

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

**10:00 on 22 January 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 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 17 December 2025 meeting approved as a true and accurate record by the panel following this change:

- Bottom of page 5, line reads “Unlike the UK, where potability standards apply to all drinking water” however, it should read “**Unlike the UK, where potability standards apply to all drinking water supplying more than one dwelling**”

## Matters Arising

No matters arising.

## Additional Findings Since the Last Meeting

Ian opened the discussion by reporting on a recent field visit to two drinking water treatment plants in Germany that had experienced severe PFAS contamination. He explained that the issue stemmed not from firefighting foam—as is common elsewhere—but from highly contaminated sludge originating from paper pulp processing. This sludge, historically applied to agricultural fields as a soil improver due to its carbon content, had resulted in extensive groundwater contamination and elevated PFAS levels in both groundwater and the municipal drinking water supply.

Ian described how German authorities implemented advanced PFAS treatment technologies, including granulated activated carbon (GAC) and ion-exchange resins, to restore water safety. He noted that the treatment systems had proven highly effective, achieving PFAS reductions to levels below those recommended in Jersey’s own guidelines. However, the implementation required substantial investment, extensive pilot testing, and took four years from problem discovery to full operational deployment. He explained that the activated carbon used in these systems is regenerated in specialist facilities across Europe, where PFAS is destroyed through high-temperature treatment before the carbon is returned for reuse. The plants operate multiple large vessels, each more than 2.5 meters high, replaced in a staggered cycle approximately every nine months.

Tony Fletcher asked how Germany addressed the contaminated sludge originally applied to fields, though Ian had not yet obtained this information and planned to follow up. Steve clarified for the panel that the German sludge issue is not comparable to Jersey’s biosolids, as paper-mill pulp contains far higher PFAS concentrations due to historical use of PFAS-treated papers and widespread recycling processes. However, the German experience remains valuable because the water-treatment technologies and engineering solutions used are directly relevant to Jersey’s context.

Steve asked about the future of ion-exchange technology at the German plants, and Ian noted that the utilities were currently testing new resin systems in separate vessels pending national approval. He also shared that the cost of drinking water in the affected German town doubled during the implementation period, raising questions about responsibility and the “polluter pays” principle—issues mirrored in international PFAS-affected communities.

Tony added a second point of relevance: he had attended a community meeting in West Yorkshire near the Angus Fire facility, where residents—including former workers—had recorded elevated PFAS blood levels. Exposure mechanisms included occupational contact and local soil contamination affecting home-grown produce and backyard poultry, while drinking water—sourced

from a remote reservoir—remained unaffected. Tony noted significant public interest in Jersey’s approach, as attendees asked whether Jersey’s recommendations and risk-assessment framework might apply to their circumstances. He directed them to Jersey’s publicly available reports. He also informed the panel that ITV was producing a documentary on PFAS contamination, featuring the Yorkshire case and others in the US and Europe, potentially including references to Jersey. Ian confirmed that ITV would be interviewing him in Sweden the following week as part of the same documentary project.

## **Work Plan for Report 4**

The panel moved to item 5, focusing on the remaining work plan for completing Report 4. Steve introduced the item by explaining that he had reviewed the draft report and identified outstanding tasks based on the previously agreed scope. He outlined a “crib list” of what still needed to be completed and sought confirmation from the panel on responsibilities and timelines. The first area discussed was the status of outstanding testing results. Steve recapped that additional fish testing, pig liver retesting, egg retesting, dairy retesting, seaweed sampling, and sea foam sampling were still in progress or awaiting reporting. Kelly confirmed that dairy and pork resample results had been delivered and discussed at the December meeting. Egg resampling from three main farms—including both retail and direct-from-farm samples—was underway, alongside the collection of information on chicken husbandry, feed, water sources, and free-range practices. Mackerel and bass had been resampled but not yet incorporated into the report. Seaweed, sea lettuce, seawater, and land-foam sampling had been completed but would not be ready for presentation until the next meeting.

Steve noted that once all pending results were received, he would begin drafting the sections on the Jersey-specific findings. He proposed that he write the first version of these chapters, which would then be supplemented by Ian and Tony with international comparisons relevant to food, surface waters, and environmental exposure. Both Ian and Tony agreed to this division of work. Steve emphasised that this structure would ensure the report clearly presents Jersey’s context alongside global parallels.

Next, the panel discussed the need for a historical timeline of AFFF usage in Jersey. Ian volunteered to take responsibility for drafting this section, noting his extensive prior work on PFAS history and foam formulations. He indicated he already possessed significant general background material but required specific information on the exact products historically used in Jersey—information that has been gathered and would soon be provided to him. Steve acknowledged that some details may require sensitivity due to references to commercial products or companies but agreed that an overview covering major foam types and their periods of use would be feasible.

Steve then identified a gap relating to international regulatory limits for PFAS across different environmental compartments. Although this information exists within various chapters already, he requested that Ian and Tony extract, consolidate, and summarise the comparator limits—such as thresholds for food, soil, and non-drinking environmental waters—into concise paragraphs within a dedicated regulatory section. Ian observed that global regulatory limits vary widely and are catalogued in resources such as the ITRC database but agreed that pulling out key comparisons already referenced in the report would be manageable. Tony confirmed that the EU provides explicit limits or guidance values for certain foodstuffs, such as eggs, which he would incorporate. Steve added that the EU’s forthcoming requirement for PFAS testing in imported foods should also be signposted to highlight likely growth in comparative datasets.

The panel also discussed the need for a consolidated section on testing methodologies, covering sampling approaches for food, soil, plants, and other materials. Steve explained that while these methods are already described throughout the thematic chapters, extracting them into a single section would make the report more accessible and help readers understand differences in sample counts and techniques. Ian agreed to assist with this consolidation.

Another outstanding task identified was a literature review on PFAS in seawater, sea foam, and sea spray. Ian volunteered to write this section, noting that it aligns closely with his academic expertise and should be feasible to produce in a concise form. He reaffirmed that this area is well within his research specialism.

Steve highlighted the need to complete all of these tasks within a compressed timeline so that a full draft of Report 4 can be prepared by March, with key material ready for review at the February meeting. Both Ian and Tony agreed that although the workload is significant, it is achievable. Steve also mentioned that he would concurrently begin drafting responses to Islander feedback received on the interim reports, although finalised responses cannot be completed until the full suite of Islander comments on the completed draft is available.

### **Any other business**

No other business was raised.

### **Date of next meeting**

Thursday 19 February 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](mailto: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](mailto:PFASpanel@gov.je).

Details of meeting dates and times can be found at [PFAS in Jersey \(gov.je\)](https://www.gov.je/PFAS)