



PFAS Islander Meeting Minutes

18th June, 2025

Contents

1. Welcomes and Introductions	4
1.1 Introduction – Steve Luce.....	4
1.2 Agenda.....	4
1.3 Welcome	4
2. WQS Updates	4
3. Arcadis Report	5
3.1 Arcadis Map.....	5
3.2 Gov Initial Response.....	5
3.3 Contact with Owners.....	6
4. Steering Group.....	6
5. What’s Next	7
6. Minister Q&A	7
6.1 Independence of Water Testing and Use of Government Staff	7
6.2 Cancer Concerns and Historical Foam Use	8
6.3 Le Tacq Area, Tanker Rumours and Calls for Further Investigation	8
6.4 Scope of Arcadis Study and Work Beyond the Plume	9
6.5 Use of Impacted Water Sources and Public Health Messaging.....	9
6.6 Concerns About Transparency, Land Contamination, and Private Boreholes	9
6.7 Ongoing Pollution and Comparison to Guernsey.....	10
6.8 Inclusion in Support Measures and Health Communication	10
6.9 Access to Blood Testing for Former Residents	10
6.10 Request to Stream Future Meetings	11
6.11 Eligibility for Testing for Former Residents and Family Members.....	11
6.12 Concerns About Media Reports and Alleged Contact with 3M.....	11
6.13 Missed Contact with Plume Resident.....	12
6.14 Soil Contamination and Progress Toward Water Strategy	12
6.15 Concerns About PFAS Safety Levels, Contaminated Areas, and Resident Communication	12
6.16 Communication with Borehole Users in the Original Plume Area.....	13
6.17 Limitations in Methodology and Concerns About Missed Properties.....	14
6.18 Map Data, Borehole Visibility, and Community Concerns	14
6.19 Borehole Use, Plume Boundaries, and Inconsistencies in Blood Testing	14
6.20 Island-Wide PFAS Monitoring in Mains Water and Public Information	15
6.21 Calls for Independent Testing and Regulation	15

6.22 Access to Blood Testing for Islanders Outside the Plume	16
6.23 Agricultural Land, Borehole Use, and Food Safety	16
6.24 Historical Landfill Sites and Acknowledgement of Public Concerns	17

1. Welcomes and Introductions

- Chair: Kelly Whitehead (Group Director of Regulation at Government of Jersey)
- Ministers: Steve Luce (Minister for the Environment) and Tom Binet (Minister for Health and Social Services)

1.1 Introduction – Steve Luce

- Steve Luce opened the meeting and welcomed attendees.
- Apologies were noted from Jonathan Renouf, former Minister for the Environment, who was unable to attend due to being detained in the UK.
- Kirsten Morel, Minister for Sustainable Economic Development, was also unable to attend due to a prior Parish engagement.
- Deputy Luce thanked all attendees for giving up their time and for their continued engagement with the PFAS work.
- He then handed over to Kelly Whitehead to begin the main presentation.

1.2 AGENDA

- Kelly introduced the agenda, noting that it would be kept brief to allow most of the time for questions and discussion.
- A short context would be provided on the Arcadis study and the current status of the Water Quality and Safety Programme.
- An overview would be given of the Government’s response statement, released the previous Thursday, along with updates on developments since the last public meeting.
- The main focus of the evening would be the Q&A session with attending Ministers.

1.3 WELCOME

- Kelly welcomed attendees and thanked both Ministers for their presence.
- She acknowledged new participants attending the meeting for the first time, including Matt Thomas, CEO of Ports of Jersey, and his team.
- Helier Smith, Chief Executive of Jersey Water, was also welcomed along with colleagues.
- Kelly explained that having representatives from key organisations in the room was important to ensure attendees’ questions could be answered directly and accurately.
- She reiterated that the evening’s focus would be on the Arcadis study, the Government’s response, and the next steps in the Water Quality and Safety Programme.

2. WQS UPDATES

- Kelly provided an update on the Water Quality and Safety Programme timeline and upcoming activities.
- The next meeting with the Scientific Advisory Panel is scheduled for 26 June and will focus on water treatment and regulatory standards.

