputy Duhamel has been trying to get in for about 20 minutes.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Thank you. You haven't actually answered the question in the way I phrased it. I wasn't actually indicating that we should go for novel technologies which aren't proven according to the department and use export as a backup. What I actually said was had you actually considered or were you going to consider, and that is the question, export now or whenever we need to, in 2008 or whatever the date is, in order to buy yourself sufficient time for those emerging technologies to mature and, at such time, you will come back and revisit the option of perhaps having a plant with a new technology in Jersey and thereby cancelling the export contract? Now, we can do that at the moment. That is what I am looking at. I would like to know from the President, when he is reviewing the draft strategy, which is a draft we are told, will this be looked as an option: export now to buy yourself a window of opportunity so that the emerging new technologies can mature to the level that would satisfy the Department?

SENATOR OZOUF: It is an important political question. The first thing to say is if we were to shut down, if we were to need to shut down, Bellozanne straightaway and we did need to export, because we haven't got a landfill, so either we store it up or we export it and either we export it to landfill or we export it to energy from waste if there is capacity, there is a cost on that. At the moment in my budget we have got £2.2 million to operate Bellozanne. I haven't got the money to do ... and that £2.2 million on a price per tonne it is actually fairly cheap at the moment ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: I understand there is a difficulty with the finance, but all I am asking -- and it is a yes or no answer -- is will the Committee be looking at this as an option, yes or no?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, the Committee is looking at all options as a consultation exercise.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: So is that a yes?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, it is a maybe, but frankly not one that I think is a ... if the Panel

want me to look into it ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: The States will decide. (**Senator Ozouf and Mr Richardson conferred**)

SENATOR OZOUF: Yes, John will answer from a professional point of view and clearly officers give advice to committees and I listen to that advice, but, from a political point of view, the option of export we are looking at as part of our option C. Now, I went to France with expectations of finding a plant that could take the waste. It doesn't exist. The plant in Le Havre doesn't have the capacity. So, therefore, export must mean, because it will take one year or two years to find a solution, if they did want to put a third stream on to Le Havre -- if, if, if -- then that is going to be two or three years away from exactly the same point as we have got here. That means export means landfill and I have said at the beginning of the meeting this afternoon that I am not prepared as President of the Environment and Public Services Committee, to countenance export for landfill unless there is a catastrophic disaster here that means that Bellozanne ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can you please answer the question in a yes or no, Senator?

SENATOR OZOUF: The option is that I don't think that it is realistic and it is an unreasonable aspiration to think that we can duck the issue of finding a solution to export Jersey's waste in the long term. Either export works in the long term or it doesn't and ----

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: I didn't say that, I said ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please answer with a yes or no.

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, there isn't a yes or no.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: It is in the short term.

SENATOR OZOUF: I think ... what is "*short term*"?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Looking to find a solution by ----

SENATOR OZOUF: I think the most dangerous issue is if the States ducks the issue, but, I mean, John has a view.

MR RICHARDSON: Can I just add that we visited Le Havre, a modern, very nice plant, along with many other plants of that nature. We have done a trawl of French incinerator plants

and I have a list of 124 here, so incinerator technology in France is pretty well known. We haven't found any others with capacity certainly in the Northern France area that will take our waste. We spoke to one of the largest operators in France and the United Kingdom, who are coming to see you, about waste management. They confirmed that to us. When we asked them what the solution was, it was possibly some going into Le Havre in an energy from waste plant, but the rest would be, I think they used the word, "*dispersed*", and that "*dispersed*" was to landfill.

So to pick up from what the President said, if we look at an export route, from the information we have from France, Northern France and from the advice we have received and the information we have received from our consultants, who, bear in mind, are a German company from looking at German incinerator and energy from waste plants and from the UK energy from waste plants, we have not found spare capacity of a significance that will take our waste. So certainly talking to one of the largest operators in France and now in the UK, who are coming to see you and your advisers on it now, they are saying they do not have capacity for incineration. So if the Island is looking for an export route for waste, then it does appear that that will be to landfill. Now, the President has answered it from a political point of view. I am just stating that it does appear, if you go down the export route, that at the moment the only options available to us are landfill.

