Minutes of public meeting of the PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel on Teams

10:00 on 19 February 2026

Panel Members present:	Dr Steve Hajioff – Independent Chair
	Dr Tony Fletcher – PFAS and Health member
	Professor Ian Cousins – PFAS and Environment member
In attendance:	Standing Observer (Regulation) - Kelly Whitehead - Group Director of Regulation, Infrastructure and Environment Department
	Programme support team from I&E

Welcome:

The Chair welcomed everyone to the Panel meeting and reminded people the meeting was being recorded.

Introductions

The Chair and Panel members introduced themselves.

Dr Steve Hajioff, Independent Panel Chair: A retired Director of Public Health from an area of London with two major international airports and a variety of other environmental hazards and challenges, with 35 years in clinical medicine. An expert on translating science into policy, he has worked with Nice, the Greater London Authority, the EU, WHO and World Bank, several UK government departments and several international governments. Dr Hajioff has also worked extensively in the pharmaceutical industry.

Dr Tony Fletcher, PFAS and Health Panel Member: Environmental Epidemiologist at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, working on PFAS since 2006 and member of the panel with experience of epidemiological studies on the health effects of PFAS in contaminated communities in West Virginia in the United States, in the Veneto region, in Italy, and in Ronneby, and is the health expert on the panel.

Professor Ian Cousins, PFAS and Environment Panel Member: A Professor in Environmental Chemistry at Stockholm University, an expert on PFAS, appointed as the environmental expert on this Panel and whose expertise on PFAS is on the sources, transport, fate, and exposure of PFAS.

Kelly Whitehead, Group Director for Regulation in the in the Infrastructure and Environment Department, leading on the Water Quality and Safety Programme, coordinating Government's response.

Declaration of Interests

- No new interests declared.

Minutes

Minutes from 22 January 2026 meeting approved as a true and accurate record by the panel.

Matters Arising

No matters arising.

Additional Findings Since the Last Meeting

Steve opened by acknowledging several islanders who had proactively shared information about commercial companies offering PFAS-related technologies, including testing solutions and treatment systems. He noted that while the submissions were appreciated and reviewed, they primarily reiterated technologies and methods the panel had already examined. Steve emphasised that the panel will not endorse or evaluate specific companies, as such judgements fall outside the panel's remit and should instead be addressed through proper procurement or scrutiny processes in the future. He confirmed that the panel remains focused on assessing the underlying scientific principles rather than commercial marketing claims.

Steve then outlined the timeline for upcoming work. The panel will reconvene on 12 March to review the draft report in full and discuss potential recommendations. This will precede a public meeting planned for the following week, during which islanders will be invited to comment on the draft. A several-week public consultation period will follow, and all feedback—both from this upcoming period and from comments previously submitted on interim reports—will be logged and considered together. These public responses, along with any panel adjustments arising from them, will form an appendix to the final report. Steve explained that the final version is expected a few weeks after the close of consultation, likely in May, although this depends on the volume of feedback received.

Tony then introduced several recent media engagements linked to increasing public interest in PFAS issues. He described a short ITV Channel News interview in which he noted that multiple PFAS-related reviews were underway, including assessments by the UK Committee on Toxicology. Tony stated that his message to the media emphasised that no new interventions were currently being recommended pending completion of these reviews, and that Jersey remained ahead of many jurisdictions in its PFAS response due largely to the work of the panel. He also referenced a BBC Radio 4 series titled Toxic, in which he appeared in an episode exploring potential PFAS exposures in household settings. Tony felt the programme was somewhat confusing and focused mainly on explaining findings derived from the C8 Study in the United States.

