

**Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 15
Monday 14th February 2010, 18.30 – 20.00**

Attending – See attached.

1. Introductions and actions from last meeting, including the update on CLP membership and review of Rookery CLP Terms of Reference

Most actions are covered on the Agenda below. Other actions are:

- Kate Fairweather (KF) to identify and approach a member of the business community to join the CLP – Completed, Rod Calvert, a Director of the Bedfordshire Chamber of Commerce has agreed to join the CLP.
- KF to review the wording of the CLP Terms of Reference and come back with a revised version – Completed, a revised version that makes it clear that the CLP aims to build trust with the local community has been circulated for comment.

Action KF to add formal acceptance of the revised Terms of Reference to the next meeting agenda

2. Update on the IPC and EA consultation process timetable

Rachel Ness (RN) went through the Notice of Procedural Decision letter from the IPC sent to all interested parties on the 21st January – see attached. This sets out the timescale for the IPC consultation up to the 15th July, and how people and organisations can participate. Further information on meeting dates can be expected once the IPC have had time to consider all the written representations to be submitted to them on 28 February 2011.

The deadline for full written representations and the Local Impact Report is 28th February – Sue Marsh (SM) confirmed that the Council will be submitting one separate report for each.

Stephen Othen (SO) confirmed that Covanta's Environmental Permit application had been made on 14th December, EA had asked for some more information about noise impacts which had been provided. The official EA decision date is 14th April but EA can extend this date. Alasdair McKellar (AM) confirmed that EA expect the decision period to take 9 to 12 months.

The EA consultation process will accept representations on an ongoing basis. AM reported that the EA determination officer has received 8 representations through the formal route, and 2 others that AM had passed on.

The next stage will be that EA will notify consultees saying that they are either minded to issue or refuse the permit with their reasons for doing so, and this will then be open for further consultation and, if they are minded to issue a permit, a copy of the proposed permit will be made available.

Question – Have all Parish Councils been sent the permit information so they can input? All except Millbrook have been sent the information.

Action AM to sent information to Jennie Thomas, the Clerk of Millbrook Parish Meeting - completed

3. Health modelling – Stephen Othen of Fichtner Consulting presented on items 3, 4 and 5, see the presentation attached.

Questions:

Why does the impact assessment look at 4 fishers in the 13 representative individuals – doesn't this skew the results?

The representatives are not averaged, they are reported separately and the risk assessed for each. This ensures that the assessment covers the groups who could be worst affected by ingestion.

Are people doing water sports included in the assessment?

Action SO to check if the resident assessment includes drinking from the local reservoir which would be the equivalent of water sports activities

Are people who are outside in the countryside included, for example horse riders?

The data shows that the impact on human health of breathing in pollutants is far lower than that of ingesting them, so the assessment concentrates on the impact of ingestion on residents as the greater risk.

What operation is the assessment based on?

The assessment is of the proposed facility producing gas at full capacity and at the legal level of emissions, so it is the highest level of emissions the plant could produce rather than the average expected emission from proposed operations.

Why have you used the US standards rather than European or British standards?

There is no EU standard for ingestion and no statutory health risk standards. The US EPA model is the best one currently available. EA is currently developing a UK standard, which treats cancer risks in a different way. There are Air Quality standards and the assessment has used the EU targets (or British targets where these are more strict).

Action SO will provide copy of the USEPA methodology so that CLP members can read the data references

How robust is this methodology - if you applied this type of modelling to Asbestos would it show that there was an unacceptable health risk?

The modelling would refer to a reference dose for Asbestos that a single particle is lethal so would find any emission of asbestos unacceptable.

Are you certain that the assessment has covered all substances that could potentially be in emissions from the facility?

The assessment is based on the content of Municipal Waste and Business and Commercial Waste that the facility is designed to handle. We know which substances will be destroyed by the incinerator and which could be released and are confident that the assessment covers all substances that could be emitted. There are a number of published epidemiological studies completed since the new incinerator standards were introduced in 1998, many of these very recent, that show no health impacts produced from modern incinerators.

Have health impacts of airborne dust pollutants from the Bottom Ash processing plant at the site been assessed as part of this permit application?

The Ballast Phoenix operation will apply for a separate environmental permit that will be handled by a different officer. The two permits will be determined at the same time as one cannot operate without the other. However the Bottom Ash from the facility is wet when stored outside before processing and a crust forms on the top to prevent any airborne pollution, the processing is done inside and the solid aggregate then stored outside. See Ballast Phoenix presentation to the CLP in June 2010 for more information.

Simon McKee (SM) asked if CLP members would like to visit a Ballast Phoenix Bottom Ash processing facility to see how it operated and to see first hand the nature and

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 15 Notes

composition of the Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) and Incinerator Bottom Ash Aggregate (IBAA)

Action KF to contact CLP members about a possible visit to Ballast Phoenix Will the Ballast Phoenix permit be subject to the same consultation as the main plant permit?

AM confirmed that this could be arranged if required

Action EA to consult with the local community on the Ballast Phoenix permit

How does the RRF prevent dioxin reformation outside the plant?

Dioxins can reform if the flue gases are held at temperatures between about 250°C and 400°C. The boiler is designed to cool the gases rapidly through this temperature range.

The plant injects activated carbon to remove dioxins which might have reformed.

Reformation does not take place outside the plant because the reformation process requires the presence of specific heavy metals, which will not be the case once the emissions have dispersed in the atmosphere.

