Infrastructure and Environment

Gouvèrnément d'Jèrri

Water Quality & Safety

Questions & Answers

Infrastructure and Environment

If you have any questions that have not been answered below, please send to regulationenquiries@gov.je

Table of Contents

Responses to questions asked by Islanders at Report Four Scoping Meeting 11 February 2025

The questions have been grouped into key areas and the response given

Government Approach, Commitment and Legislation

Panel's Access to Information on Past Actions and Issues	The Independent PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel has access to all relevant historical data, background information, and ongoing studies. The panel also has ongoing access to officers if they require further information. This ensures their recommendations are grounded in a thorough understanding of past actions and current challenges. The input and expertise of the panel are highly valued, and the government must use world experts to understand the science and base its efforts on this. The Chair has made it clear that he and the panel members have never been asked to suppress any aspect of their work. The Government is fully committed to the openness and independence of the panel. If any attempt to intervene in their work were ever discovered, the Minister for the Environment and Minister of Health and Social Services who jointly Chair the Water Quality and Safety Programme would use all available powers to prevent such an attempt.
Politicians' Ability to Make Decisions on the complexity of PFAS	The complexity of PFAS contamination and the need for informed decision-making are recognised. The panel's work is conducted publicly, and input is sought from experts by experience and subject matter experts to ensure that the latest scientific research and best practices guide decisions. The knowledge and dedication of civil servants, along with their skill and commitment to ensuring that decisions are based on well-informed and detailed advice, are recognised by Ministers, who inform decisions regularly. It is acknowledged that PFAS and the emerging science are beyond the levels of expertise available solely in Government. This is precisely why the Panel is in place: to ensure that recommendations can be moved forward into policy, regulation, or direct action, knowing that world experts have informed the decision-making process.

Variation in approach by Guernsey and Jersey's Historical Management	There is insufficient background currently on the different approaches taken by Guernsey and Jersey. While both approaches can be compared, there are several physical and practical differences between the PFAS issues both Islands have had to deal with at their respective airports. The Government of Jersey is focused on progressing the understanding of what needs to be done to address the issues Jersey faces. While it can be helpful to review history and differences in approaches, it is believed that it is best to ensure the effort of resources working on the Water Quality and Safety programme is directed to the present and implementing recommendations that have a positive impact now. This will be achieved through the work of the scientific panel, water regulation, water treatment, and testing of food and the environment.
Implementation of the Panel's Recommendations	The Government is committed to implementing the recommendations of the PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel where appropriate. The Panel's reports are provided to Government once Islanders have been able to review and comment on the draft report, and the Panel have reviewed all comments and amended the report in light of comments. Once with Government, the Water Quality and Safety Board will review all recommendations and decide whether they should be implemented, and funding identified & agreed. Recommendations will be implemented subject to staffing capacity and in a priority order. Currently, the priority is the implementation of the Clinical Review Service for affected Islanders.

Implementing PFAS legislation and an independent regulator	Developing effective legislation requires comprehensive scientific research, stakeholder consultation, and the establishment of stringent and feasible regulatory standards. Before regulatory standards for PFAS in water can be amended, international standards must be reviewed, the impact on public health and the environment assessed, and the practicality and enforcement of the proposed regulations considered. This takes time. This thorough and meticulous approach is necessary to create robust and effective legislation. There is a commitment to introducing a robust regulatory standard for PFAS in mains water within this government term. Any changes to legislation need to be considered alongside advanced treatment technologies to reduce PFAS levels in the water supply, ensuring that the new regulatory standards are effectively met. Report Four will ensure that the best evidence is available for making these decisions. The Regulation Directorate, under the Water (Jersey) Law 1972, oversees water resources and quality. While the role an independent regulation could play is acknowledged, it is believed that in a small jurisdiction like Jersey, it is essential to carefully consider the additional benefits versus the potential for over-governance of a small population. Confidence is placed in achieving the same objectives with an open and transparent government, without needing a permanent independent regulatory body. There is the opportunity to seek independent review and input as required, such as through the Independent PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel. This approach allows for the benefit of expert advice and oversight without the continuous funding of independent bodies, which can be costly to general taxation. By balancing transparency, accountability, and fiscal responsibility, the government can effectively manage PFAS contamination and other environmental issues.

