



Infrastructure
and Environment

Gouvernement d'Jèrri

Water Quality & Safety Programme

Public Meeting – 19th March 2026

Agenda



ITEM	TIME
Welcome and Programme update - Kelly Whitehead, Group Director for Regulation	18:00
Presentation of the completed draft for Report 4 – PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel	18:05
Questions for the Panel	18:35
Close	19:30



Welcome

Introductions

- Independent PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel: Dr. Steve Hajioff, Prof. Ian Cousins, Dr. Tony Fletcher

We welcome your feedback and questions

- regulationenquiries@gov.je
- pfaspanel@gov.je

Meeting Minutes available and copies of reports

- Visit gov.je/pfas

PFAS contact list

- To be included in updates and public meetings notifications, send a request through to regulationenquiries@gov.je

Programme Updates



- The WQS Board has been paused due to upcoming elections until new Government has been formed.
- The WQS Team will continue appropriate activities that do not require board oversight.
- Final Report 4 will be given to Government by the PFAS panel in Summer 2026. A Government response will be issued following receipt of the report and new formation of Government.
- No more public meetings are planned due to elections and the panel completing their work

- This evening is an opportunity for questions and answers with the Panel, rather than for prepared statements to be read out.
- Please respect the time of others by keeping questions focused so as many people as possible can take part.



PFAS in Jersey



Dr Steve Hajioff

Chair of the PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel



PFAS Panel



Independent Chair - Dr Steve Hajioff

PFAS and environment - Prof. Ian Cousins

PFAS and health - Dr Tony Fletcher



Purpose of the panel

To coordinate and provide expert advice on per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) issues to enable an effective and evidenced based approach to decision-making, enabling a sound and informed response to PFAS matters on the Island.



Panel reports

1. Review of therapeutic phlebotomy (i.e. having blood taken to reduce PFAS levels)
2. Assessment of the impact of PFAS exposure on health
3. Clinical interventions, biomonitoring, PFAS blood testing and re-testing
4. **Environmental management**
5. An update on the reports reviewing any additional evidence available



Report 4 stages



1. Interim report on the treatment of freshwater at scale for human consumption
2. Interim report on PFAS and PFAS management in food, sludge and slurry, borehole water supplies etc
3. **Final report**



Approach

- Being led by evidence
- Working through consensus
- Involving experts by experience and subject matter experts
- Public involvement throughout the process
- Default to meetings being in public
- Ability to work in private where there is a need for confidentiality
- Regular engagement with key stakeholders in addition to panel meetings
- No surprises



Key sources
of
information
for the
report

- Review and analysis of scientific literature
- Testimony from experts by experience
- Evidence from subject matter experts



Final Islander input period for Report 4

A five-week Islander input period starts now

We are inviting your feedback on:

- The content and recommendations in the report
- Whether or not you agree with the recommendations
- Any further questions and concerns you wish to raise

Please email PFASpanel@gov.je with your comments by 24th April

Report 4: Evidence reviewed by the Panel

- ▶ 12 literature reviews
- ▶ 20 subject matter experts gave evidence, including:
 - ▶ Julia Hartmann, Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM)
 - ▶ Gloria Post, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
 - ▶ Toke Winther, National Food Institute at the Technical University of Denmark
 - ▶ Hans Peter Birk Hansen, Danish Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
 - ▶ Ian Ross, CDM Smith
 - ▶ Christopher Bellona, Colorado School of Mines
 - ▶ Kevin Berryhill, Provost and Pritchard Consulting Group
 - ▶ Lutz Ahrens, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
 - ▶ Marcel Riegel, TZW German Water Centre
 - ▶ Philip McCleaf, Uppsala Water and Waste
 - ▶ Sebastian Castano, Oasen Drinkwater
 - ▶ Thorhallur Halldórsson, Faculty of Food Science and Nutrition, University of Iceland
 - ▶ Leo Yeung, Örebro University
 - ▶ Irina Gyllenhammar, Swedish Food Agency
 - ▶ Ida Hallberg, veterinarian and researcher
 - ▶ Jelena Rejanovic, Catalan Institute for Water Research in Girona, Spain
 - ▶ Steven Chow, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology in Zurich, Switzerland.
 - ▶ Linda Lee, Purdue University
 - ▶ Michel Hubert, Norwegian Geotechnical Institute (NGI)
 - ▶ David Andrews, Environmental Working Group (EWG)
- ▶ Local evidence from:
 - ▶ Arcadis
 - ▶ Jersey Water
 - ▶ La Collette Energy Recovery Facility
 - ▶ La Collette Clinical Waste Incinerator
 - ▶ Waste Disposal Cells at La Collette
 - ▶ Bellozanne Valley Wastewater Treatment Works

Report 4 on PFAS and the environment

Recommendations:

- There needs to be a new standard for PFAS in water specifically for Jersey. This should involve a single regulatory level and the principle that PFAS in water should be “as low as is reasonably practicable”
- The new standard for PFAS should be enforceable through either legal or contractual means
- The enforceable primary standard for PFAS in drinking water should be 4 ng/L for the simple sum of four PFAS (PFOS, PFOA, PFHxS, PFNA). If any of those moieties is below the limit of quantification, it should be assumed to be at the limit of quantification.
- Monitoring and reporting should include a 10 ng/L guidance value for the average sum of forty-eight measurable PFAS. This should be used to trigger further investigation and is not an enforceable limit.
- Consider the use of powdered activated carbon (PAC) in existing infrastructure as an interim measure to reduce PFAS before longer term treatments come on stream.
- Granular activated carbon (GAC) or ion-exchange resins (IX) appear to be the optimal primary water treatment technologies currently available for removing the health-relevant PFAS on Jersey.