Draft paper on PFAS in seawater, sea foam and sea spray

The meeting proceeded to Item 5, focusing on the draft literature review on PFAS presence in seawater, sea foam, and sea spray. Ian began by summarising the scientific background, explaining that PFAS have been measured across the world's oceans through large-scale research cruises that collect substantial water volumes at varying depths, including down to five kilometres. He noted that PFAS levels in open ocean waters are extremely low—typically in the hundreds of picograms per litre—making them difficult to detect without sampling hundreds of litres at a time. Ian explained that PFAS are widespread globally, having been detected in remote locations such as Antarctica, the Arctic, and even Mount Everest. Coastal waters, however, tend to exhibit higher concentrations, especially in estuarine areas influenced by wastewater treatment plants and river outflows. Based

on existing channel-area measurements, he suggested that coastal waters near Jersey may register in the nanograms-per-litre range, though still far below concentrations observed in foam.

He then described the behaviour of PFAS at the ocean surface. Due to their strong surfactant properties, PFAS molecules accumulate at air–water interfaces, including the surface microlayer and especially in naturally occurring foams formed by wave action or turbulence. These foams consist of many small bubbles, each creating an interface that concentrates PFAS. Sea spray aerosols—formed when enriched bubbles burst at the surface—likewise carry concentrated PFAS inland, with research indicating that elevated deposition tends to occur within the first kilometre from the coastline. Ian cited studies from Denmark and Belgium showing that these processes can influence local groundwater contamination.

Ian further detailed that collapsed sea foam can contain extraordinarily high PFAS concentrations. When collected, foam rapidly breaks down into a brown liquid that may contain up to a million nanograms per litre (milligrams per litre), representing an enrichment factor order of magnitude, higher than seawater itself. He emphasised that variation between foam samples is substantial, influenced by factors such as foam age, sampling method, environmental conditions, and analytical limitations. He explained that while the seawater concentrations are very low, the extreme enrichment in foam warrants caution, though scientific understanding is still developing due to limited global research.

The panel then discussed potential exposure pathways. Although PFAS concentrations in foam are high, dermal absorption through skin is low, and existing evidence—including a Danish study of surfers—does not show increased PFAS blood levels among individuals frequently exposed to sea spray. Steve highlighted that the more meaningful risk arises if concentrated foam residue on the hands is accidentally ingested via food. He suggested that public guidance might include simple precautions, such as washing hands after contact with foam, especially before eating. Ian agreed this would be a sensible and proportionate recommendation.

Tony raised questions about how to reconcile the extremely high PFAS measurements in foam with the lack of measurable increase in human exposure in the surfer study. He also queried references to modelling from a Flemish study that suggested possible exceedance of the tolerable weekly intake (TWI) under certain assumptions. Ian noted that modelling often incorporates worst-case scenarios that may not reflect real-world exposure. Steve added that TWI is based on chronic, long-term intake rather than single exposures, meaning occasional contact—even if theoretically above TWI thresholds—would not significantly affect body burden unless repeated frequently over months. The panel agreed that further discussion and clarification in the report would help resolve the apparent contradictions.

The discussion concluded with consideration of whether foam and sea-spray exposure should form part of future recommendations, including evaluation of risks for populations living very close to shorelines. Steve proposed adding this as a topic for further deliberation at the next meeting, scheduled for 12 March.

Draft chapter on PFAS in food

The panel proceeded to Item 6, with Steve introducing the discussion on PFAS in food and explaining that the next three agenda papers were drafted as future report chapters, each containing placeholder appendices that would later be finalised. He noted that the detailed analytical results referenced in the discussion are contained in the testing results appendix, already shared among the panel. Steve then handed over to Tony to lead the item.

Tony began by outlining the structure of the food-testing dataset, which contained a broad range of PFAS measurements for meat, eggs, vegetables, fish, and dairy products collected from Jersey suppliers. These results were summarised in tables comparing: (1) Jersey samples with UK comparator samples analysed by the same laboratory; (2) Jersey results against EU regulatory maximum levels or indicative limits; and (3) Jersey results against recently published international literature, with emphasis on the most recent high-quality studies given the declining time trends in PFAS concentrations in many foods. Tony said that the overall picture across food groups was reassuring, with most Jersey values being similar to or lower than UK comparators and staying well under EU reference levels. He noted that high-protein foods—such as eggs, meat, milk, and fish—were the main categories of interest due to their greater potential for PFAS accumulation.