Water Quality and Treatment	
Water Treatment Plant	Building a water treatment plant is a complex process that involves several stages, including planning, design, permitting, construction, and commissioning. Depending on the size and complexity of the project, as well as regulatory and environmental considerations, it can take anywhere from 2 to 5 years to complete a water treatment plant. However, Jersey Water has already started planning the options and will be in an advanced position to act on the findings and recommendations of Report Four.
Water Supply Concerns	Concerns about the safety of mains water have been continually raised. Jersey Water adheres to current regulatory standards and conducts regular testing to ensure water quality. They publish an annual Water Quality report, providing detailed data across several water quality factors, including PFAS. For instance, Jersey Water's 2024 report demonstrated 100% compliance with current UK and EU regulatory standards for PFAS. Jersey Water maintains rigorous monitoring and adherence to standards and is a committed stakeholder in reducing PFAS further in the water supply.
Last Extraction from Boreholes	Jersey Water states that the boreholes impacted in St Ouen and Pont Marquet were historically used intermittently, as required to support water resources. Jersey Water stopped using the most contaminated borehole (number 1) in 2009, and the remaining boreholes were only used intermittently until November 2022, when reservoir levels required topping up.
Testing Tap Water for PFAS	Following Drinking Water Inspectorate requirements, Jersey Water samples the drinking water at the Handois and Augres outlet and does not routinely sample from customer properties for PFAS. Jersey Water have had less than a handful of customers request and pay for their own samples, but cannot share these results due to data protection. However, the results in general have been comparable to the samples we collect from the outlet of Handois or Augres. Tap point testing will be considered for inclusion in Report Four.

Island-Wide Impact and Wider Testing	
Blood Test Results and Official Statements	The 104 blood test results submitted to the Government have been accepted, however there is a need for further analysis and interpretation. There is the need for strict testing processes in PFAS testing which can affect test quality and needs factoring into the further analysis to ensure the findings are robust. As part of Report 3 the Panel have reviewed all the evidence that was submitted to them and there will be a further opportunity for Islanders to feedback on the Panel's work in April. Report 3 will include recommendations about testing and re-testing. The Government and Panel continue to be grateful to Islanders for their input into the Panel's work.
Recommendations for Private Boreholes	This is an important issue, as roughly 2,500 households depend on borehole supplies. Report Four will consider treatment options for boreholes. The importance of addressing this is recognized, and specific guidelines and treatment options for private well owners will be considered.

Considering Impact of PFAS Beyond the Plume	The plume refers to the area around the airport affected by PFAS contamination, where firefighting foams containing PFAS were historically used. It is defined by the extent of PFAS/PFOS in samples of surface water, groundwater, and soils collected historically. The recently conducted hydrogeological survey has undertaken regular monitoring to assess the spread and concentration of PFAS. This survey will produce an updated plume map based on recent sampling data collected during the project. The report is independent and will be published in Q2 this year. The Government acknowledges the need to understand the context of PFAS Island-wide, as PFAS is a global issue that impacts the food chain and environment. The focus on the plume area is required because it is a known 'hot spot' that necessitates a specific response. Much of the learning and actions needed can be implemented Island-wide. The hydrogeological study focuses on understanding the plume area but also examines impacts beyond this area. The government's focus on the plume is not misleading but a targeted approach to address the most affected areas. It is known that there has been a particular long practice that has led to 'hotspot' higher levels of PFAS than the baseline background level seen globally. It is acknowledged that PFAS will be present more widely and testing and monitoring efforts are being expanded to ensure an understanding of the background levels Island-wide.
Wider Testing and Priority Areas	We are prioritising a comprehensive testing programme to understand the extent of PFAS contamination better and inform our response and regulatory actions. We will focus on food sources, boreholes, sea foam, water and spray, and materials recycled to land. The results will be considered and interpreted in Report Four, and testing will be undertaken to support the Panel's work on this report. Results and data interpretation will be made available as part of Report Four.