Are dioxins emitted from the plant, is there a way to guarantee no dioxin emissions?

Dioxins are emitted at a maximum of 0.1 nanograms per cubic metre. The RRF is designed to reduce these emissions to the smallest possible amount to not be a significant health risk. If the plant did not recover the heat and quenched the incinerator immediately on completion of burn then there would be even lower dioxin emissions. However this would waste the heat generated.

4. Comments on Professor Paul Connett's report on health issues– Stephen Othen of Fichtner Consulting presented on items 3, 4 and 5, see the presentation attached.

Questions

Is Bottom Ash approved for use in the USA?

Action Covanta to check

How does the bag filter work?

These are fabric bags coated with lime that is injected when the gases have been cooled down to 140 degrees, the temperature that the lime reacts most efficiently with substances in the gas and prevent particles from getting into the air. The bags are routinely cleaned by compressed air shaking them to release excess lime, so they do not get clogged. The bags provide a large area of filtration as there are hundreds of them in the plant.

Action KF to request that CLP members can see a filter bag on their trip to Lakeside RRF – completed: It will not be possible to see a bag but Grundon have an outline of the bag so visitors can see the dimensions of the bags

5 Potential for failures in emission controls – Stephen Othen of Fichtner Consulting presented on items 3, 4 and 5, see the presentation attached.

Questions

Which of the emission from the plant are the most dangerous to health?

NO_x and SO₂ – because these are at higher levels in the gases and are more likely to cause health impacts if they were released into the air. Dioxins and metals are in such low concentrations in Municipal Waste and Business and Commercial Waste the plant would handle that there is not a significant risk from them.

Why can't dioxins, furans and metals be measured more often than every 3 months, surely there is a risk that the plant could be emitting these between these measurements?

There are no continuous measuring instruments available to do so, because there are not large enough amounts to measure. EA have no legal authority to compel operators to take samples more often because it is costly to do so for no proven benefit.

The CLP remains very concerned about this issue and requested that Covanta consider providing more frequent monitoring during the first few months of operation to give the local community assurance that dangerous levels of dioxins, furans and metals are not being emitted.

How can EA and the local community have confidence in Covanta as a responsible operator when they have no UK track record – the Italian plant may not be subject to inspection as rigorous as EA's, and reports from the US suggest that Covanta has breached environmental standards for emissions?

SM pointed out that the CLP have had previous input on Covanta's track record in the US – see attached paper issued in December following CLP Meeting 4 in November 2009.

Action Covanta to provide information on its track record – KF to circulate Covanta's Corporate Responsibility Report to CLP members and request questions for the next meeting

AM pointed out that EA have to be confident that they can permit based on the application - see AM's presentation to the CLP Meeting 14 in December 2010

Are EA fines for breaches of emissions targets punitive?

Fines are set by the courts and are generally not very punitive. However if EA compel an operator to shut down then they lose money and that tends to be the more important incentive.

How quickly is the plant shut down if alarms show emissions targets have been breached?

Immediately, if it is safe to do so and if the problem which is causing the emission limits to be breached cannot be fixed quickly. If the problem is related to the flue gas abatement and can be fixed within four hours, then the plant will continue to operate while the problem is fixed, but this is limited to a total of sixty hours in the year and each such event has to be reported to the EA..

How is combustion controlled?

By the amount of oxygen introduced, this is checked and adjusted continuously, as the mixture of waste on the grate can change each time a batch of waste is introduced.

What happens if the problem is with the Ballast Phoenix operation?

If Ballast Phoenix operations were shut down Covanta could choose to send their Bottom Ash to another processor, provided that EA were satisfied that transport was safe. Alternatively the plant would have to close.

6. Date of next meeting and items to cover

Items to cover:

Action KF to check with CLP members if there are any other items for the agenda – completed: RN and SM have some items that the CLP should take before the IPC's May Issue Specific Meetings, agenda now to cover:

Progress on discussions with the Council on the draft planning requirements (equivalent to planning conditions), the draft S106 agreement (how offers around the community trust

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 15 Notes

fund, discounted electricity, forest fund will be provided) and the draft Development Consent Order, which has progressed since the IPC application was made

Questions on Covanta's Corporate Sustainability Report which includes sections covering social responsibility and community programmes

The next meeting will be on 4th April 2011

Item for a future meeting: A layperson's explanation of how the noise impact of traffic to and from the RRF has been assessed CLP Membership

Hugh Roberts	MMAG
Barry Halton	Volunteer with Beds CPRE
Rod Calvert	Bedfordshire Chamber of Commerce – Apologies
Gary Summerfield	Amphill Town Council - Apologies
Lisa Frangiamore	Houghton Conquest P. C.
Jennie Thomas	Millbrook Parish Meeting
David Cooper	Stewartby Parish Council
Alan Barnard	Maulden Parish Council - Apologies
Peter Neale	Marston Morteyne Parish Council
Richard Franceys	Resident
Ed Hiam	Resident - Apologies
Robina Chatham	Resident
Independent Observers	
Sue Marsh	Principal Minerals and Waste Planning Officer, Central Bedfordshire Council
James Delafield	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:	
Rachel Ness Director of Planning	
Simon McKee Planning Manager	
Robin Treacher Communications Director - Apologies	
Presenting:	
Stephen Othen Fichtner Consulting Engineers Limited	