The panel then examined food categories one by one, beginning with meat. Tony highlighted that for beef and pork samples, some Jersey values were slightly higher than UK comparators, but still aligned with averages seen in recent European studies and well below EU limits. Steve reminded the panel that several samples, including eggs and potatoes, had been taken deliberately from areas known to be affected by PFAS contamination, which might explain higher values within the upper ranges. Kelly later clarified that this applied to potatoes but not to eggs, correcting an assumption that had inadvertently been made.

Discussion then turned in depth to eggs, which Tony described as complex because PFAS levels depend on factors such as whether hens are free-range or kept on controlled feed. Free-range systems allow hens to ingest soil and worms, which is known internationally to produce higher PFAS levels—so much so that the Netherlands had issued national advice against eating free-range eggs regardless of proximity to contamination sites. Tony explained that some Jersey egg samples appeared slightly elevated, potentially due to sampling near contaminated land; however, Kelly interjected to correct this, emphasising that Jersey had not sampled eggs from the plume area. She clarified that the island has only three commercial egg producers, all of whom had been retested directly at the farm and via supermarket stock, with three samples below detection and three extremely low. The single high reading (0.7 µg/kg) was traced back to a specific known supplier and subsequently shown to be a one-off rogue result, as follow-up testing from the same producer produced non-detectable values. Tony acknowledged this clarification and remarked that the case illustrated why policy should not be based on single data points. Steve reiterated that even the initially elevated egg sample had been well below the EU maximum, confirming safety for consumption or export.

The panel then reviewed results for seafood. Most locally caught fish, crabs, oysters, and scallops were at or below UK comparison values and comfortably below EU maximum thresholds. A concern raised earlier in the papers about crab related only to a UK comparator sample, not a Jersey sample. Tony and Steve noted the need to correct a cod-related row in the written appendix concerning EU limits, as the value was placed in the incorrect table. Tony clarified that EU rules specify both species-specific and general fish maxima, and that cod falls under the general 2 µg/kg limit.

Potatoes were then discussed, with Tony noting that most samples were non-detects, though a higher proportion of Jersey potatoes showed measurable PFAS than UK comparators. Steve clarified that nearly all detectable potato results were from within the known contamination area, meaning the data could not be interpreted as a Jersey-wide difference from the UK. Later, after the meeting break, Steve returned with fresh information confirming that all but one detectable potato sample came from the contamination zone, and the remaining one could not be geographically verified—supporting the view that there was no meaningful difference between UK and Jersey potatoes overall, especially given all values were far below any EU levels of concern.

Milk results were then reviewed. Tony noted that a single whole-milk sample had exceeded the EU indicative level, prompting concern, but Kelly explained that this appeared to be a sampling anomaly. Raw milk taken at the same time was non-detectable, and all retests—including both raw and processed milk—were also non-detectable. She suggested the cause may have been carton contamination or a laboratory error. The panel agreed to document this explicitly in the report.

The discussion then moved to two true exceedances of EU statutory thresholds: a UK sample of crab (not Jersey) and a Jersey pork liver sample. Tony explained that PFAS can accumulate very heavily in liver tissue, particularly in wild animals, and that the values observed in the Jersey pork liver were unusually high even compared to literature. Kelly confirmed that this product came from a single island supplier, that two high readings had been found, and that the supplier had already voluntarily withdrawn the product from sale upon being informed. Steve emphasised that the key point was that the item had been removed from the human food chain. The panel agreed to ensure this was fully reflected in the written report.

Tony then summarised the EU regulatory framework for food PFAS limits, showing the maximum limits and indicative levels relevant to Jersey's dataset. He had opted not to include comparisons to US or other jurisdictions, considering that unnecessary. The panel reviewed recent international literature, focusing only on recent high-quality surveys due to declining long-term PFAS trends, and Tony stated that Jersey values were broadly similar or lower than those reported elsewhere in Europe.

