

**Minutes of the EnviRecover Community Liaison Group Meeting 5
18th March 2010, Stourport Manor Hotel**

Attendees:

Neil Proffitt, Sharon Davies, Cllr John Webb, Cllr Roy Murphy, Cllr Maurice Broomfield (Community)
Javier Piero, John Plant, Ian Barber (Mercia Waste Management)
Caroline Macdonald, Zoë Lenkiewicz (Sauce Consultancy)

Apologies:

Tom Purnell, Paul Lugg,

1. Purpose:

1.i) To share information and engage in balanced discussions regarding the EnviRecover proposal.

2. Actions from previous meeting:

2.i) Since the previous CLG meeting three members of the CLG have resigned. Essentially all three did not wish to continue with the CLG as it did not fulfil their expectations and was not worth their time. The reasons given for this action were:

- Cynical marketing exercise by Mercia

The Chair clarified that from the outset, it had been made clear that this was a consultation exercise for the Mercia EnviRecover planning proposal. It was not a consultation as part of a scoping project nor was it an issues and options consultation. Therefore all responses to issues raised by the community reps would be made by Mercia as opposed to the national or local government.

- Went against the Terms of Reference

The Chair clarified that the ToR had been rechecked for evidence of this. The ToR clearly states that representation or membership of the CLG does not mean individuals support the proposal and its existence was purely for the EnviRecover planning application.

- Myths handout taken from CLG discussions

The Chair clarified that the myths hand out was not drawn from the CLG discussions – the agreed minutes clearly state what was discussed and any potential mis-information clarified. The myths handout was drawn from media and internet reports brought to the attention of Mercia, including letters into the local press and comments following online articles. The myths hand out was not too dissimilar to the FAQ's.

- Community views “not clearly represented”

The Chair clarified that from the outset, the issues discussed by the CLG were set in the first meeting by the community representatives independently of Mercia reps (who left the room whilst these were being discussed). Furthermore the real opportunity for community views to be represented comes when the application has been submitted and the statutory consultation period has begun.

- CLG documents have not been easily found on the EnviRecover website

The Chair clarified that in recognition of this the EnviRecover website has been updated, in particular the section relating to the CLG. In addition there is now an EnviRecover Blog which can be accessed via www.envirecover.com

- A lot of people had not returned to the CLG after the first meeting

The Chair clarified that the Mercia has contacted those people who had either expressed an interest in joining the CLG prior to its inception and those who had attended the first but not the subsequent meetings to find out why individuals had not participated. A number cited personal reasons however the majority did not respond.

2.ii) Mercia Waste Management offered to hold a Question and Answer session prior to the planning submission, which has now been delayed until the end of April.

2.iii) Over one hundred people attended the recent EnviRecover exhibition. The majority of people attending had not been to the previous EnviRecover exhibition.

2.iv) The presentation and minutes from the previous CLG meeting have been published on the EnviRecover website.

2.v) With regard to the alternative weather stations suggested in the local area by a CLG member, Fichtner have looked into the data available from these stations and have determined that:

- Waresley Park station only records rainfall
- Stourbridge station does not collect wind direction data.

Studies are ongoing and Fichtner have agreed to contact these weather stations with a view to finding other suitable alternatives with which to supplement current data.

2.vi) As there are no further scheduled CLG meetings prior to planning submission, Mercia will provide CLG members with direct email updates.

3. John Plant, Mercia Waste Management Presentation – Response to Concerns and Issues (Pt II)

The full presentation will be made available on the EnviRecover website.

Supplementary Q&A:

D8 Where did the waste figures come from assuming an increase in waste by 2020?

- i) The figures have been obtained from a number of sources including the JMWS and RSS together with Mercia's knowledge of waste arising in the two counties.
- ii) CLG representative indicated the potential for 6,000 new houses in the south of the county and queried whether this would affect the centre of gravity for waste generation. Mercia responded that this number of houses in the south would be unlikely to significantly impact the outcomes of the modelling to date. Waste arisings growth was modelled for the Traffic Assessment at around 1% p.a., weighted geographically according to the likely location of new houses

D9 How will capacity be maintained if waste leftover after recycling reduces?

- i) This is not projected to be an issue, experience in Europe suggests that EfW will be required in order to extract value from the waste that is not suitable for recycling. Mercia's analysis is that the plant is "right sized" to meet future need

D12 If Mercia's other plant at Norton can recycle 105,000 tonnes there is not enough to support 200,000 tonnes

- i) This has been considered in the calculations of the EfW capacity required.

E10 Why is the building so large? There are 'nicer' ones being built elsewhere

- i) A curved building would need to be taller and would therefore be more prominent in the local setting.
- ii) It is not technologically possible to meet UK regulations without a tall stack.

E11. How can MWM be seen as providing a balanced view on the needs of waste management, as they are a private company whose parent company manufactures incinerators?

- i) CLG representatives requested further details on alternatives to incineration.

Autoclave: Mercia is not aware of an existing market for the fibrous outputs of autoclave, so at present these outputs would need to be landfilled or incinerated. Incineration of autoclave outputs poses further difficulties due to high moisture content (40%) and low calorific value (CV). Mercia Waste Management therefore considers autoclave to be an unsuitable solution.

A CLG representative spoke about a company in the Rhondda Valley that is manufacturing products from autoclave outputs, and agreed to provide further details to Mercia.

It was noted that exporting autoclave outputs to China may not be legal as only recyclate can legally be exported.

Anaerobic Digestion (AD): AD is ideal for treating source-separated, wet biodegradable waste such as kitchen waste and farm slurries. While it is possible with extensive pre-treatment to anaerobically digest residual municipal waste, the outputs would not be

derived from source separated material and as such digestate and would need to be landfilled or used as landfill cover or restoration material since it could be contaminated with things such as heavy metals.

