

STATES OF JERSEY



ENERGY FROM WASTE FACILITY: RESCINDMENT (P.8/2009) – ADDENDUM (P.8/2009 Add.) – COMMENTS

**Presented to the States on 3rd February 2009
by the Minister for Transport and Technical Services**

STATES GREFFE

COMMENTS

The report is long and provides Members with a mix of fact, opinion and general comment. At times, it is hard for the reader to know which they are reading, and throughout there is little or no evidence to support the statements made.

There is very little new evidence in this report and almost all of it was debated in 2005 and 2008. Whilst the Deputy claims that the world has changed, in all the areas where he claims this to be so (recycling rates, climate change, lifecycle analyses etc.), little has changed since last year.

Any delay at this stage will cost the Island large sums of money. Based on the issues raised which have already been debated, they do not lead to any change in the overall decision. In terms of environmental pollution, it is far more damaging to delay the project, leading inevitably to the old plant operating for longer, than to progress the new plant as quickly as possible.

Comment on Section 2:

2.3 Climate Change

- The Waste Strategy was developed in line with the internationally accepted Waste hierarchy which states that waste should be Reduced, Re-used and Recycled before a final disposal route is found for the residual. The waste hierarchy principles are generally aligned to the Deputies comment on climate change.
- This section makes two references to the Solid Waste Strategy. It refers to recycling of paper and card and glass. It then goes on to comment of the impact of recycling on global warming.
- Paper, Card and Glass form an essential part of the recycling element of the waste strategy which is in agreement with comments contained in this section, not as the report seems to infer going against it.

2.4 Policies on Waste Elsewhere

- The UK and Europe are working towards meeting their obligation under the EU Landfill Directive which it to divert 65% of biodegradable waste from Landfill by 2020.
- Jersey does not have Landfill and is not bound by this Directive although it has committed to meeting waste minimisation and recycling targets which are sustainable in the long term for a small island jurisdiction.
- The UK targets (revised 2007) requires a 50% recycling rate by 2020. By contrast, Jersey has set a target of 36% which does NOT include food waste. If food waste is added to the Jersey target, Jersey would achieve approximately 46–48%.
- All UK authorities base their recycling targets on MUNICIPAL (parish) waste and do not include in their quoted tonnages the vast amount of burnable commercial waste that generally goes directly to landfill.

Comment on Section 3:

3.2 Change in Attitudes

- There is no question that attitudes have changed over the past 3 years, much of which can be

attributed to the excellent work of the TTS Recycling Team and the continual efforts of all staff in the waste section to assist the public.

- The public feedback of the 2008 JASS survey confirms this.
- To achieve the target of 36% recycling it is essential that the current bring banks are increased and that EVERY Parish participates in a Kerbside recycling scheme for the clean recyclable products that have been identified in the waste strategy.
- The figures are not at odds with the TTS position in that the survey reports on public attitude and not actual practice.

Comment on Section 4:

4.1 The Waste Arisings model.

- The comment made in the report that the waste arisings model was not provided to Juniper, the Scrutiny Panel's advisor is totally incorrect. The report was provided to the Scrutiny Panel who did not forward it to their own advisor.
- When the updated model was produced to reflect the revised housing needs survey, a copy was sent to Juniper in April 2008 and recently provided to Deputy Wimberley.
- When the model was updated to include the predicted household growth, it included an allowance for the +250 heads of household, working with the most up-to-date information.
- The waste model was also run on the assumption that there was no inward migration and no increase in the number of households. This model provided a figure for the capacity for the EFW plant of 85,667 tonnes per annum.

Comment on Section 5:

5.1 Failure to listen on the part of TTS

- This comment is totally without substance. The Department held numerous public consultation meetings prior to the P.75/2005 Solid Waste Strategy debate and accepted some of the amendments put forward by Members during the debate.
- Throughout the consultation process and scrutiny meetings, etc., there has always been a challenge to divert food waste from the normal waste stream to treat it separately through some form of organic waste processing system.
- TTS' response to this challenge remains the same. It is perfectly feasible to separate food waste, subject to the Parish collection authorities being prepared to pay for and operate an additional collection scheme. There is no argument that the technology exists to process this material.
- The disposal of the resultant digestate or compost is the reason why this process has not been recommended for the Island. Under current supermarket protocols the end product cannot be disposed of to prime agricultural land (potato crop).
- Consideration has to be given to the competing demands for the Island's land bank. At present, the available land which forms part of the agricultural crop rotation cycle receives green waste

compost, farm slurry and treated sewage sludge. All of these products, whilst beneficial to the land in terms of nutrient value, have to be applied in accordance with strict UK, ADAS and supermarket protocols and regulatory requirements. In addition, the availability of land is weather and crop-dependant. At certain times of the year it is already difficult to find land for the existing material.