In concluding remarks, Steve stated that—with the single withdrawn pork liver item excepted—no Jersey food products tested were at levels exceeding EU thresholds, and none appeared concerning in terms of human health risk. He noted that Jersey foods remain safe for consumption and export, and that the overall PFAS exposure risk from Jersey foods is equivalent to that faced by citizens elsewhere in Europe consuming similar foods. Tony agreed and said that this conclusion would be incorporated into the written chapter. The item concluded with confirmation that the summary text would be updated to reflect the clarifications raised.

Draft chapter on PFAS in soil

The meeting proceeded to Item 7, where Steve invited Ian to present the draft chapter on PFAS in soil. Ian explained that the chapter opened with soil-quality guideline values derived from precautionary thresholds originally proposed in Flanders. These include limits for agricultural and sensitive land, as well as for recreational, industrial, and residential areas, particularly focusing on the sum of PFAS. He noted that PFAS contamination is now global due to decades of emissions and atmospheric dispersal, meaning that no soil anywhere in the world is free of PFAS. Background levels typically range from below 1 µg/kg in pristine forested areas to 2–3 µg/kg in more urban European regions. A global review suggested an average of approximately 2.7 µg/kg, though Ian believes true background levels in remote areas are likely lower.

Turning to Jersey, Ian explained that soils outside the known contamination area generally fell within the expected background range and were safely below the recommended thresholds. Agricultural fields, grasslands, and forest soils across the island showed PFAS concentrations consistent with normal atmospheric deposition. However, two exceptions were identified: fields that had received applications of filter-cake sludge or biosolids. These amendments, derived from the island's water treatment and wastewater treatment plants, contain PFAS at concentrations higher than typical soils and therefore elevated PFAS levels in those specific fields. Ian stressed that such outcomes are expected and not unique to Jersey. Similar impacts are documented internationally wherever biosolids are applied to land.

Within the known contamination area, however, soil results showed more pronounced elevation. Of the sampled soils, four fell below the guideline threshold, while nine exceeded it, including one field with levels above 20 µg/kg—what Ian described as a “trigger point” suggesting significant contamination requiring closer evaluation. This field was confirmed by Kelly Whitehead to be the agricultural area closest to the fire training ground, explaining its elevated results. Some additional contaminated fields had also received biosolids, indicating multiple potential exposure pathways: groundwater irrigation, historic airport-related contamination, or biosolid application. Nonetheless, most elevated results remained in the 4–20 µg/kg range—higher than background but far below PFAS concentrations recorded at severely contaminated international reference sites.

Steve reminded the panel of their earlier decision to avoid rigid prohibitions on land use. Instead, any exceedance of the guideline threshold would trigger a case-by-case risk assessment, rather than blanket condemnation of land (as originally proposed—but ultimately not implemented—in Flanders). He emphasised that the relevance of elevated soil PFAS depends on how the land is used. For example, PFAS transfer into apples is negligible, so orchards on elevated soils would pose minimal risk; potatoes might require periodic monitoring but remain low-risk; free-range egg production, however, would require closer scrutiny due to known bioconcentration pathways from soil to hens to eggs. Ian agreed and added that landowners may choose to alter crops or cease certain uses entirely if they wish.

The discussion turned to the PFAS levels found in land-applied materials. Ian noted that wash-water treatment cake had an average PFAS level of around 50 µg/kg (range 23–94), making it more contaminated than wastewater biosolids. He explained that this material contains powdered activated carbon that naturally absorbs PFAS during water treatment, resulting in higher concentrations. Steve clarified that the data originated from the technical briefing submitted as Appendix YYYY. By contrast, treated wastewater biosolids contained PFAS levels within normal international ranges and may decline further as upstream industrial sources are addressed. Meanwhile, seaweed fertilisers contained very low PFAS concentrations—much lower than soil itself—meaning seaweed could be safely applied even to elevated soils without contributing to contamination. In fact, Steve highlighted seaweed as a potentially useful, naturally occurring fertiliser for PFAS-impacted land because its use would effectively dilute soil PFAS rather than increase it.

