

## **Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 11 Notes**

### **Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel (CLP) Meeting 11 Monday 21st June 2010, 18.30 – 20.30**

**Attended** – See attached.

#### **Introductions and actions from last meeting:**

Robin Treacher Covanta Communications Director introduced himself.

#### **Actions from last meeting -**

Covanta to provide forecast A421 traffic data – completed and circulated with notes

Covanta to provide maximum traffic noise figures – on the agenda for this meeting together with response to follow up queries asking for maximum noise forecasts, see end of notes for details

Covanta to report on the report of radioactive material getting into landfill and explain waste flow monitoring processes for the RRF – on agenda for next meeting

Covanta to provide noise data for a comparable facility – to be provided, Kate Fairweather (KF) to chase a response

Malcolm Chilton from Covanta was unable to attend the meeting and sent his apologies; the item he was due to present regarding financial savings flow through to Local Authorities was deferred to the next meeting.

**Local Impact Report (LIR) process** – Sue Marsh (SM) Central Bedfordshire Council presented – see presentation attached

#### **Questions**

##### **How do CLP members provide input to the LIR?**

Contact Sue Marsh Telephone 0300 300 6032, email [susan.marsh@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:susan.marsh@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk)

##### **What is the timescale for input?**

Current Covanta plans to put in the application mid July means that the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) could validate mid August at the earliest, and the LIR has to be submitted in 6 weeks after that. As the school holidays are coming up the process really needs to start now.

##### **Action CLP members to provide local issues to Sue for inclusion in the LIR**

##### **Who is being contacted to provide input?**

Sue has presented to the Marston Vale Liaison Group as well as the CLP and has asked Covanta for the list of organisations they have consulted.

##### **Action Covanta to provide Sue with the contact list of organisations**

The CLP suggested that Sue needed to put adverts in the local press, and send information to all Parish Clerks to put on Notice boards, in newsletters and on their web sites.

**As there is scope for the LIR to cover aspects that are not usually part of the planning process, could it cover the wider impact of this development with other similar operations in the area, and the development of the entire Rookery South Pit site as a result of the RRF being built there? This is an issue of concern for the local community.**

Yes it can include this type of issue - the Council planners will be able to provide input on the wider development impacts.

##### **Action SM to include this issue on the list for the LIR to address**

## **Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 11 Notes**

### **How will the Bedfordshire and Luton Waste Policy that finished consultation shortly feed into the LIR?**

The policy consultation completes in July and has conclusions on sites suitable for development: The Rookery South site has been identified as suitable for processing of locally produced waste, which the Covanta proposal doesn't fit. This issue will be covered in the Committee Report on the proposal to the IPC, but can also be addressed in the LIR. However the Waste Policy will not have great weight until it is adopted, and this will not be achieved until it has been through a final hearing with the Inspector.

**Bottom ash processing and recycling** - David York MD of Ballast Phoenix (BP) presented – see presentation attached. Ballast Phoenix is the contractor for Bottom Ash processing at the site for the lifetime of the plant, producing Incinerated Bottom Ash Aggregates (IBAA) that will be sold to the construction industry

### **Questions**

#### **How can paper come through the incineration process?**

Dense paper items such as phone books can go through on the moving grate and the core still be intact when it is ejected.

#### **Action Covanta to explain how much of the waste will not be fully incinerated in the process**

#### **Will the Bottom Ash be stockpiled?**

BP will take the Bottom Ash from the plant, store and process it on site and BP will typically hold a stockpile of 6 months production in heaps at the site to allow the site to supply large construction projects and over periods when materials are not in demand (poor weather, recession). No raw IBA will leave the site.

#### **What are the noise impacts of the process?**

The processing involves crushing material over 40mm, which is screened out and held, then crushed in batches of 5000 tonnes. This process is all completed inside the building on site.

#### **Will the Bottom Ash be dusty?**

No, it is quenched in the Covanta plant so it is soggy when it arrives and does not become dusty. Stockpiles crust over so there is no dust at this stage either.

#### **You test the leachate for pollutants – if you find increased level of pollution how do you escalate this with Covanta as the source of the waste?**

The content of Municipal and Industrial/Commercial waste is fairly constant – this is the same across Europe, it does not change significantly. However BP will test several times year to check there are no changes to the leachate, and if there is a change would raise this with Covanta. In 12 years of running these operations BP has seen consistent levels of content with minor changes – these have always been due to new waste streams coming in. BP will have daily liaison with Covanta, plus monthly Management meetings and this is where these issues would be monitored. BP send the leachate to laboratories to test 3 to 4 time p.a – they test for dioxins twice p.a and also test for bacteria such as listeria.

#### **How often will the water be discharged from the pond?**

Most of the water will be recycled back into the RRF for quenching. Unusual rainfall events are taken into account and there is provision to store excess water in tanks on site.

#### **Where will the IBAA go to and what will the traffic effects be?**

## **Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 11 Notes**

BP will produce 115k tonnes per annum which will be sold to a variety of users – road schemes, factory construction etc. The IBAA will be shipped by open top tippers and will use about 100 vehicles on average per week.

### **How will you deal with iron waste?**

Metals are collected, separated and go for recycling off site. Usually the process produces 4% by mass ferrous metals and 1.5% non-ferrous.

### **We have read about an issue where concrete blocks made from IBAA exploded – will there be any concrete block manufacture on site?**

No, however BP supply IBAA for manufacture of concrete blocks. The incident where foamed concrete exploded was investigated and a result of a contractor not following clear Health and Safety Datasheet instructions to ventilate the area and not to use electrical tools, as foam concrete can produce hydrogen during a three day setting period.

