

#### **4.1 The Deputy of St. John of the Minister for Economic Development regarding repairs to the Duke of Normandy:**

Given that the Duke of Normandy has had to return to Holland for repairs, who is meeting the cost of the replacement tug, the staffing of that replacement and the cost of sending staff to accompany the Jersey vessel to Holland and what are the estimated costs of the repairs and hire charges of the relief tug?

##### **Senator A.J.H. Maclean (The Minister for Economic Development):**

Jersey Harbours will meet all the costs associated with the current repairs to the Duke of Normandy which are being undertaken by the tug's builders, Damen, in Holland. I am told that current indications are that the actual cost of repairs will be approximately 60,000 euros although it was initially estimated at between 45,000 euros and 150,000 euros, depending on the full extent of the damage. Four crew members accompanied the tug to Holland, 2 crew members returned to Jersey immediately at a cost of approximately £250 for flights, 2 engineers have remained on board to oversee the work. The only additional cost for these crew members will be overtime-related. The cost of bringing in the relief tug, Goliath, are £4,000 mobilisation costs and £980 per day which includes one crew member.

##### **4.1.1 The Deputy of St. John:**

Could the Minister tell us how much downtime our Duke of Normandy tug has had over the last 2 years, and also given that the Duke of Normandy is capable of dredging and the like, why we have had to employ a second tug to dredge the entrance across the harbour for the cable instead of waiting for our own vessel to return, or in fact hiring a tug capable of doing the multitasks that our tug was constructed for? Will the Minister give us those answers please?

##### **Senator A.J.H. Maclean:**

In terms of downtime, which I assume the Deputy is referring to in relation to the Duke of Normandy, the Duke of Normandy has averaged 175 days per annum utilisation so 75 per cent of its time is fully utilised. So aside from the classification works that were recently undertaken and the refit and this existing issue, it has been very well utilised during the time that it has been employed by Jersey Harbours. As far as the dredging works are concerned, they have been undertaken during this unfortunate period where the tug has had to return to Holland because it has apparently been more suitable from a tidal perspective to get the work done to ensure the port remains open and safe.

##### **4.1.2 Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour:**

Would the Minister comment on whether the accident or the problems that befell the engine were in fact highly unusual and, if so, has the cause been determined, and why is the matter not being dealt with under warranty, which apparently was an extended warranty?

##### **Senator A.J.H. Maclean:**

Taking the second part of the question, my understanding is that the warranty has been extended, and indeed that was the purpose of the classification survey - the 5-year survey - to ensure that was the case. As far as the cause of this particular incident is concerned, it is unknown at the moment exactly what the cause is; however

we have employed an independent engineering surveyor to look at the cause, in effect, and to report back to the Harbour Department accordingly.

**4.1.3 Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier:**

Would the Minister concede that it was a highly unusual occurrence and a way of interfering with the engine?

**Senator A.J.H. Maclean:**

I think that is probably correct... I mean, I am not an engineer but there are 4 hydraulic pumps I understand on board this vessel and a problem has occurred with one of those pumps. Clearly the vessel is still in Holland, until the repairs are completed we will not know the full extent and the details so I cannot really comment any further.

**4.1.4 Deputy M.R. Higgins:**

Part of my question was asked already, how can the Minister be so precise about the cost of the repair for 65,000 euros when he could not tell us what the actual cause of it was? Surely if they are still investigating or trying to find out what the cause is, the figure would not be fixed?

**Senator A.J.H. Maclean:**

I do not think I gave a fixed figure I gave an approximate figure and that was based purely on the initial inspection. It was not clear before the vessel went to Holland as to exactly the extent of the problem. There are 4 hydraulic pumps and it depended on the extent of the damage and how many pumps were damaged and so on.

[15:00]

The early indications are that it is going to be more like 60,000 euros but indeed we cannot be absolutely precise at this stage, as I am sure Members will understand.

**The Bailiff:**

The Deputy of St. John, do you wish to ask the final question?

**4.1.5 The Deputy of St. John:**

I do not know if it will be final, Sir, but I hope you will allow me, if need be, to put a supplementary because the Minister said "one pump" and in his reply just now to Deputy Higgins he was not sure how many pumps were affected. Could the Minister be more specific, please?

**Senator A.J.H. Maclean:**

There is believed to be damage to one of the pumps but clearly when the vessel arrived in Holland and the engineers started to look at it it was obviously important to make sure there was not any further damage. Clearly the wide range of the estimates, between 45,000 euros and 150,000 euros, was taking into consideration the fact that the damage could have been more severe than initially thought.

**The Bailiff:**

Very well, then we will move to question 3 which Deputy Le Claire will ask of the Chief Minister or do you wish to queue that one, Deputy?

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

As you can see, Sir, the question was to ask the Chief Minister for an unreserved apology, which he has already given us. Instead of putting the question to him I would just like to thank him for having done so.