Tony queried whether sufficient data existed to determine statistical differences between biosolid-amended and non-amended soils. Steve responded that while the dataset was limited, approximate averages could be calculated: soils outside the contamination area (assuming non-detects = zero) averaged roughly 1.63 µg/kg, whereas soils within the contamination area that had not received biosolids averaged around 6.5 µg/kg. This indicated a modest increase but not orders of magnitude—consistent with either mild contamination or atmospheric deposition variation. Ian added that dilution occurs naturally when biosolids are integrated into the soil, moderating their impact.

As the discussion concluded, Steve summarised the key findings:

- Outside the contamination area, Jersey soils are entirely consistent with European and global norms and show no reason for concern.
- Within the contamination area, PFAS levels are elevated but still generally lower than those found in severely contaminated sites elsewhere, reinforcing that this is a localised issue, not a widespread island-wide problem.
- The sampling programme appears sufficiently representative, with numerous samples taken across several parishes; more granular data remain available in the detailed testing results paper for those wishing to examine field-by-field information. Ian agreed with the summary,

noting only the general scientific caveat that no sampling programme can guarantee that no isolated hotspot has been missed.

Draft chapter on PFAS in environmental waters

The panel proceeded to Item 8, with Steve clarifying that although the agenda referred broadly to "PFAS in environmental waters," the chapter also covered environmental foams and aspects of sewage treatment. He noted that references to "appendix XXXX" pointed to the central testing-results paper already discussed earlier in the meeting. Ian then began summarising the findings, starting with surface water analyses carried out across streams in Jersey. Tests screened for 48 PFAS compounds. Nearly all streams exhibited PFAS levels typical of urban environments—tens of nanograms per litre—reflecting generalised global contamination arising from PFAS use, wastewater discharges, and runoff. However, the Pont Marquet stream was a clear outlier, showing concentrations approaching 250 nanograms per litre, indicating a distinct point-source influence. Ian explained that the chemical pattern at this location showed elevated PFOS in particular, consistent with historic use of aqueous film-forming foams at the airport. By contrast, other streams contained a mixture of PFAS compounds without a dominant firefighting-foam signature, pointing to background urban contamination rather than airport-related releases.

Ian then discussed the sampling of freshwater foam from the Simon Sand quarry. As expected, the foam displayed enrichment relative to the surrounding water, although the enrichment factor was modest compared to typical sea-foam behaviour. With the underlying water containing approximately 870 nanograms per litre of PFAS, the foam displayed concentrations about 300 times higher—significantly enriched, but still well below the thousand-fold or greater enrichments often observed in marine foams globally. Ian attributed this to the already high PFAS concentration in the underlying water column, meaning the foam had less scope for additional concentration. Steve reminded the group of an earlier planning discussion in which they noted that although foam PFAS levels may appear alarming, the overall volume of foam in freshwater systems is tiny. Therefore, its contribution to surrounding soil or water contamination is negligible unless individuals come into direct contact with the foam and inadvertently ingest residue—for example, by touching the foam and then eating without washing. Dermal absorption alone is unlikely to be significant, but ingestion poses a plausible exposure route. Ian agreed with this interpretation and reiterated that, as with sea foam, individuals should avoid contacting dense foam accumulations as a precaution.