Limiting New Exposure and Recycling	
Limiting use of PFAS products in the environment	The Minister for the Environment is committed to examining the impact of new PFAS exposure and considering how to limit the import and use of PFAS-containing products in the environment. Understanding the level of PFAS in materials recycled back onto land or liquids recycled back to sea is part of Report Four which will help in understanding and interpreting what regulatory levels could be introduced.
Use of Firefighting Foam Containing PFAS	Tracing back with accuracy the exact timelines so many years on is challenging. However, it can be said broadly that in the mid to late 1990s, it was emerging globally, and was being acknowledged that the PFAS in firefighting foam may cause environmental harm. At that stage (in the 90s), it is likely concluded that the government learned about potential environmental harm. Work is under way in report four and the Arcadis study to understand the chronological history relating to the use of foams containing PFAS.
Examination of PFAS Emissions from Waste Incinerator	PFAS emissions from Jersey's waste incinerator have not been researched in detail. The Hydrogeological Study and Report Four both begin to address waste products. Further actions may be required to understand PFAS levels in the waste incineration process and byproducts after both reports are concluded and published.

February 2025 Updates		
Petition Response	Minister for Environment and Minister for Health and Social Services response to petition when it gained 1000 signatures.	**Response from the Minister for the Environment** Thank you for your petition regarding the quality of Jersey's water, particularly PFAS (particularly PFOS and PFHxS) and nitrates, and the associated health risks. I appreciate your concern and the urgency of addressing this critical issue. I support the outcomes the petition calls for, and as a Minister, I am committed to ensuring that any actions are grounded in research and backed by scientific evidence. I am acutely aware of the challenges posed by PFAS contamination and the potential health risks it presents. Our government is committed to ensuring the safety and quality of our water supply and protecting public health. **Current Measures and Compliance** Our regulatory framework under the Water (Jersey) Law 1972 ensures that water quality is monitored. Jersey Water's 2024 report has demonstrated 100% compliance with current UK and EU regulatory standards for PFAS, and we are working towards introducing a specific regulatory requirement for Jersey to meet even stricter standards. **Water Quality and Safety Programme** The Water Quality and Safety (WQS) Programme is a comprehensive initiative to address public concerns about PFAS in the environment and their impact on our water. This programme consolidates various linked projects under a single governance structure, providing a coordinated and prioritised response to WQS, including the critical PFAS workstreams. In addition, the programme will review

		and monitor PFAS in the broader environment and food. The programme's formation signifies a serious ministerial commitment to delivering significant progress on these matters during the current government term. **Investment in Treatment and Regulation** I recognise the need for advanced treatment solutions to address PFAS contamination. This includes exploring treatment technologies and regulatory standards to reduce PFAS levels in our water supply. The Independent Scientific Advisory Panel commissioned by the Government are undertaking Report 4 - PFAS in the Environment in 2025. It will review global standards to allow me to recommend a regulatory standard for Jersey. I plan to introduce this standard in this government term with a phased implementation period. Reviewing international regulatory standards and treatment technologies helps inform our approach and ensure it is appropriate for the water management systems operated in Jersey. The example of Australia's $30M treatment plant in Katherine is a valuable model, and we are considering similar solutions to mitigate contamination effectively. I meet regularly with Jersey Water, who are committed to implementing treatment technology to reduce PFAS and nitrates in our water supply. Jersey Water has undertaken significant work reviewing the options. I am confident that when I bring forward a Jersey Regulatory standard for PFAS later this year, Jersey Water will be in an advanced position to implement treatment in their two water plants. **Stakeholder Engagement and Transparency** To ensure transparency and public awareness, we maintain open communication with stakeholders, including residents, Jersey Water, and the media. The independent PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel provides evidence-based advice for our public health policy and environmental management. The Panel's work is

		conducted in public, and it seeks input from 'experts by experience' and 'subject matter experts' to ensure Jersey has access to world-leading research and scientific learnings that are developing at a rapid pace. As Minister, I am committed to letting science lead actions and investments to ensure we can maximise every opportunity to remove PFAS from the environment. **Future Actions** Moving forward, I will continue to prioritise the implementation of a robust regulatory standard for PFAS in Jersey and investments in treatment technology to allow these regulations to be met. I am committed to bringing this standard before the Assembly within this government term. Additionally, we will deliver Report Four by the independent PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel and advance our research and monitoring efforts to allow us to understand better the specific environmental impacts we face in Jersey. My Natural Environment team will shortly publish an Independent Hydrogeological Survey Report to enhance our understanding of the impact of the historic use of PFAS-containing Fire-Fighting Foam at the airport. The study has widened previous monitoring areas and will give my officers vital information to help improve our understanding of the impact of PFAS on the environment around the airport. It will also help us develop interventions and treatments. The Water Quality and Safety programme will also widen its focus to understand PFAS in food, infrastructure and waste and will focus on PFAS levels and impacts Island-wide. Your petition highlights the importance of safeguarding public health, the food chain, and the environment. Rest assured, we are dedicated to addressing these concerns through coordinated efforts and international best practices. Thank you for your engagement and advocacy on this critical issue.