- A further public meeting is planned for July, which will concentrate on health-related matters and Report 3. Attendees were advised that questions relating to Report 3 would be best held for that session.
- Planning is underway for an August meeting focused on the environmental aspects of Report 4. The Panel will visit Jersey and present an interim report centred on water, which will then go out for consultation.
- The final version of Report 4, which will include consideration of soil, food, and broader environmental concerns, is expected to be published for public comment in December.
- Kelly confirmed that the programme remains on track with the timeline communicated earlier in the year.

3. ARCADIS REPORT

- Kelly outlined the purpose and findings of the Arcadis report.
- Arcadis, an independent consultancy, was commissioned to study the movement of PFAS in groundwater around Jersey Airport.
- The Phase 2 report was released on 1 May and builds on existing data, including information previously shared by Islanders.
- The study tracked and classified PFAS movement over time and across the catchments.
- A Remediation Options Appraisal was included, presenting a range of potential mitigation measures. Arcadis did not prescribe a single solution but provided a framework to help Government and stakeholders prioritise actions and develop a future remediation strategy.

3.1 ARCADIS MAP

- Kelly presented the map produced by Arcadis, illustrating the PFAS plume area surrounding Jersey Airport.
- She explained that this map represents the current areas of concern identified through the study and is the most accurate and up-to-date version available.
- It was clarified that a recent media article had shown an incorrect version of the map. The media outlet later admitted the error.
- Kelly also noted a copy-and-paste mistake in the appendix of the published report, which mistakenly referred to a UK county council instead of the Government of Jersey.
- Arcadis had since corrected the error and issued an apology. Kelly thanked members of the public who had flagged the mistake.

3.2 GOVERNMENT INITIAL RESPONSE

- Kelly outlined the Government's initial response following the release of the Arcadis report on 1 May.
- Six key areas of focus were identified, and a Steering Group was established to coordinate the response.

- Key stakeholders were brought together, and two meetings of the group have taken place. Terms of Reference have been agreed, and the intention is to publish these along with meeting frequency online.
- Government officers have contacted residents in the expanded plume area, offering advice and support to those potentially impacted.
- On 29 May, an online public meeting was held where Arcadis presented their findings and responded to questions and requests for clarification.
- Targeted environmental monitoring is now underway to provide robust data for the PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel.
- The Arcadis report has been formally published and briefings have taken place with all key stakeholders.

3.3 CONTACT WITH OWNERS

- Kelly provided an update on follow-up activity following the release of the Arcadis report.
- The report identified 343 properties within the defined plume area.
- Each property was reviewed to determine whether it was connected to mains water, used private supplies, or was classified as a business, residential dwelling, or field.
- From this review, 16 properties were identified as likely users of private boreholes.
- Government officers conducted door-to-door visits, up to four times per property, in an effort to make contact with all owners.
- Letters were left where direct contact could not be made, informing residents about the Arcadis report and inviting them to engage. Consent forms for water testing were also provided.
- PFAS testing has been completed at 10 of the 16 identified properties.
- Tailored advice has been offered to all affected households.

4. STEERING GROUP

- Kelly provided an overview of the Steering Group established in response to the Arcadis report.
- The group has met twice and includes officers from a range of Government departments, as well as representatives from Jersey Water and Ports of Jersey.
- A key commitment is transparency, with the Terms of Reference being published online.
- The Steering Group brings all relevant stakeholders together to coordinate and manage the Government's response to PFAS.
- Meetings are held monthly, and minutes will be published to allow the public to track the progression of the work.
- Each month, the group will review a different remediation option from the Arcadis report to support prioritisation.
- This process will enable the development of a comprehensive remediation strategy.

- Arcadis consultants will be invited to join meetings remotely from the UK to provide clarification and context for each option they proposed.
- The PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel will guide the Steering Group throughout its work, and any new information the Panel uncovers will be fed into the process to strengthen decision-making.