Report 4 on PFAS and the environment

Recommendations (cont):

- The panel recommends a whole lifecycle cost-effectiveness analysis (including costs borne elsewhere in the economy) and local piloting be conducted to guide the choice between the best treatment technology or treatment train.
- When determining the choice of water treatment media, priority should be given to any media that can be regenerated or recycled over those that would necessitate destruction of spent material.
- Mains water should be treated to achieve a level of 4 ng/L of the four PFAS as soon as is practicable and within five years.
- Where a borehole or a well supplies drinking water to multiple premises, the owner of the supply should consider applying a standard of 4 ng/L for the simple sum of four PFAS (PFOS, PFOA, PFHxS, PFNA) and/or 10 ng/L for the sum of forty-eight measurable PFAS.
- For a borehole or well that supplies a single household, public authorities should make available information on different potential treatment options that the owner may wish to consider. That information should include the relative strengths and weaknesses and the necessary maintenance.
- Consider updating the current voluntary register of borehole water supplies and encouraging wider participation.

Report 4 on PFAS and the environment

Recommendations (cont):

- If a household is considering in-home water treatment for PFAS, generally speaking, multistage processes are more effective and efficient than single stage filter jugs (although more expensive). It is important to adhere to the maintenance and replacement schedules of any given product.
- Public authorities should make available information on the strengths and weaknesses of in home treatment options; drawing on reports such as that of the Environmental Working Group and the North Carolina field study.
- In areas with suspected ground or water contamination, free-range egg production should be discouraged. In these areas, birds should be kept indoors and only consume clean, commercial feed.
- Consider periodic testing of any potato crops grown within the area of known contamination.
- Consider periodic testing of any potato crops grown in fields where a sum of four PFAS (PFOS, PFOA, PFHxS, PFNA) in the soil exceeds 4 µg/kg dry weight.
- Agricultural land and sensitive land such as water abstraction areas should not be considered to be PFAS affected unless they contain a sum of four PFAS (PFOS, PFOA, PFHxS, PFNA) that exceeds 4 µg/kg dry weight.

Report 4 on PFAS and the environment

Recommendations (cont):

- Residential, recreational and industrial land should not be considered to be PFAS affected unless they contain a sum of four PFAS (PFOS, PFOA, PFHxS, PFNA) that exceeds 8 µg/kg dry matter.
- If land other than agricultural, sensitive, residential, recreational or industrial has or a sum of four PFAS (PFOS, PFOA, PFHxS, PFNA) that exceeds 20 µg/kg dry matter, the source of contamination should be identified and remediation considered.
- Where land meets the relevant threshold for being PFAS affected, a risk assessment should be undertaken to clarify appropriate land management and usage, testing and retesting schedules of land or any products from that land, and any further source investigation or remediation.
- Soil washing may be appropriate for contamination hotspots; for lower contamination areas, containment should be considered when appropriate
- If surface or ground waters that are not to be used for drinking water production are found to have a sum of four PFAS (PFOS, PFOA, PFHxS, PFNA) that exceeds 10 ng/L, the source of that contamination should be identified and mitigation considered.
- Contact with persistent sea foam and freshwater foams should be avoided, if possible. Where there has been contact with foams, skin should be rinsed; especially on children and before eating or drinking.

Report 4 on PFAS and the environment

Recommendations (cont):

- **When treating water or soil or when destroying PFAS-contaminated materials, only interventions with a technology readiness level (TRL) of 8 or above should be considered. Those include soil washing and immobilisation for soils; pump-and-treat with GAC/IX for plumes; and GAC/IX (and foam fractionation/RO/NF depending on setting) as principal water treatments and thermal destruction of resulting concentrates.**
- **Any system that treats or destroys PFAS should include a plan from the very beginning for how PFAS will be managed through the entire process, including what happens when the system reaches the end of its life. This prevents PFAS from being released later when the equipment is taken apart or when waste from the process needs to be handled.**
- **Biosolids should only be applied to land when the level of PFAS in that land is below the contamination threshold for that particular land type and will not be raised above that threshold by the application of biosolids.**
- **Seaweed may be used for soil enrichment even in locations where the level of PFAS is elevated for that particular land type. There may be non-PFAS considerations in some locations, however.**
- **Consideration should be given to the longer-term management of biosolids using destruction technologies. It is likely that this will require additional infrastructure.**
- **Use incineration as the primary PFAS destruction route for contaminated activated carbon or ion exchange resins where regeneration or recovery is not feasible.**
- **Use hazardous waste landfill solely as last resort containment for small volumes, such as post-incineration ash, and not bulk soils or biosolids**



Final Islander input period for Report 4

A five-week Islander input period starts now

We are inviting your feedback on:

- The content and recommendations in the report
- Whether or not you agree with the recommendations
- Any further questions and concerns you wish to raise

Please email PFASpanel@gov.je with your comments by 24th April



Questions and comments