The panel next considered seawater and sea-foam data. Seawater samples had been reported as "zero," but Ian clarified that this simply reflected laboratory detection limits: commercial laboratories cannot detect the extremely low picogram-per-litre concentrations found in open ocean and coastal waters. Based on channel-wide measurements from academic cruises, Ian estimated that Jersey's coastal waters likely contain PFAS concentrations in the hundreds of picograms per litre—well below nanogram-per-litre levels and therefore undetectable by the commercial test methods used. Steve confirmed that the analytical limit of detection across four priority PFAS chemicals was 3.3 nanograms per litre, meaning any real values below this threshold would be recorded as non-detect. Sea-foam samples taken at the same time also showed clear enrichment, though at lower concentrations than typical international values. Ian emphasised that only a single set of foam samples had been collected, and much more data would be needed before drawing firm conclusions about foam enrichment patterns around Jersey. Steve asked whether recent storms could explain lower enrichment due to water-column mixing, but Ian said this was unlikely because the ocean's mixed surface layer tends to be tens to hundreds of metres deep and does not mix rapidly with deeper waters.

The discussion then moved to groundwater. Ian noted that groundwater samples, recorded by parish, showed a wide range of PFAS concentrations. Several parishes had values consistent with typical background contamination (10–20 nanograms per litre), but St Peter and St Brelade displayed very high levels—sometimes in the thousands or tens of thousands of nanograms per litre—reflecting their partial inclusion in the known contamination zone linked to airport releases. Kelly Whitehead confirmed that the most elevated groundwater samples indeed came from boreholes within or adjacent to the contaminated zone. Steve provided additional technical detail regarding detection limits for seawater PFAS, reiterating that any enrichment calculations would have to assume a maximum possible seawater value based on the analytical limit of detection.

The panel then reviewed information on private water supplies. Steve explained that Jersey maintains a voluntary register of boreholes and wells, roughly half of which are known to be used for drinking water, though the dataset does not link individual registered uses with the specific boreholes sampled for PFAS testing. Of approximately 55 private water sources tested, many exceeded 10 nanograms per litre and 4 nanograms per litre thresholds, which Ian said was unsurprising given the groundwater results showing many sites naturally fall within that range. Kelly clarified that these results should be interpreted cautiously because some private systems include septic tanks or mixed-source plumbing arrangements that may affect PFAS measurements.

Finally, the panel examined the wastewater treatment plant data. Ian explained that incoming PFAS loads in wastewater do not equal outgoing levels in effluent because the treatment process transfers a large fraction of PFAS into sludge. The PFAS concentrations in the plant's effluent were similar to those found internationally in municipal wastewater and not exceptionally high. Steve added that seawater sampling near the outfall pipe had shown PFAS below the detection limit, which he described as reassuring. Ian agreed but noted it would still be valuable for academic researchers to directly measure low-level PFAS in Jersey's marine environment, as the commercial detection limits currently available are too high to capture real environmental concentrations.

In concluding remarks, Ian stated that, aside from the well-documented area of known contamination near the airport, PFAS concentrations in Jersey's streams, groundwater, seawater, foam, and wastewater appear consistent with patterns seen across urban regions in Europe. Steve endorsed this assessment, emphasising that nothing in the data suggests Jersey is uniquely or unusually contaminated; rather, Jersey reflects a global pattern of widespread PFAS presence with one localised hotspot.

Government Paper on transboundary shipment of waste

The panel moved to Item 9, in which Steve introduced the government paper on transboundary shipment of waste and invited Kelly to present it. Kelly explained that, following the publication of interim draft chapters, it was important to expand the contextual information on Jersey's options for handling and exporting granular activated carbon (GAC) and ion-exchange resins after their use in PFAS treatment. She noted that the paper provides background on the mechanisms by which materials can legally be exported from Jersey under existing waste-export controls. There are three principal pathways: export as a material not classified as waste, where both exporting and receiving authorities agree; export as waste destined for recovery, such as regeneration of carbon media; or export as waste destined for disposal, which requires a formal "duly reasoned request" agreement between Jersey and the relevant competent authority.