5. WHAT'S NEXT

- Kelly outlined the next steps in the Water Quality and Safety Programme.
- Report 4 will be delivered in two phases:
 - An interim draft focused on water is scheduled for August.
 - A full draft, incorporating soil, waste, and broader environmental elements, is planned for December.
- The ongoing testing programme must align with the Scientific Advisory Panel's process. Individuals requiring inclusion in testing need to be referred to the Panel for consideration in their report.
- A detailed methodology document, covering how, when, and why testing and monitoring are conducted, will be published at the end of June or early July. This will support a transparent and targeted monitoring approach available to Islanders.
- Some attendees raised concerns about the monthly meeting rhythm during the summer holiday period.
- Kelly acknowledged the challenge but explained the importance of maintaining momentum and keeping pace with contributions from external consultants.
- She also highlighted the PFAS webpage as a key source of up-to-date information and encouraged Islanders to email regulationenquiries@gov.je with questions or concerns.

6. MINISTER Q&A

- Kelly opened the floor for questions from the public.
- She reminded attendees to respect one another, take turns, and raise their hands to speak.
- Kelly noted that while many questions would be directed to the Ministers, others may be better answered by representatives from Jersey Water, Ports of Jersey, or other Government officers present.

6.1 Independence of Water Testing and Use of Government Staff

- Attendees questioned whether the use of Government of Jersey employees to assist with water sampling compromised the independence of the Arcadis study.
- Steve Luce acknowledged the concern but emphasised that independence does not require Arcadis to perform every task directly. He noted that Arcadis had not commissioned separate independent sampling but that their approach did not undermine the integrity of the results.

- Kelly Whitehead clarified that water samples were collected using trained personnel following Arcadis protocols, with the samples sent directly to an external laboratory for analysis. She questioned the basis of the perceived conflict if the laboratory analysis was independent.
- Tim du Feu (Head of Land Resource Management – Government of Jersey) added that borehole sampling is technically complex and that medical-grade pumps and specialist equipment were used. Government of Jersey staff received extensive training and operated under Arcadis oversight, meeting all technical specifications.
- One attendee argued that training alone did not equate to independence.
- Steve Luce acknowledged that scepticism was inevitable whenever Government staff were involved, but reiterated that the process was transparent, supervised, and that if discrepancies were found, they would be addressed.
- Kelly Whitehead also explained that Arcadis deployed two or three consultants directly, but it was more cost-effective and operationally efficient to train local staff under Arcadis supervision.

6.2 Cancer Concerns and Historical Foam Use

- An attendee raised concerns about a possible spike in cancer cases being linked to historic landfill sites and suggested that firefighting foam had historically been sprayed on common land above L'Étacq. It was asked whether Arcadis could investigate this further.
- A second attendee referred to an alleged secret cancer study being carried out by a local GP.
- Kelly Whitehead directed the question regarding cancer incidence to Peter Bradley (Director of Public Health – Government of Jersey).
- Peter confirmed that a past Freedom of Information request had raised the issue of cancer clusters, but the data referenced was old and unrelated to PFAS exposure. He stated that no current cluster had been identified, and the type of cancers linked to PFAS were not those referenced in past cases. He added that no formal investigations had been brought to his attention.

6.3 L'Étacq Area, Tanker Rumours and Calls for Further Investigation

- An attendee asked how large the PFAS plume was and expressed concern about potential contamination near L'Étacq, referencing information that had caused alarm.
- Questions were also raised about the need to investigate the Pont Marquet area and a historical crash site. It was claimed that Water Awareness Jersey had been contacted by hundreds of concerned Islanders regarding these locations.
- Kelly Whitehead confirmed that L'Étacq would be investigated.
- Peter Bradley explained that data is under constant review and noted that he had not been informed of any new evidence linking these sites to PFAS-related cancer cases.
- One attendee alleged that misleading information had been shared publicly suggesting PFAS does not cause cancer.
- Steve Luce said he was not previously aware of reports that tankers had offloaded in the L'Étacq area, but confirmed the issue would be investigated.

- When asked to follow up on the claim of a secret GP-led cancer study, Tom Binet advised that any credible concerns or sources should be submitted directly to him for follow-up. He noted the need to distinguish between evidence and rumour, emphasising the importance of a practical and proportionate response.
- Steve Luce reiterated that the tanker allegation at L'Étacq would be specifically followed up.

6.4 Scope of Arcadis Study and Work Beyond the Plume

- An attendee questioned why Arcadis was investigating areas beyond the identified PFAS plume.
- It was explained that this approach reflects the original scope of the study and the need to respond to evolving understanding.
- Kelly Whitehead noted that circumstances have progressed since the study was commissioned, and that Report 4 will consider the broader geographic scope and inform any further action.

