

**P F Horsfall CBE**

7<sup>th</sup> March 2012  
Senator Ian Gorst  
Chief Minister  
Cyril Le Marquand House  
St Helier

Dear Chief Minister

You will recall that we had a brief conversation after the Enterprise Awards function and you said that you would welcome a letter setting out my thoughts on the two subjects touched upon.

This is the first and relates to the import of Guernsey's waste for burning in our new Energy from Waste Plant.

The following points tend to follow the process and are not in any order of priority. They are also based on what I have learned through the media.

1. The waste will be imported in bale form through the Ferry Port or the Victoria Quay. Having gone through the Guernsey collection, recycling, baling and assembly into a batch, it is likely to be two weeks old. Will it contain any putrefying material that will give off noxious odours?
2. Bearing 1. in mind, how long will it take before it is incinerated? Depending on their calorific value it is unlikely that the bales will be burnt whole and will have to be broken down. Also depending on the waste's calorific value, it may have to be fed in with waste of a higher calorific value as used to happen from time to time at Bellozane. With the high targets set for recycling by the Guernsey authorities the calorific value is likely to be low as combustibles like paper and cardboard will not be present.

The point is that the imported waste may be hanging around for some time before incineration, increasing the risk of bad odours.

3. Statements have been made to the effect that money will be earned by the sale of electricity to the JEC, produced as a result of burning Guernsey's waste. This is true, but how much, depends on the calorific value of the waste received at the Plant. Because of the levels of recycling this may be low and minimum acceptable levels should be set. There have been occasions in the past when some of Jersey's own waste was held back and fed in over time owing to its low calorific value.

The contract should take account of calorific value and a minimum acceptable level set to ensure that the anticipated power generation is achieved and also that the incineration process is not slowed down by having to gradually feed in low calorific value waste.

4. After incineration, the residue of toxic ash has to be catered for and a charge for this will be incorporated if it is to stay in Jersey. If it is re-exported to Guernsey, all well and good but the transport of this material may be subject to international rules that may well change over time and this eventuality should be covered in any agreement.

Should the ash remain in Jersey, the present method of stockpiling it in concrete silos may be acceptable but what happens when the present facility can take no more? That problem will have to be solved but the addition of the Guernsey ash will bring that time and cost nearer and this must be factored in to any agreement.

5. It is likely that making greater use of the plant will shorten its overall life and this entails a cost which must also be factored in to any agreement.
6. In the past there have been occasions when Jersey has had to stockpile its waste in different locations and there have been mountains of stinking waste at Bellozane, Le Crete Quarry near Anne Port, and other locations.

The reason for this has been either mechanical break-down of the incinerators at Bellozane or else industrial action taken by the workforce.

This should be factored in to the contract on the basis that any forced stockpiling of Guernsey waste must take place in Guernsey.

In the future it is possible that international conventions may set more stringent limits on disposal of toxic material and, most likely, carbon emissions from communities.

With the proposed agreement, Guernsey will export its carbon emissions from the burning of waste to Jersey. It would be unfortunate, to say the least, if Jersey has a serious carbon emission problem because of this and Guernsey did not.

This arrangement is for the long term and one cannot foresee what rules may apply regarding the carbon emissions in the future. Perhaps the answer lies in some provision for carbon trading if the need arises. In any event some safeguards must be introduced in the agreement.

In conclusion, I would add that I do not speak from any position of expertise but make comments only based on experience of the past linked to my serious concerns that whatever we do, every negative must be factored in to any agreement in order to avoid the possibility of saddling ourselves with a Trojan Horse. As you will have gathered, I am rather sceptical about the whole project.

Yours sincerely

**P F Horsfall**