Plasma Arc Gasification: This technology, whilst very effective at dealing with pharmaceutical and chemical waste, is at present very expensive compared to traditional incineration. Therefore while it is suitable for small quantities of e.g. highly classified waste it is not financially feasible for the large quantities of MSW requiring treatment in Worcestershire and Herefordshire.

ii) Mercia confirmed that neither parent company nor Mercia itself manufactures incinerators.

E13. How can MWM technology proof the plant or process or need, as a great deal could happen in the lifetime of the plant?

i) A CLG representative enquired whether the building would be adaptable for new uses or technologies in the future. In principle this would be feasible. However there is nothing foreseeable that would replace this technology.

ii) A CLG representative enquired how the building would age and what would be done to prevent it becoming an 'eye-sore' in the future. Mercia responded that while the building will age, it will be constructed to a high standard and well-maintained.

F6. As the plant is a PFI initiative, what money will MWM directly invest into the scheme?

i) PFI credits are a contribution to the County Councils to enable them to offset the debt for a major infrastructure project of this kind. Mercia Waste Management receives no financial benefit from this PFI credit system. Furthermore, 15-20% of the cost will be met by Mercia's shareholders.

G1. Why do Mercia believe that any community will accept incineration in any forms?

i) There are many communities who have accepted incineration. For example, there are four energy-from-waste facilities around the city of Copenhagen, and some of them are very close to residential areas. In the UK there is a legacy of concern due to the old style of incinerators (which have since been closed down).

H4. What are the running costs of this plant every year?

i) A CLG representative asked for comparative costs of landfill and the EnviRecover solution. Mercia confirmed that EnviRecover will be cheaper than the costs of landfill.

H7. Apart from PFI, what other grants either local or national are available to MWM?

i) Mercia is not aware of any grants that it could utilise in the project.

H9. With a number of these incinerators being known to catch fire, what guarantees can MWM offer?

i) Fires at energy-from-waste facilities are extremely rare. The majority of fires at waste management facilities occur at recycling facilities and landfill sites, not at energy-from-waste facilities. Insurers will require high levels of fire suppression (including water cannons) that would rapidly extinguish any accidental fire.

H13. At the end of its useful life who will fund the plant's decommissioning and disposal of contamination?

i) Mercia cannot comment upon this - the life of the plant exceeds that of its contract; ownership of EnviRecover will revert to the Council at the end of the contract.

J3. How will the heat produced in CHP be used in summer? What is the heat requirement during these periods? What will be done with the residual?

i) Mercia Waste Management are in ongoing talks to establish heat clients with consistent demand in order to maximise the opportunities for Combined Heat and Power (CHP).

4. AOB

4.i) CLG representatives confirmed that Mercia Waste Management had responded to all the issues raised in Meeting 1. CLG representatives requested that Mercia produce a document to demonstrate how this had been achieved (i.e. which meetings and presentations dealt with which issues). This has been included as an appendix to this Meeting Report. It was also noted that further detail would be available in the Planning Application.

4.ii) All presentations from the CLG meetings are available on the EnviRecover website.

4.iii) The EnviroSort facility at Norton is now officially open and Mercia extended an invitation to CLG representatives to visit the facility. Those wishing to take up the invitation should contact Ian Barber (whose contact details were provided to the CLG members) to arrange a visit.

4.iv) A CLG representative enquired about the expected life of the Hill and Moor landfill site. Mercia confirmed that last year in addition to waste disposed of in other landfills and out of county EfW facilities that around 180,000 tonnes of waste was landfilled at the site. If waste inputs to the landfill continued at that rate the expected year of closure would be 2019/20.

4.v) A CLG representative enquired about the alternatives to a new waste management facility for Worcestershire and Herefordshire. Mercia confirmed that without a new facility, the Councils would be subject to significant LATS fines or would have to export waste out-of-county for disposal.

4.vi) A full copy of the Planning Application will be made available to members of the CLG.

4.vii) Mercia Waste Management and Sauce Consultancy extended their thanks to CLG representatives for their attendance and valuable contributions to the meetings.

5. Future Meetings

This meeting was the final scheduled meeting for the CLG. Mercia Waste Management offered to meet again with the CLG during the statutory consultation period (i.e. after submission of the Planning Application). CLG members wishing to attend a further meeting in this period were requested to email Caroline Macdonald on carolinemacdonald@sauceconsultancy.co.uk indicating the required content for the agenda.

6. Satisfaction

Group members were asked to indicate on a sliding scale how satisfied they were with the following two aspects of the meeting:

1. How confident do you feel that the liaison group will be worth your while?

Not at all	0	0	1	2	1	Very confident
------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

2. How easy do you find it to participate in the CLG meeting?

Very difficult	0	0	0	3	2	Very easy
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	-----------

7. Acronyms

APC – Air Pollution Control

CHP – Combined Heat and Power

CV – Calorific Value (MJ/kg)

EA – Environment Agency

EIA – Environmental Impact Assessment

LATS – Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme

MSW – Municipal Solid Waste

MWM – Mercia Waste Management

PAS100 – BSI Publicly Available Specification for Compost Materials

PPS – Planning Policy Statement

RCV – Refuse Collection Vehicle

HGV – Heavy Goods Vehicle

8. Append

8.i) A notice of resignation was received by Peter Townley after the meeting had been held as Mr Townley felt the CLG was of limited use with most of the fundamental issues not being discussed.



8.ii) The Chair responded to Mr Townley to thank him for his participation and to reiterate that the CLG had been convened as part of the consultation for a planning application not as part of an issues and options project.