6.5 Use of Impacted Water Sources and Public Health Messaging

- An attendee challenged Deputy Luce on previous public statements suggesting there was "no immediate issue to public health." They expressed concern that this language was misleading, given the ongoing reliance on affected sources and the potential for future use.
- Steve Luce responded that he stood by his wording but acknowledged the concerns raised. He clarified that his reference to "no immediate issue" related to the current situation, where Jersey Water is not using the impacted sources. He conceded that the phrasing may have been unhelpful and reiterated his hope that these sources could be used safely in the future, noting that every drop of water is valuable if properly treated.
- A further concern was raised about factual inaccuracies in the Government's response document.
- A representative from Jersey Water confirmed that while five boreholes in St Ouen's Bay have not been used for decades, the utility remains reliant on those sources. They emphasised support for prioritising work in the Pont Marquet catchment but noted that borehole number 4 has shown particularly promising results. If effective treatment and remediation can be achieved, Jersey Water would seek to bring these sources back into use.

6.6 Concerns About Transparency, Land Contamination, and Private Boreholes

- An attendee expressed frustration that Arcadis appeared to be focused solely on Jersey Water sources, rather than broader issues of pollution affecting land, crops, and the sea. They stated that they had not been contacted despite living in the affected area and relying on a private borehole, which they said had not been tested in five years.
- Another attendee further criticised a perceived lack of transparency, referencing political and technical groups that had operated without published minutes or agendas. They described a cycle of delayed action, citing the time taken for the

Arcadis survey and concerns about inconsistent communication between public health and the natural environment team. They questioned the role of the Steering Group and the Programme Board, noting that the Board's terms of reference were not publicly available.

- Steve Luce acknowledged the concerns and noted that further information would be made available through the forthcoming interim report.
- Kelly Whitehead clarified that the Terms of Reference for the Programme Board are in fact published and publicly accessible.

6.7 Ongoing Pollution and Comparison to Guernsey

- An attendee voiced frustration that PFAS pollution had continued for two decades without intervention to stop the source. They criticised the focus on managing impacts rather than addressing ongoing contamination, and suggested Jersey should adopt a more proactive approach like Guernsey.
- Kelly Whitehead asked whether the attendee had a specific question to raise.
- The attendee responded that their remarks were an observation rather than a question.

6.8 Inclusion in Support Measures and Health Communication

- An attendee asked whether there was a model in place to identify individuals who, while not living directly within the defined PFAS plume area, were nearby and potentially affected, particularly if they were unwell. They questioned whether proximity alone was considered sufficient for support, and whether people with conditions like cancer were proactively contacted or offered mains water connections.
- Peter Bradley responded that from the outset, a flexible approach had been taken. Individuals near the defined area were treated as eligible for support where appropriate.
- Kelly Whitehead asked for clarification.
- The attendee acknowledged they were new to the discussion but felt that much of the response seemed retrospective.
- Steve Luce explained that the geographic area of concern had been established based on testing data.
- Kelly Whitehead added that testing had also taken place beyond the initial plume boundaries to ensure a precautionous approach.
- The attendee concluded by expressing support for the Arcadis study and urged those present to work collaboratively. They stressed the need for better links between health concerns and environmental data, calling for clearer public advice when a health risk is suspected, such as guidance not to drink from private water sources.

6.9 Access to Blood Testing for Former Residents

- An attendee asked how their daughter, who lived in the affected area from 1991 and now resides in the UK, could access PFAS blood testing. They explained that they had previously been told they were ineligible for testing due to the absence of health conditions at the time.

- Kelly Whitehead confirmed that the response to expanded testing and re-testing would be part of the release in July. She encouraged the attendee to get in touch with the team directly so they could discuss options and provide further guidance.

6.10 Request to Stream Future Meetings

- An attendee asked whether the next public meeting could be broadcast via Zoom and if remote participants would be able to ask questions.
- Kelly Whitehead responded that while questions can be submitted in advance, the meetings are not being streamed at this time.