DEPUTY RONDEL: It is now nearly quarter to five. I am going to allow you to sum up on this particular question and allow one more question and that will be it for today.

SENATOR OZOUF: Fine, okay. Well, I mean, the issue is we are setting out three options: Jersey, Jersey/Guernsey and export. That export issue will answer the question that Deputy Duhamel raises because either export is possible, either it is economically viable, either it is legally possible or not. I am afraid you asked me the issue about whether or not it is possible to export in the short term. Well, I don't think that a short term solution is what we want to do, but certainly being shaken out of that option C is the answers that you will be looking for and we will be publishing those options: environmental issues, legal issues, economic issues and risk assessment. All that will be laid out and it will be for the public and ultimately the States to decide which option they want to take. Now, I have got one issue I just want to raise with you, if

I may?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Well, one more question.

SENATOR VIBERT: Providing it doesn't block what I wish to ask.

DEPUTY HILL: I have got to be in St Martin's by five.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Fine, okay. Thank you.

Deputy Hill left the room

DEPUTY RONDEL: We will put the one question and then sum up. Can you be short, please?

SENATOR VIBERT: On the matter of landfill, are you saying that if there is a landfill in France that meets all the European Directives in terms of controls (and we saw one certainly that was a very sophisticated landfill that met every Directive), you are saying that we don't wish to put it in landfill?

SENATOR OZOUF: Landfill is the worst form of ----

SENATOR VIBERT: But that is your opinion.

SENATOR OZOUF: But ----

SENATOR VIBERT: But if the French ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please leave the witness to answer the question.

SENATOR VIBERT: But he is not, is he? If the French ----

SENATOR OZOUF: No, I ----

SENATOR VIBERT: If the French Government and the French authorities and the European Directives and all of those things are met, who are we to say we don't want to go into landfill?

SENATOR OZOUF: Because Senator, through the Chair, I have an environmental conscience. I ----

SENATOR VIBERT: Oh we have.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please let the witness answer the question, for the last time.

SENATOR OZOUF: I am President of the Environment & Public Services Committee and I am not going to be a President that puts forward a strategy in the States which effectively is a backwards step in terms of waste strategy than where we are at the moment. Landfill is a backward step. All countries in the world are going away from landfill. They are going away

from landfill to either energy from waste plants or alternative technology and I have to say the States would have to cart me out kicking and screaming if I am going to go down a route of exporting our rubbish and putting it in a hole in the ground.

SENATOR VIBERT: Even though it meets ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please.

SENATOR OZOUF: I think it is an environmental abomination to suggest that we are going to export our rubbish and chuck it in a hole in the ground in France. I will not put that forward in a strategy. If there is anything I am willing to rule out, it is that. It's a backward step and I wouldn't put that on the Normandy community.

SENATOR VIBERT: Are you suggesting ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: You have had the answer ----

SENATOR VIBERT: No, we haven't.

DEPUTY RONDEL: ---- to the question.

SENATOR VIBERT: With respect, Mr Chairman, I don't believe we have. What we have had is an argument against landfill.

SENATOR OZOUF: You bet.

SENATOR VIBERT: The position I am putting to you is this. You have issued a personal opinion about landfill. The area in France that we have looked at has got at least 30 years, if not 40 years, of landfill available and they are running it completely to European Directives.

SENATOR OZOUF: Fantastic.

SENATOR VIBERT: So you are saying that you wish to satisfy your environmental concerns, right, against the wishes of the French Government?

SENATOR OZOUF: No. Let me tell you there is international legislation on waste ----

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes.

SENATOR OZOUF: ---- for good reason. A fundamental principle of sustainability, which the States has signed up to, is that you deal with the consequences of your living in the jurisdiction in which you are.

SENATOR VIBERT: Hmm.

SENATOR OZOUF: France is not our jurisdiction. We are Jersey.

SENATOR VIBERT: So you don't export to France at all?