One of the CLP members will prepare a further list of questions for BP to respond to.

### **Action CLP member to send the list of questions to KF to forward to BP for response**

**Noise issues – follow up on previous presentation** by Colin English of the English Cogger Partnership – see presentation attached.

### **How do we know what affect the additional noise will actually have, can we have a simple explanation of why the additional noise will not have a high impact – is there anyone we can talk to who has experienced this kind of noise change so get their opinions?**

There will be times when local people will hear the operational noise, depending on wind direction. However because the existing noise in a similar spectrum to the predicted noise from the plant it will not be obvious as the source. Additionally because the additional noise will be constant worldwide research shows that people will not find it attention drawing.

Traffic noise is of more concern than operational noise – the same principles apply, if there is already a lot of noise a new source of noise will effectively be drowned out. Moving traffic on a road produces a fairly constant noise so the additional traffic on the de-trunked A421 will not be distinguishable from the forecast traffic noise.

A single lorry passing close to houses would produce about 85dB and this may be distinguishable from the noise of other noise going past at 5.00 am.

### **Action Covanta to produce a simpler explanation of how additional noise impacts are calculated and advise of whether there are communities or studies the CLP could refer to about the actual perception of noise increase in similar situations**

**Monitoring of air emissions** – presentation by Stephen Othen of Fichtner – see presentation attached.

## **Questions**

### **Are the “nastiest” emissions only being monitored every 3 months because of cost?**

It is costly to monitor emissions of the dioxins, furans, heavy metals, but emissions of these are also usually constant because the content of waste going into the plant is constant. However techniques for continuous monitoring are being developed and EA would probably set a Permit Condition requiring Covanta to review these for use.

### **Would Covanta consider putting continuous monitoring into place as part of their Visitor Centre activity?**

## **Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 11 Notes**

### **Action Covanta to respond to this proposal**

**Could EA impose additional monitoring checks by EA of the site over the first 2 years of operation to establish community confidence that the plant is safe?**

Where there are greater levels of perceived risk and concerns EA do more checks.

**The higher levels of pollutants to the North East of the site matches information from the Met Office about the prevailing winds in the area – it is important that levels continue to be monitored** by the continuous monitoring station at **Stewartby** rather than the **Forest Centre** otherwise the monitoring will miss the most affected area.

**Action Covanta to review the siting of the diffusion tube to place it back in the north east direction**

**How much higher are Mercury levels than is normal for a rural area?**

2 or 3 times higher – no obvious explanation for this apart from the industrial history of the area

### **Date of next meeting and items to cover**

**Date of next meeting Monday 19<sup>th</sup> July**

#### **Items on the agenda:**

Financial savings flow through to Local Authorities

Monitoring of content of waste coming into the RRF – following concerns raised by radioactive waste getting into landfill

Response from Covanta to the Middlewich Incinerator planning refusal, and Cardiff planning refusal

CLP members to provide any other items for the Agenda by 5<sup>th</sup> July to allow Covanta to arrange for presenters to be available.

## Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 11 Notes

### Attendance

Nigel Milway	Chair of "Revamp" Ampthill - Apologies
Hugh Roberts	MMAG
Barry Halton	Volunteer with Beds CPRE
Tony Talbot	MD Forest of Marston Vale
Gary Summerfield	Ampthill Town Council - Apologies
Lisa Frangiamore	Houghton Conquest P. C. - Apologies
Jennie Thomas	Millbrook Parish Meeting - Apologies
David Cooper	Stewartby Parish Council
Alan Barnard	Maulden Parish Council - Apologies
Peter Neale	Marston Morteyne Parish Council
Richard Franceys	Resident – Apologies, Sean Tyrell substituting
Ed Hiam	Resident
Robina Chatham	Resident - Apologies
Independent Observers	
Sue Marsh	Principal Minerals and Waste Planning Officer, Central Bedfordshire Council
Alasdair McKellar	PPC Compliance Officer, Environment Agency
Covanta representatives	See below
Kate Fairweather	Independent Chair

Attending this meeting for Covanta:  
Robin Treacher Communications Director

Rachel Ness Director of Planning - Apologies

### Presenters:

David York Ballast Phoenix – Bottom ash processing  
Colin English English Cogger Partnership – Noise  
Stephen Othen Fichtner – Air emissions monitoring

## **Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 11 Notes**

**Details of queries from CLP Members regarding the presentation on noise – these issues were addressed at this meeting under the agenda item Noise Issues.**

"Hi Kate – Could you get clarification for me on the noise presentation we had on Monday? In thinking about what was said and looking at the notes we were given, it seems to me that the claim that the increase in noise (a couple of decibels) would be virtually imperceptible may be misleading. As Peter pointed out, the numbers presented were, I think, all based on LAeq – which averages the sound energy over a period. The change in this averaged value may be small enough to be imperceptible but this does not tell us anything about the peak sound level – or anything between peak and average. Colin also made a differentiation between vehicle noise and traffic noise – isn't it vehicle noise that is likely to be the greater problem rather than an averaged hum of traffic? Could we get clarification and does it leave unanswered the true noise impact?"

"I too came away confused about what we were being told and I have to agree with you that it seems we may be being sold a pup.

Surely noise is a multi faceted issue what cannot be simply passed of with average db levels.

Frequency of the sound for one thing must make a vast difference to the way that sound is perceived ie. if the sound is at the same db level at 50hz then the same db at 5000hz is completely different.

I would like considerably more clarification and information on this."