6.11 Eligibility for Testing for Former Residents and Family Members

- An attendee shared that they had lived in the orange zone of the PFAS plume for 10 years, up until 2009, but were told they were ineligible for testing. They expressed concern that past exposure had not been considered.
- They also requested testing for their children and questioned the response they previously received.
- Kelly Whitehead reiterated that the expansion of the testing programme is being considered as part of the response to Report 3. She encouraged the attendee to speak with her or a member of the team after the session to discuss their situation.

6.12 Concerns About Media Reports and Alleged Contact with 3M

- An attendee referenced a newspaper article that claimed the Government had exchanged 5,000 emails and 14,000 pages of information across various departments, including correspondence involving 3M and its subsidiaries. They expressed concern about transparency and asked how the public could trust assurances that there had been no contact.
- Steve Luce responded that he had no knowledge of such correspondence and stated he was not in contact with 3M or any related entities, noting that 3M's historical involvement dated back over 25 years.
- The attendee claimed that Water Awareness Jersey had evidence of such communications and repeated their concerns about public trust.
- Steve Luce reiterated that he had no involvement or communication with 3M and emphasised the importance of focusing on the current response and future actions.
- Tom Binet questioned the credibility of the claim, asking when the alleged emails were exchanged. He cautioned attendees to be careful about the accuracy of such evidence, stating that no such volume of recent correspondence had taken place.
- The attendee insisted the article made specific claims.
- Steve Luce asked for the name and date of the article in question so it could be reviewed.
- The attendee confirmed that the journalist was Orlando Crowcroft.

6.13 Missed Contact with Plume Resident

- An attendee stated that they live within the PFAS plume area but had not been contacted to date. They offered to provide their details for follow-up.
- Kelly Whitehead welcomed this and asked the attendee to share their information after the meeting.

6.14 Soil Contamination and Progress Toward Water Strategy

- An attendee asked whether soil contamination is being addressed as part of the PFAS response.
- Kelly Whitehead confirmed that soil contamination is being looked at specifically as part of the work to inform Report 4.
- Another attendee expressed support for the goal of safely reusing all water sources but raised a historic concern about unresolved charging mechanisms for water dating back to the 1980s. They asked for a timeline for when meaningful reports and actions would be delivered, noting the prolonged nature of discussions and offering to share related correspondence about water rates.
- Steve Luce agreed to follow up on the issue of water rates directly with the attendee.
- He acknowledged public frustration but emphasised the progress made over the past 18 months. He highlighted that the Arcadis study was commissioned before the current Steering Group was in place, and that since then, an internationally respected Scientific Advisory Panel had been established. He anticipated that by the end of the year, the Government would have the evidence and options needed to take action on water treatment and future supply.
- Steve Luce defended the establishment of the Steering Group and Board, stating that while some may find it unnecessary, it represents a collaborative and thorough approach. He committed to stepping in and using his powers if necessary should progress stall, but stressed that action must be grounded in independent, verified evidence. He reaffirmed his intention to work constructively with Jersey Water and Ports of Jersey.

6.15 Concerns About PFAS Safety Levels, Contaminated Areas, and Resident Communication

- An attendee cited international expert Ian Cousins, stating that there is “no safe level” of PFAS in drinking water. They argued that any measurable level is therefore unsafe and questioned the adequacy of the current response. Referencing Jake Hurst’s Arcadis presentation, they noted the study confirmed contamination to ground level and asked whether animals were present on this land; Jake had confirmed they were.
- They also raised concerns about historical use of Creepy Valley for cleaning fire trucks, claiming this activity continues daily. Nearby streams and ponds, including those used by the golf course and frequented by children, were reported to be contaminated. The attendee said Faulkner Fisheries, located in the study area, had not received any communication despite drinking borehole water daily.

- They alleged that no homes or businesses in the area had been contacted, even two weeks after Government had stated outreach would begin immediately.
- Kelly Whitehead responded that officers had spent weeks conducting door-to-door visits and engaging with residents in the extended plume area. She challenged the suggestion that outreach had not occurred, inviting anyone who had not been contacted to come forward.
- Further questions were raised about newly identified properties in the Arcadis report and whether those residents had been informed.
- Kelly Whitehead explained that properties within the extended orange and yellow zones of the plume had been identified and checked for mains water connections.
- Steve Luce pointed to maps to demonstrate the boundaries of the extended area, and both he and Kelly Whitehead confirmed that officers had visited the area on four separate occasions to speak directly with residents.