		Statement from the Minister for Health and Social Services Public Health commissioned the independent PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel in 2023, which has produced two of three planned reports on the impacts of PFAS on health. I am committed to delivering the report's recommendations and report three, which focuses on interventions to lower PFAS levels, blood testing, and re-testing. As the Minister for Health and Social Services, I want to assure you that we are taking significant steps to address the health impacts of PFAS contamination for all Islanders, especially in the Island's hotspot around the airport. We are establishing clinical review service for Islanders impacted by historic contamination from the Airport. These reviews will provide comprehensive health assessments and potential interventions for those affected. In 2025, training will also be provided for healthcare workers about PFAS. Furthermore, the Scientific Advisory Panel's third report will make further recommendations for health interventions to lower PFAS levels in the blood. This will guide our healthcare strategies and ensure we provide our affected community with the best care and support. This report is expected in Spring 2025.
PFAS in Pesticides	Reply to an Islanders request for clarification from panel member Ian Cousins	**From Ian Cousins, Environment Panel member**: I have been asked to respond to your email directly. In this response, I express my personal scientific opinion. As you point out in your email, I do think the widespread contamination of the environment with trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) is a global environmental problem which needs to be addressed. In my view, one should use safe and sustainable alternatives to PFAS pesticides going forward as a matter of precaution. However, it is also my opinion that the risk from TFA resulting from the use of PFAS pesticides in Jersey is not an imminent one based on our current understanding of

		TFA's toxicity. My concern is that if we continue to use chemicals which can transform into TFA (so called "TFA precursors") in the long term the levels in the environment and drinking water will continue to increase over the coming decades until the levels are eventually above safe thresholds. This would be especially problematic for TFA because it is very difficult and expensive to remove TFA from drinking water. My general position regarding PFAS, which is well documented in the media and the scientific literature, is that society should only use PFAS where they are essential (for health and safety or the functioning of society) and otherwise uses of PFAS should be substituted with safe and sustainable alternatives. I understand that Jersey do not analyze TFA in drinking water. It requires a separate analytical method from the method currently used by Jersey Water for the standard suite of PFAS chemicals. Our Panel has been commissioned to focus on the PFAS which accumulate and persist in blood. Any TFA is rapidly excreted and is usually not detected in the human body.
PFAS in Pesticides	Concerns regarding import and use of PFAS containing pesticides and reporting of this.	It is important to distinguish between long-chain PFAS, such as those found in firefighting foams, and the PFAS used as active ingredients in certain pesticide formulations. The latter, referred to as PFAS pesticides, include compounds like fluazinam, flufenacet, fluopyram, and trifloxystrobin. Officers have consulted with the PFAS Scientific Panel Expert on Environmental Impacts, who has provided the following context. Some reporting and reactions to using the four pesticides have not considered the key differences detailed below. The term PFAS covers a wide range of substances, including any substances containing CF2 or CF3 groups in the pesticides in use (fluazinam, flufenacet,

		fluopyram, and trifloxystrobin). The broad structural definition of PFAS means that PFAS have diverse properties, behaviour, hazards and risks. The PFAS in firefighting foams (AFFF) are quite different from the PFAS used as active ingredients the four pesticides. The PFAS in AFFF have long fully fluorinated carbon chains, making them bioaccumulative in humans and where they exert numerous health effects. In contrast, PFAS pesticides contain persistent C-CF3 fragments that can degrade into trifluoroacetic acid (TFA), an ultra-short-chain perfluoroalkyl acid. TFA is non-bioaccumulative and relatively non-toxic compared to long-chain PFAS. These pesticides have undergone rigorous safety testing and have been approved for use by regulatory authorities in the EU, UK, and US. Their approval is based on comprehensive evaluations of their safety profiles, including their toxicity, environmental impact, and potential for bioaccumulation. Below, I have a detailed summary of each pesticide. **Fluazinam** is a widely used fungicide with a relatively safe profile when used correctly. It does not accumulate in potato tubers and has a moderate environmental impact, primarily affecting soil organisms like earthworms. Given its low leachability and degradation properties, the risk of long-term soil accumulation is minimal. **Flufenacet** is a widely used herbicide with moderate toxicity. It does not significantly accumulate in soil or crops and has a moderate environmental impact.