Kelly outlined the legislative and international frameworks governing waste movements, including multilateral environmental agreements to which Jersey is a signatory, despite not being an EU member state. Jersey is generally self-sufficient regarding waste management, but where exported

waste is involved, the Regulation Directorate acts as Jersey's competent authority, while the UK Environment Agency typically serves as the receiving regulator. Kelly explained that the categorisation of GAC or resins depends not on PFAS alone but on the range of other substances adsorbed—such as pesticides, heavy metals, or volatile organic compounds—because these influence whether the spent media is classified as hazardous or non-hazardous waste. She then described how each of the three export categories might apply, highlighting that negotiations with receiving authorities could be complex and case-specific. Jersey has historically maintained bilateral disposal agreements and is currently negotiating arrangements extending to 2028; as part of this, the Government has sought UK regulatory advice on whether PFAS-laden GAC or resins would be acceptable for export.

Kelly also reviewed the legal definitions of "waste," noting that, under certain conditions, GAC used for PFAS treatment could be exported as a non-waste product, provided contractual arrangements exist and all competent authorities accept the classification. She emphasised that PFAS is not specifically listed as a hazardous waste under relevant frameworks, and while persistent organic pollutant (POP) considerations must be evaluated, they do not automatically classify the material as hazardous. Her key conclusion was that multiple viable pathways exist for exporting spent media—whether for regeneration, recovery, or destruction—but that Jersey would need sufficiently detailed information about volumes, contamination profiles, and proposed interventions before any final agreements could be established with external regulators.

Steve responded by observing that the panel had previously worked from the assumption that PFAS-laden GAC or resins would need to be destroyed on-island. He recalled earlier concerns about insufficient incinerator capacity, inadequate temperatures for PFAS destruction, risks from off-gassing, and residual PFAS in incinerator ash. In light of the new information, he suggested that off-island regeneration or recovery could provide a significantly better environmental outcome and reduce reliance on high-carbon-footprint incineration—or the current practice of spreading powdered activated carbon to land. This new understanding, Steve said, could justify favouring PFAS-removal technologies that support regeneration pathways.

Kelly added that while high-temperature incineration remains an option, it would require major infrastructure investment and likely take multiple decades to realise in Jersey. She emphasised that exploring off-island options for both regeneration and destruction would open up more realistic near-term solutions than waiting for long-term on-island incineration upgrades. Building on this, Steve said the panel would need at its next meeting to reconsider the wording of the relevant recommendation in the interim report to explicitly allow for off-island regeneration or disposal. Kelly agreed, emphasising that the recommendation should encompass both regeneration and high-temperature destruction outside Jersey, where appropriate.

Papers for noting

The panel moved to Item 10, which Steve introduced as a noting item rather than one requiring full discussion. He explained that the two papers referenced under this agenda point—the comprehensive testing results covering food and environmental samples, and the technical briefing on Jersey Water's wash-water cake—would be incorporated as appendices in the final report. Steve asked the panel whether they were content simply to receive these documents or if further discussion was required at this stage.

Kelly stated that, from her perspective, all substantive material contained in the testing paper had already been addressed earlier in the meeting during discussion of the preceding chapters. As such, she did not believe any additional matters needed to be highlighted for Item 10.

Steve noted one correction that had emerged during the day's discussions: an error concerning the threshold for COD in the testing paper. He requested that a Version 2.1 be produced to incorporate this correction before the document is inserted into the final report as an appendix. Kelly confirmed that the team would make the necessary amendment.

Any other business

No other business was raised.

Date of next meeting

Thursday 12 March 2026. It will be held 10am - 1pm online.

The Chair thanked everyone for their contributions, those watching the meeting and those offering support throughout the whole process.

A reminder to the public that this meeting has been recorded, and the video will be available online on request by emailing the Regulation Enquiries mailbox on RegulationEnquiries@gov.je. This will take a couple of days to make sure the observers are anonymised.

There being no further business, the meeting was closed.

To note that the Panel can be emailed via PFASpanel@gov.je.

Details of meeting dates and times can be found at PFAS in Jersey (gov.je)