6.16 Communication with Borehole Users in the Original Plume Area

- An attendee asked whether residents in the original PFAS plume area who rely on boreholes would be contacted.
- Lucy Brundell (Regulation Standards Officer – Government of Jersey) explained that the Arcadis sampling results had been mapped against Jersey’s address locator system. In doing so, a central area previously included in the predefined plume was now outside the revised boundary due to lower PFAS levels. However, officers had visited all addresses within the original and updated plume areas. Any property with a registered borehole or without a mains water connection had been identified so that advice and support could be offered.
- Kelly Whitehead encouraged anyone who had not been contacted to speak with the team.
- Another attendee noted that borehole registration was never compulsory, and therefore, some properties may not appear on official records. They believed many households may be unaware that their boreholes are unregistered.
- Steve Luce acknowledged this was a valid point. While there is legislation around borehole registration, the team understands the limitations of the existing data.
- Kelly Whitehead added that outreach had prioritised properties without a mains connection, regardless of registration status.
- Additional concerns were raised about boreholes that had not been tested recently.
- Kelly Whitehead explained that Arcadis had tested boreholes in this area and found lower PFAS levels.
- A resident whose estate is fed by a shared borehole expressed concern about possible contamination.
- Kelly invited them to speak with the team after the meeting to explore the issue further.
- The attendee added that Arcadis had previously flagged concerns about their water supply.
- Kelly confirmed this would be followed up.

6.17 Limitations in Methodology and Concerns About Missed Properties

- An attendee noted that in Le Braye, their property is on mains water but had previously been told not to use their borehole. They expressed concern that the current methodology, which prioritises properties not on mains, may miss households like theirs that are still at risk due to historical borehole use.
- Kelly Whitehead responded that the immediate priority had been to identify properties within the plume that were not on mains water. She welcomed the identification of data gaps and acknowledged that further work would help refine the picture.
- Steve Luce agreed, stating that additional work would be needed to address any remaining gaps in the dataset.
- The attendee added that a report some years ago had noted the shale around the airport could contribute to elevated PFAS levels, suggesting a potential historic factor in contamination.

6.18 Map Data, Borehole Visibility, and Community Concerns

- An attendee asked whether the map presented at the meeting showed specific houses identified by the Government.
- Kelly Whitehead explained that the displayed map was used as a base and then overlaid onto the Government's address database to identify relevant properties.
- When asked whether boreholes were shown on the map, Kelly clarified that the team had worked with Jersey Water to cross-reference properties without mains water connections.
- The attendee noted that they personally knew several individuals in the northern part of the area who use borehole water, some of whom were unwell, and indicated the location on the map.
- Kelly encouraged anyone who believed they had been missed to come forward and provide their details so the team could follow up.
- Steve Luce responded that while some residents are concerned, others have told the team they are satisfied and prefer not to be contacted further.

6.19 Borehole Use, Plume Boundaries, and Inconsistencies in Blood Testing

- An attendee asked whether individuals using borehole water would automatically be connected to mains supply.
- Kelly Whitehead explained that this decision is made on a case-by-case basis. Water from the borehole must first be tested, and any advice provided would be based on those results.
- The attendee then questioned why the PFAS study appeared to be confined to a specific area.
- Kelly Whitehead clarified that testing had been conducted beyond the designated area, and the current plume boundaries were drawn based on where elevated PFAS levels were found.

- Steve Luce added that the border was established by systematically testing all around the suspected contamination zone.
- Another attendee raised a concern that PFAS blood test results from residents on an estate outside the impacted area did not align with the mapped boundaries.
- Kelly Whitehead responded that the team requires residents' consent to conduct further borehole testing and fill in identified data gaps. She encouraged anyone willing to support the investigation to get in touch.
- The attendee added that Ports of Jersey had tested their estate's shared borehole twice annually until 2019.
- Kelly Whitehead confirmed that this would be taken away for further investigation.