		Fluopyram is a widely used insecticide with low toxicity and a low potential for bioaccumulation. It does not significantly accumulate in soil or crops and has a low environmental impact. **Trifloxystrobin** is a widely used fungicide with low toxicity and a low potential for bioaccumulation. It does not significantly accumulate in soil or crops and has a low environmental impact. Produce is tested by Government for pesticide residue annually, and flufenacet, fluopyram, and trifloxystrobin are included in the screen, but not fluazinam. No detections were made in residue tests during 2024. In addition to this testing, the Government monitors pesticide imports.
Tolerable Weekly Intakes	In 2020, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) established a tolerable weekly intake (TWI) of 4.4 ng/kg body weight for the sum of four PFAS compounds, covering all sources of food/water exposure. Considering this limit, could you clarify: • If Jersey were to align with this TWI, what concentration of PFAS in mains tap water	Thank you for your question seeking clarification on the Tolerable Weekly Intake (TWI) calculation and how Jersey compares to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) (TWI) of 4.4 ng/kg (nanograms/kilograms) body weight for the sum of four PFAS compounds. The four compounds are PFOS, PFOA, PFNA and PFHxs. PFNA has not been detected in the tests conducted by Jersey Water, which are contained in their 2024 Annual Water Quality Report. We have used the following information to derive the calculations below. The TWI (EFSA) is 4.4 ng/kg/week (4.4 ng/kg/wk converted to equal 0.0044 µg/kg/week) Then: 85kg persons TWI = 0.374 µg/week 72kg persons TWI = 0.3168 µg/week

	would be considered appropriate? • How does our current drinking water level of approximately 50 ng/L compare to a theoretical calculation based on EFSA's guidelines? For example, Denmark derived a limit of 2 ng/L in drinking water by working backwards from EFSA's TWI, factoring in average daily water consumption, body weight (particularly of small children), and the contribution of PFAS from other food sources. Has a similar calculation been considered or undertaken for Jersey?	Average amount of the three compounds present in Jersey Water = 0.013 µg/l (based on published data for the four compounds only) Average of 1.5 litres per day of drinking water consumed (based on advice from the Scientific Panel) Assumed there is 100% (i.e. perfect) absorption of the four PFAS into the body during ingestion Weekly intake in Jersey from Drinking Water for **85kg person** = 0.013 µg/l x 10.5 (1.5 litres x 7) = 0.1365 µg/week, which is **36.5% of the TWI** Weekly intake in Jersey from Drinking Water for **72kg person** = 0.013 µg/l x 10.5 (1.5 litres x 7) = 0.1365, which is **43.1% of the TWI** We currently do not have sufficient information on the levels of the four compounds in food sources to undertake a complete TWI calculation for Jersey. The independent scientific panel in Report Four, which focuses on PFAS in the environment, will research possible levels in food sources and how this relates to tolerable weekly intakes. The intention of Report Four is to follow the example of other countries, such as Denmark, which you reference in your email and work back from TWI to calculate the regulatory limits required for drinking water in Jersey. The government will also monitor levels in local food sources to provide test data to support the panel's work. Thank you for your questions, which we have tried to answer in part and are committed to responding in full through Report Four. If you have any further questions, please let me know.

Further Blood Testing	Is there was more information please on the blood testing available for PFAS levels for individuals living in the affected area?	The PFAS Panel are currently considering testing and re-testing as part of Report 3. This is due to be presented to islanders in April in draft form. Once finalised following a period of consultation, the Government will review the recommendations and agree whether to adopt the recommendations, and agree funding.
The Government of Jersey will continue to add questions asked and responses given to this document to build up a repository of information on Water Quality and Safety. Information provided in response to Freedom of Information Requests can be viewed at Freedom of Information requests and responses.		

