



Minutes of the EnviRecover Community Liaison Group Meeting 6 20th July 2010, Stourport Manor Hotel

Attendees:

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

Apologies:

Paul Lugg, Tom Purnell and Cllr Maurice Broomfield (Community)
John Plant and Javier Peiro (Mercia Waste Management)

1. Purpose:

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

2. Activities since previous CLG meeting:

2.i) Since the previous CLG meeting the EnviRecover Planning Application has been submitted to Worcestershire County Council.

2.ii) Mercia Waste Management have delivered further presentations on the EnviRecover proposal to Worcestershire County, Wychavon District and Rushock Parish Councils.

2.iii) Mercia Waste Management is continuing to respond to enquiries as they arise.

2.iv) The Environmental Permit application has been submitted to the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency may request an extension to the Permitting timeframe if required.

3. Issues raised

3.i) There has been some confusion in the media about the difference between the Efficiency Rate of EnviRecover and its Recovery Rate.

In our planning application we have stated that the facility will recover energy from the combustion of waste, by way of electricity and heat production. Because some 55 -65 % of the waste will be from renewable sources like paper, cardboard, timber and food waste, the energy is classified as Renewable.

This is not the same as the plant's efficiency. There is a threshold efficiency that the plant must meet if it is to qualify as a Recovery Operation under the European Waste Framework Directive. A complex

formula is used to determine whether the plant achieves this threshold – known as an R1 efficiency of 0.65. The formula takes account of the higher value of power compared to heat, by multiplying the power efficiency by 2.6 and the heat efficiency by 1.1. It is not the same as an efficiency of 65%.

In our Environmental Permit application we have implied a net efficiency (i.e. power exported divided by the heat in the waste) of 23.3%, which gives an R1 efficiency of 0.683.

(Note also that the Authorities have taken on a challenge to recover value from 78% of waste by 2015; this includes recycling, composting and energy.)

3.ii) EnviRecover will be CHP enabled. Mercia Waste Management is continuing to look into opportunities for heat recovery.

3.iii) A question was raised about the security of PFI credits. While Government has confirmed that there will be no new PFI schemes for waste management facilities, projects that have already been signed off (including EnviRecover) have security of funding.

3.iv) A CLG representative requested clarification on how PFI schemes work - Mercia will respond in due course.

3.v) There has been some confusion in the media over the Government's position on Anaerobic Digestion (AD) and Zero Waste. AD has operational limitations that make it unsuitable for the treatment of large quantities of residual waste. There are many AD facilities in continental Europe but the majority of these treat animal slurries on a farm scale. Worcestershire and Herefordshire Councils undertook a detailed Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) study, and more recently a Residual Options Appraisal, which identified Energy from Waste as the most suitable solution for treating residual municipal waste in the two counties.

Comments made by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) on Zero Waste refer to zero waste to *landfill*. If the EnviRecover proposal is successful, Mercia estimates by 2020 the amount of municipal waste being landfilled in the two counties could be as low as 4% of the total arisings.

3.vi) Some comments have suggested that EnviRecover is based on outdated technology. While burning waste is a technique that has been used for many years, the technology, operational regime and pollution abatement systems in the EnviRecover proposal are state-of-the-art.

3.vii) Issues have been raised regarding the scale of plant with some people claiming it is too large. Mercia Waste Management has undertaken detailed modelling to assess the likely waste arisings for the duration of the contract period. Among other factors, the modelling takes into account improved recycling and composting collections and the number of new houses. The County Councils need to meet progressive waste minimisation and recycling targets and are aiming to reach 50% recycling within the contract period. EnviroSort and other recycling initiatives (kerbside collections and household waste sites) mean there is capacity for 100,000 tonnes per year to be recycled in Worcestershire and Herefordshire.

However not all waste can be recycled or composted and affordability issues coupled with the law of diminishing returns mean that residual treatment capacity will always be needed. EnviRecover is most efficient when running at capacity and any excess will be met by treating small quantities of commercial waste arising in Worcestershire and Herefordshire. The technology will be continually improved to optimise energy efficiency.

3.viii) In case of prolonged breakdown, the contract waste will either need to be disposed of in landfill or treated in a neighbouring (out of county) facility until EnviRecover is operational again.

3.ix) Ash arising from EnviRecover will total around 20% of the input tonnage. The majority of this is bottom ash and will be safely recycled and used in road surfacing and construction. The market for incinerator bottom ash (IBA) has been strengthened by the development of an Environment Agency and WRAP (Waste and Resources Action Programme) waste protocol which enables the material to become a product rather than a waste (as long as it meets stringent quality controls). In addition, the reduction in the number of coal fired power stations in the UK mean there is less pulverised fuel ash (PFA) available on the market which will in turn drive demand for IBA. The only ash from the process that will be landfilled is the Air Pollution Control residue which will be disposed of in a hazardous waste landfill site. APC residue is classified as hazardous because it contains lime which is very alkaline.

3.x) Questions have been raised about the relationship between Worcestershire and Herefordshire County Councils and Mercia Waste Management. To clarify, Mercia Waste Management is underwriting this project and therefore carries the financial risk. Worcestershire County Council (as the Planning Authority) may reject the EnviRecover Planning Application in the same way that it has rejected other waste management applications from Mercia Waste Management in the past. Should the application be rejected and in turn appealed by Mercia Waste Management. Mercia will check this and respond in due course.

4. Community Fund

Mercia Waste Management will provide a Community Fund associated with EnviRecover. The Community Fund is not a material planning consideration and as the application has not yet been determined details of the Fund cannot be agreed at this stage. Mercia Waste Management and the Community Liaison Group representatives had a discussion about possible ways in which the Community Fund could be administered and the types of projects it might support. All agreed to discuss the details after the planning process has been completed subject to a successful application. Mercia Waste Management is keen to maintain open channels of communication with the community and to make sure people understand that the Community Fund is an ongoing plan.

5. Future Meetings

Mercia Waste Management will maintain open communication channels with the Community Liaison Group and meetings will continue as required. If the EnviRecover proposal is approved the

CLG will have revised aims, constitution and Terms of Reference. It was noted that the CLG may not need to be such a managed process and the Parish Council would continue to be involved.

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	4	0	0	Very confident
------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

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

Very difficult	0	0	0	4	0	Very easy
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	-----------

7. Acronyms

APC – Air Pollution Control

BPEO – Best Practicable Environmental Option

CHP – Combined Heat and Power

CV – Calorific Value (MJ/kg)

Defra – Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

EA – Environment Agency

EIA – Environmental Impact Assessment

IBA – Incinerator Bottom Ash

LATS – Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme

PFA – Pulverised Fuel Ash

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