6.20 Island-Wide PFAS Monitoring in Mains Water and Public Information

- An attendee raised concerns about the lack of publicly available information on PFAS levels in mains water across the rest of the island. They noted that many Islanders outside the plume area were worried and asked what measurements were being taken, how often, and whether data was being published.
- A representative from Jersey Water responded that they have been testing drinking water, streams, and reservoirs for many years. Testing frequency varies depending on perceived risk. The results are published annually in their publicly available report. They encouraged anyone with specific questions to get in touch directly.
- They added that Report 4 would provide more detailed PFAS level data. In the meantime, Jersey Water has undertaken a six-month study to assess the practicality, effectiveness, and limitations of different treatment options. They emphasised that while some treatments are complex and costly, decisions are being guided by independent scientific advice to ensure water remains safe.
- When asked about testing frequency, Jersey Water confirmed that samples are taken fortnightly and published once per year. They offered to share links to the reports upon request.
- Steve Luce added that he had spoken to Jersey Water early in the process and was clear that work should begin now rather than waiting for the end of the year. He confirmed that action is already underway.
- The attendee welcomed the update but said this level of monitoring and transparency should have been implemented years ago. They expressed concern about the long-term impact on future generations and stressed the importance of providing the public with clear indicators that PFAS levels are decreasing and effective action is being taken.
- Jersey Water reassured the audience that PFAS levels in their supply are, on average, 70% lower than EU standards and below UK levels, and reiterated their commitment to public safety and transparent reporting.

6.21 Calls for Independent Testing and Regulation

- An attendee emphasised the importance of independent testing, particularly given earlier concerns about the perceived lack of independence. They

acknowledged the potential cost but argued that the island would benefit from independent regulation.

- Steve Luce responded that with a population of around 100,000, Jersey must make careful decisions about how resources are allocated. He noted that while independent regulation may be desirable, it comes at a significant cost and may not always be feasible.
- Kelly Whitehead added that testing will be carried out by Government of Jersey officers, as it is not financially viable to continually bring in specialists from the UK. However, all testing and methods will be subject to scrutiny by the independent Scientific Advisory Panel. She confirmed that the Government's methodology will be published and that suggestions for checks and balances are welcome. She stressed the need to balance independence with practical limitations.

6.22 Access to Blood Testing for Islanders Outside the Plume

- An attendee shared that they have PFOS in their blood but, living outside the plume area, felt their doctor had been sidelined and was unable to access follow-up testing. They called for wider access to PFAS blood testing for Islanders across the island.
- Kelly Whitehead responded that her earlier comments referred to other types of testing, but acknowledged the point raised.
- The attendee reiterated the need for this issue to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

6.23 Agricultural Land, Borehole Use, and Food Safety

- An attendee raised concerns that certain fields are being contaminated daily and asserted they had direct knowledge of this. They also questioned whether the Government was only visiting households on boreholes because they were considered a risk.
- Kelly Whitehead responded that the outreach was part of the planned study announced in May, aimed at gathering the necessary data, not because of confirmed concerns.
- The attendee asked if that meant there was no concern. Kelly clarified that advice is given on a case-by-case basis, depending on the results of testing.
- The discussion turned to agricultural land, with the attendee asking who was checking the water used by farmers to grow food for the island.
- Steve Luce responded that while the number of actively farmed fields had reduced, Government is testing food and produce to ensure safety.
- Kelly Whitehead added that ongoing testing is essential to understanding the risk, and data is being gathered to support evidence-based decisions.
- The attendee reiterated that if the Government is concerned enough to visit borehole users, similar concern should be shown for farms using ponds and untreated water.

6.24 Historical Landfill Sites and Acknowledgement of Public Concerns

- An attendee said they had been informed that there was an open-cast rubbish dump in St John's during the 1970s and asked whether this was being investigated as a potential pollution source.
- Steve Luce confirmed that Report 4 will consider whether wider Island testing is necessary and we'll act on those recommendations.
- Deputy Tom Binet emphasised that Government is taking PFAS seriously, with £800,000 already allocated to the response. He acknowledged that while some view the Government team with suspicion, the work being undertaken is complex, important, and carried out by hardworking, committed officers. He thanked those in the room who had remained respectful during the meeting and expressed disappointment at some of the outbursts.

Closing

Ministers thanked the public for their attendance and contributions. The meeting closed at approximately 19:30.