WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT BY DEPUTY K.L. MOORE OF ST. MARY, ST. OUEN AND ST. PETER QUESTION SUBMITTED ON MONDAY 9th JUNE 2025 ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON MONDAY 16th JUNE 2025

Question

"Will the Minister advise what risk assessment and financial modelling, if any, has been conducted to calculate the potential long-term costs of land and water contamination from PFAS, including liabilities arising from biosolid application, water treatment upgrades, and future compensation claims?"

Answer

I take the issue of PFAS contamination extremely seriously. Understanding the long-term risks and financial implications of PFAS, in our land and water, is a key priority for this Government.

To that end, we commissioned and recently published a comprehensive hydrogeological study to assess PFAS movement and fate of PFAS in St Ouen's Bay and Pont Marquet catchments. This work, led by Arcadis, has provided us with a detailed understanding of how PFAS has moved through our environment, particularly from historic use of firefighting foams at the airport.

Last week I published a detailed response to the independent report detailing the formation of a Hydrogeological PFAS Steering Group to progress a remediation strategy and continual updates to the Hydrogeological Risk Assessment.

The Steering Group, which includes Jersey Water and Ports of Jersey, are now assessing a range of remediation options. Fully evaluating all options is crucial to inform the development of a PFAS remediation strategy. This will include a clear process for prioritisation and cost assessment, ensuring that our actions are both effective and proportionate. It highlights the need for a flexible, phased approach, and identifies data gaps we must address to move forward.

Alongside this, we established the Independent PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel to assess the health and environmental risks of PFAS exposure. Their work, including the upcoming Report Four, is critical in helping us define a regulatory standard for PFAS in water and treatment options appropriate to the treatment plant sites in Jersey. Only when a new limit has been determined, can Jersey Water further develop their solution and have this costed.

Report Four will also include a review of practices relating the recycling of biosolids to land. Until research is undertaken, it would be premature to cost up any alternative options.

We are taking a science-led, evidence-based approach to ensure that any future costs whether environmental, health or social are fully understood and responsibly managed. This work is essential to protecting public health, our water supply, and Jersey's natural environment for generations to come.