January 2025 Update		
Generic Area	**Specific Question(s)**	**Answer**
Testing Standards for Water Supply	What are the testing levels for liquid entering the water treatment plant, and what levels are achieved post-treatment? What testing and analysis is conducted on Jersey's water supply? What were the levels in water in the past?	Jersey Water publishes testing data for PFAS annually and outlines how these compare to the regulations and standards it follows. You can view the 2024 Water Quality Report and previous years by clicking here. The testing covers both raw and treated water samples. Jersey Water has recently commenced testing for PFAS in the sludge created from the separation of silt/solids during the water treatment process. The testing data is not yet available. The Scientific Panel Report Four will undertake further research in this area which is an industry issue globally with emerging treatment technology. Jersey Water are taking steps to ensure the situation is fully understood. Jersey Water started testing for PFAS in April 2019, and the results have been reported in the annual water quality report since then are published on the Jersey Water website. Water Quality Report - Jersey Water
	Are these levels deemed acceptable?	Drinking water in Jersey is regulated according to the Water (Jersey) Law 1972 (as amended). Under this law, Jersey Water is legally required to maintain a supply of "wholesome" water sufficient for domestic purposes. Wholesome water is defined in the associated regulatory schedule and includes a requirement that it does not contain any microorganism, parasite, or substance at a concentration or value that would constitute a potential danger to human health.

		In the absence of specific water quality parameters relating to PFAS in Jersey, regulations and best practices within the UK and EU are used to monitor test results. The EU requires the sum of PFAS (20 compounds) to be less than 0.1µg/l by 12 January 2026 which Jersey Water mains water is fully compliant with. The Jersey Water Quality Report details their performance against these standards and demonstrates compliance with these standards.

Nitrates	What are the standards and processes for removing Nitrates?	Drinking water provided by Jersey Water in Jersey is regulated under the Water (Jersey) Law 1972 (as amended). The law sets out a limit that Nitrate levels in drinking water do not exceed a maximum of 50 mg/litre. A Ministerial decision is in place that, under certain circumstances, would allow Jersey Water to breach the agreed 50mg/litre level. Whilst this is in place Jersey Water has complied with the nitrate standard in drinking water of (50 mg/l) for over a decade and has not needed to utilise the dispensation to maintain supply. This is achieved by selecting and blending raw water supplies. It was also due to the availability of low nitrate water collected in the reservoirs before the growing season began. An Action for Cleaner Water Group comprised of agricultural industry (potato and dairy), Jersey Water and Government representatives have, for some time, worked jointly together to address Island water quality issues. The continuing lowering of nitrates in streams is an example of the good work of the group. Both surface water (streams) and groundwater average annual levels remain below the EU and local drinking water limit of 50mg/l. Average levels of nitrates in groundwater have levelled off, with surface water levels continuing to decrease. For more information, click this link to read Jersey Water's annual Water Quality Reports.

Jersey Water Blending	Do Jersey Water still use blending processes to achieve lower PFAS levels?	Jersey Water is not blending water to achieve lower PFAS concentrations. The boreholes in St Ouen's Bay and the abstraction point at Pont Marquet are not in use and have not been used since 2022. Blending is a process used to maintain the quality of water throughout the year, but it is not a specific practice because of PFAS.
Reclamation Site Leak Testing	Is there testing to assess whether the reclamation site near La Collette is leaking PFAS into St. Aubin's Bay?	No, at present there is no specific routine testing for PFAS in this area.
Meeting Time	Change the time of the meeting to suit those coming from town or working.	A survey was circulated to the contacts database. Most of the respondents preferred a 6 p.m. start time and agreed that Les Orms was a good location. Therefore, we have moved future meetings to a 6 p.m. start at Les Orms.

Public Knowledge	What is GOJ doing to increase public awareness of PFAS?	The Government maintains a website that provides information on PFAS and publishes all the papers and minutes from the PFAS Scientific Panel. The website is being improved, and it will include a FAQ section that will contain answers to all questions raised by the public that do not contain personal information or identifiable information. The Government is committed to continuing public meetings and making all information on PFAS public through the website. The Government will continue commissioning the PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel, whose business is conducted in public. The PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel is an independent panel. It's made up of external experts recruited from a global pool of specialists in their field. All reports are scoped, prepared, and published in the public domain. The Water Quality and Safety programme has a project specifically for public relations, and over the coming year, the website will be improved with significantly more advice and information.
Continuity of Information	What information has been provided to Regulation as part of a handover?	Regulation has been working on PFAS in the background with colleagues in Public Health and Natural Environment for some time. The Water Quality and Safety Programme is about ensuring a coordinated approach, but there is an ongoing need for colleagues from Public Health and Natural Environment to continue as subject matter experts in their area. Briefings have taken place to ensure knowledge transfer and continuity of approach. Information is being collated and organised into a single shared structure to ensure historical information is accessible and available to inform future decision-making.