- As a result of these difficulties, the new Energy from Waste plant will have provision to accept treated sewage sludge as a back-up when the land bank is not available.
- The report refers to the Babbie Fichtner technology review and implies that the chosen technology had to process all of the waste. This is incorrect and the Deputy has totally misunderstood the requirements of the previous Committee who prepared the OJEC notice (Official Journal of the European Community). They sought Expressions of Interest from companies who could offer a solution for treating the Island's waste. The notice did not specify one single treatment process.
- The Deputy fails to refer to the Cost Comparison Report which was supplied to all Members in P.72/2008 where the combination of processes was fully evaluated.
- Had the Deputy referred to this document, he would be in a position to understand that a multiplicity of different technologies, all requiring land, processing plant and staff to operate, would become a very expensive option for the Island.

5.2 Failure to conduct an adequate EIA

- The Minister for Planning and Environment has commented in detail on this section.
- The EIA refers to RAMSAR.
- Reference is made to "refuse stored alongside the new incinerator and (with all its toxins and heavy metals) and from toxic chemicals used in the plant." NO waste will be permitted to be stored outside and ALL waste reception facilities will be drained to the foul drainage system for full treatment.

Comment on Section 6:

6.1 Impact on Health

- If this proposition is accepted, the Bellozanne plant will have to continue in operation until a new Waste Strategy has been developed and approved by the States. Following this approval, a site(s) will have to be identified for the process(es) and a full EIA, HIA and planning approval process will have to be undertaken BEFORE tender documents can be issued. Following tender evaluation and appointment of preferred bidder(s)' contract, documentation will have to be prepared together with detailed Planning Approval.
- Given that the other technology choices identified in the cost comparison report were more expensive and the termination of this EFW contract will cost the States in the region of £50 million, a new waste strategy will require significant additional financial resource at a time of economic constraint.
- The above adds up to suggest that Bellozanne will have to remain operational for several more years with the resultant pollutants impacting on the Bellozanne/First Tower area. In addition, the maintenance and reliability issues already faced will get worse and the inevitable consequence of having to store putrescible waste in open pits at La Collette will become more prevalent.

- The Bellozanne plant does not meet European standards on emissions, and is one of the most polluting plants left in Europe.

6.3 Reputational damage

- The Deputy refers to Impact on Reputational Damage. What is not said is the reputational damage that will occur if the contract is terminated without good reason and the States find themselves in the Technology and Construction Courts in London. This is the final location for dispute resolution for this contract. This would be a very significant case and would attract much media coverage given the scale of damages that will inevitably result from a case of this magnitude.

6.4 Impact on Land Value

- Reference is made in the report to land value in the region of £400 million, the basis of calculation being that La Collette is 4 times the size of the new financial quarter and therefore will attract 4 times the value.
- The most appropriate starting point for the Deputy would be the 2002 Island Plan, which clearly defines the use of the land at La Collette for industrial purposes and a small area for recreation.

6.8 The incinerator has demands that must be satisfied

- The Deputy is confusing CV (calorific value) and throughput.
- The throughput for the plant has been designed so that it can operate from between 37,500 tonnes per annum up to its maximum capacity of 105,000 tonnes per annum. This flexibility, coupled to the fully enclosed waste storage bunker, provides maximum operational flexibility for the plant. Given that the current throughput is 75,000 tonnes per annum with a 30% recycling rate, it is very difficult to envisage a scenario where the plant would operate at 37,500 tonnes.
- If waste growth, population and housing do not increase as the waste model predicts, the plant can run at a slightly reduced load. It will last longer and require less outage time for maintenance.
- The CV for all thermal treatment plants is specified within a range to provide the required flexibility for the plant to run on different types of waste. This same rule applies to the technologies being put forward as alternatives to the energy from waste plant.
- The reference made in the report is simply incorrect.

6.9 The Incinerator has a large element of risk

- Given the number of modern Energy from Waste plants operating or being built throughout Europe, they carry one of the lowest risks in terms of long-term reliability for the disposal of residual waste after recycling.
- The report refers to the risk of the waste being diverted away from the plant. This could only happen if the Parish authorities and their respective ratepayers elected to build, operate and pay for their own facilities.
- Given that the ratepayers are predominantly the local taxpayers, it is hard to envisage a situation whereby they would be paying for their waste disposal through general taxation and then elect to

pay for a new facility to be operated by their Parish. For example, the Parish of St. Helier are now working with TTS for the processing and disposal of their recyclable products.

- It is essential for the Parish authorities to divert more waste to recycling through a fully integrated kerbside collection. This is vital if TTS is to reach and exceed its recycling target of 36%.

Comment on Section 7:

7.4 Making money from waste not rates

- It is true that a proportion of recyclable products do have a value, but having allowed for collection, processing, shipping and delivery to a UK/European processing centre, the income stream is marginal.
- The majority of recycling streams which include paper and cardboard require a substantial States subsidy currently averaging £25.00 per tonne of material exported.
- Some plastic was attracting good market prices when the world oil price was so high, but this has dropped significantly in recent months and is unlikely to go back up to previous highs as seen last year.
- When reviewing the recyclable products that a Parish would recover; paper, cardboard, aluminium, tin cans, PET (plastic drink bottles) and possibly green waste, it is very hard to see where the income stream will come from for the parish, especially after they have paid for their products to be collected, separated and bulked-up for transportation off-Island.

Comment on Section 8:

- This section is completely void of any new information upon which to make comment. The States were aware of some of the alternatives put forward in Appendix 5 when they debated P.72/2008.