SENATOR OZOUF: Well, on that basis ----

SENATOR VIBERT: Not ever.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please let the witness answer the question.

SENATOR OZOUF: I would be ... I can see a possible option of exporting and putting it in for waste energy recovery, but I absolutely do not believe that we should be countenancing a backwards step in terms of putting our rubbish in a hole in the ground in Normandy.

DEPUTY RONDEL: President.

SENATOR OZOUF: That is ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: President.

SENATOR OZOUF: I can barely contain myself in terms of the environmental impact of that, and it is not something that ... it is like saying let's export our rubbish to Guernsey and put it in a hole in the ground there. How we would feel if ----

SENATOR VIBERT: That is a gross exaggeration.

SENATOR OZOUF: How would we feel ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Please, gentlemen. I am calling the meeting to a close.

SENATOR OZOUF: But can I ask my question?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Yes, in a second, and I will invite you back to continue this debate shortly.

MR RICHARDSON: Chairman, can I ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: We haven't got time to take any more questions.

MR RICHARDSON: Can I just add one point to Senator Vibert's comment?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Not at the moment. You will have to come back and we will continue it on a future date. Senator, you have a comment?

SENATOR VIBERT: All I want is one piece of information we haven't received whilst we are here. Do you remember we spoke about the plant and equipment and you told us that in fact it was all leased and we didn't own it and we have the list of the plant, but we don't have the costs? Do you remember you were going to get the costs?

MR RICHARDSON: You have got the costs in the spreadsheet.

MR BENNIE: The costs are in the spreadsheet of the costs of running the operating ----

SENATOR VIBERT: Under "*Transport*", is it?

MR BENNIE: Yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could you gentlemen sort that out with the office? Sorry Senator?

SENATOR OZOUF: Yes. Now, all I want to just discuss with you, and I realise this is a sensitive issue, and that is timing, because, I mean, I have explained to the Scrutiny Panel my difficulty in terms of timetable and I wish no ... I don't want to be difficult with the Scrutiny Panel, but, I mean, I have political responsibility for dealing with waste and putting to the States a waste strategy, of which my timetable dictates that because of Bellozanne I must put that strategy to the States at some point for debate not later than the end of February.

Now, I am actually quite pleased that the Scrutiny Panel has been doing what they have been doing because actually you are helping me in raising awareness of waste and actually, you know, there have been some good things that have come out. I think we have been having some good discussions about all of this and it is certainly keeping me on my toes and that's good. But my difficulty is how we are going to reconcile our timetables here, because I am sure that you will understand that I have responsibility in the States for finding a solution to this and what happens if I am going to work up my strategy and my Committee is going to sign off on its strategy in January and we are going to be seeking a States' debate in February?

DEPUTY RONDEL: You are ----

SENATOR OZOUF: For all the reasons I have just said, is there is any way that you would be able perhaps to give consideration to perhaps an interim report that would effectively assist us in the development of our strategy? I mean, how can we work together as a team ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: As a team, you are already aware. We have already spoken in the Members Room last week and my Committee, my Panel sorry, are supportive of bringing out an interim report in the very early part of next year, i.e., early January, to assist you so that you can continue with your work and we can all start getting things wrapped up shortly after that. We will bring in an interim report early on.

SENATOR VIBERT: I think there is something that needs to be made really clear. We are currently talking about your draft strategy. Clearly that strategy could well change by the time you have done all your consultations.

SENATOR OZOUF: Absolutely, yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: So we will need to then scrutinise your actual strategy.

SENATOR OZOUF: Yes. This is where you are shadow and we are learning and we are all learning about how Scrutiny is going to work. This is where I think we are going to be potentially in some difficulty, because I am going to want the States to consider our strategy in February because of the reasons and I am not ---

SENATOR VIBERT: When will you have your final report completed do you think?

SENATOR OZOUF: I think our final report hopefully will be completed by the second week of January.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can I say that at this moment I think we can now close the meeting as such from the public and have an informal chat and try and move things forward in that respect. Okay?

SENATOR OZOUF: Fine, okay.