Food	How is PFAS in food monitored and what standards do we follow?	The Government of Jersey will generally adopt EU parameters for contaminants in food. The EU introduced parameters for PFAS in certain foods on the 1st of January 2023 through this Regulation: COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) 2023/915. The Government of Jersey has plans to begin a sampling regime based on the parameters set in the aforementioned legislation. This will build on our small trial test performed on potatoes in December 2023 and May 2024.

Establishing background PFAS levels	Based on the blood results in 2022, can you calculate the likely levels of PFAS in blood at the height of the issue?	As part of their work for Report Two, the Scientific Advisory Panel compared the blood results of Jersey plume Islanders with levels from other hotspot areas. The full details of the panel's conclusions can be ready in Report Two, section 6.1 - Comparability of exposure. A summary of the main points and conclusions are as follows: **Key Comparisons and Extrapolations:** 1. **Ronneby, Sweden:** • **Average PFOS Levels:** 135 ng/ml • **Timing of Testing:** 6 months to 2 years after primary exposure was identified and stopped. • **Extrapolated Levels:** If testing were conducted 16 years after exposure, the levels would be expected to fall to approximately 10 ng/ml due to PFOS's half-life of about 3 years. 2. **Australia:** • **Average PFOS Levels:** 5.5 ng/ml • **Timing of Testing:** About 4 years after contaminated groundwater was identified and alternative sources were used. • **Extrapolated Levels:** Given the half-life of PFOS, the levels might have been about twice as high (around 11 ng/ml) when the exposures were first identified and controlled. 3. **Jersey:**

		• **Median PFOS Levels:** 10.9 ng/ml • **Timing of Testing:** 16 years after the most contaminated water supplies were replaced in 2006. **Analysis:** • **Half-Life Consideration:** The half-life of PFOS is approximately 3 years. This means that the levels of PFOS in the blood decrease by half every 3 years. • **Extrapolation for Jersey:** If we consider the timing of the Jersey blood tests (16 years after exposure), the levels would have been higher closer to the period of exposure. Using the half-life, we can estimate that the levels would have been significantly higher shortly after the exposure was controlled. **Conclusion:** Based on the extrapolation from the Ronneby data, it is reasonable to assume that the PFOS levels in Jersey residents would have been much higher if tested closer to the exposure period. The current median level of 10.9 ng/ml in Jersey is consistent with the expected decrease over time due to the half-life of PFOS. While there are uncertainties, the Ronneby data provides a valuable reference point. The consensus view is that the exposure in Ronneby is reasonably similar to the situation in Jersey – because this area had exposure from the same type of fire fighting foam in drinking water - making it a useful source of evidence for understanding potential health effects in the Jersey plume area.

Domestic Water Filters for Plume Residents	What filters are recommended for removing PFAS from the domestic water supply within the household? How do you safely dispose of the filters used? Is the Minister considering funding support for these filters?	The scientific panel will focus on the effectiveness of options to treat the public water supply as part of Report 4's scope. As detailed in the Jersey Water Annual Water Quality Report, the drinking water in Jersey's public supply meets both EU and UK regulations. However, some Islanders may wish to explore and utilise domestic treatment options to reduce PFAS further in their supply. To date, the government of Jersey has not conducted any independent research or testing of products designed to reduce water contaminants. However, the Environmental Working Group in America has undertaken independent testing of household options and provided helpful guidance. EWG's 2024 guide to countertop water filters | Environmental Working Group and Getting 'forever chemicals' out of drinking water: EWG's guide to PFAS water filters | Environmental Working Group. Although the links are to American retailers the items reviewed are readily available from UK retailers. Any government decision to fund specific domestic filtration solutions must be grounded in sound research and scientific evidence of their effectiveness. Therefore, the Ministers have asked for a review of domestic treatment options to be an early phase of Report Four, after which they will consider the merit of recommending and funding appropriate options. This will be considered alongside the options for a unilateral reduction in PFAS levels through additional treatment methods at our two water treatment plants.

Delay in informing Plume residence of original contamination	Why was there a delay in informing residents that their borehole may have PFAS?	Given the passage of time, it is difficult to investigate the background and conclude with any certainty the reasons for any delay in informing residents. The Ministers are focused on ensuring absolute information transparency moving forward, as demonstrated by the public meetings, the website and the panel's work being undertaken in public.