



Residual Waste Working Group

10am-1pm Tuesday 1st April 2014
Members Room
AGENDA

1. **Apologies**
2. **Minutes**
3. **Matters arising**
4. **Reflections on site visit to New Earth Solutions Ltd**
5. **To receive representations from Sue Oppenheimer etc on behalf of the campaigning group GlosVain:**
10.30am-11.30am
6. **Out of county capacity**
Tony Childs
7. **Revisit consideration framework**
Tony Childs to give short presentation to open up discussion
8. **To consider members' suggestions for agenda items and arrangements for future meetings**
9. **Future meeting dates:**
 - **Friday 2nd May, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1**
 - **Tuesday 3rd June, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1**
 - **Tuesday 1st July, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1**
 - **Tuesday 5th Aug, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1**
 - **Tuesday 2nd Sept, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1**
 - **Wednesday 1st Oct, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 2**
 - **Tuesday 4th November, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1**
 - **Monday 1st December, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1**

Site Visits:

- **Advanced Plasma Power Swindon, Thursday 17th April 9am-1pm**

Membership: Chairman David Jenkins, Cllr Tim Harman, Cllr Sarah Lunnon, Cllr Tracy Millard, Cllr Patrick Molyneux, Cllr Brian Oosthuysen, Cllr Alan Preest, Cllr Simon Wheeler, Cllr Bill Whelan

Officers: Rachel Ferris, Christine Wray, Tony Childs, Sidgorée Nelson

If you have any queries in regards to this agenda please contact Sidgorée Nelson on 01452 425075 or Sidgorée.Nelson@gloucestershire.gov.uk

Notes: Residual Waste Working Group 18th February 2014

1. Apologies

Attendance

Cllr Tim Harman	P	Cllr Sarah Lunnon	P
Cllr Tracy Millard	A	Cllr Patrick Molyneux	P
Cllr Brian Oosthuysen	A	Cllr Alan Preest	P
Cllr Simon Wheeler	P	Cllr Bill Whelan	A
Ind Chair David Jenkins	P	Duncan Jordan (officer)	P
Rachel Ferris (officer)	P	Christine Wray (officer)	P
Tony Childs (officer)	P	Steve Read (officer)	P
Sidgorée Nelson (officer)	P		

P = present A = apologies/absent

2. **Minutes** – these were approved at the meeting.

3. **Matters arising**

3.1 David Jenkins, Chair informed members that the council had received a letter from the Planning Inspectorate advising that the Secretary of State is due to make his decision on the planning appeal by 17th September 2014.

3.2 The Chair then took members and officers through the actions sheet from the group's meeting on 7th January. A number of actions including extending meeting times and reporting on recycling performance had been completed.

3.3 Officers had been asked to provide information on the tonnage of waste diverted from landfill using the Ecodeco plant in Italy and the Frog Island plant in London. A paper by Shanks was sourced (available on request) detailing the generic mass balance of their MBT plants.

3.4 Members had also requested a map of residual waste treatment capacity in adjacent counties. One had been produced showing waste facilities across the south west, south east, midlands and Wales, but it had proved a challenge to plot the capacities clearly without making it difficult to read. This information is however available, and after discussion officers were asked to produce an accompanying summary of potential capacity.

ACTION – Tony Childs

3.5 In response to a request from the Chair, officers had identified a number of waste treatment plants that could be visited. It was determined that based on types of technologies members' decided they wanted to investigate further, facilities would be approached with a view to arranging site visits.

3.6 Members learnt that work continues to produce a factual resource containing the key information necessary to produce a potential fallback strategy.

4. Workshop

4.1 Duncan Jordan, Chief Operating Officer explained to members that the workshop had been organised reflecting comments made about wanting to accelerate the work programme. The aims of this session were described as:

- Member identification of who they want to hear from
- Member identification of what site visits they would like to make
- Member identification of the technologies they want to hear more about
- Member identification of the scenarios they would like officers to explore further
- Member identification of the key factors they would want to see taken into consideration in any evaluation of potential scenarios/solutions
- Officers having the information necessary to produce a revised work schedule that members are happy with

4.2 He briefly re-capped the important background information that members had received at previous meetings; in particular highlighting the fact that while the council has existing contracts in place for landfill until August 2018, Defra advises that for a residual waste treatment solution, from project inception to achieving an operational facility (including the procurement) could take 10 years. The need to identify a viable solution is clear.

4.3 However the group's first challenge was identified as establishing and agreeing what the need for a residual waste treatment solution is. This discussion began by looking at the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy target of at least 60% by 2020 and the county council's aspirational target of 70% recycling and composting of municipal waste by 2030. Members also discussed the adopted Waste Core Strategy (WCS) tonnage range (151,000tpa to 218,000tpa). Members considered whether the tonnage range and the recycling targets were appropriate to develop their strategy against, or if alternative models should be developed.

4.4 Members were asked to take differing views on what is achievable into account. There is a view for example that the amount of potential recyclable material in municipal waste could be as much as 70%. Although recognised as possible, this would rely on the county achieving almost 100% capture of recyclable materials, which we are far from. In Gloucestershire, which performs above the UK average recycling rate (achieving 48% compared to a National average of 43%), officers believe it will be very challenging to reach our 60% recycling target by 2020. Waste composition was also highlighted as important to the group's thinking, as what's left in the residual waste stream (and in what quantities) will narrow down the number of viable technologies available to treat residual waste.

4.5 Members discussed what was possible and what was probable at great length. Some felt that more ambitious recycling targets and lower waste arisings were achievable, whilst others felt the need to ensure that the council developed a solution that accounted for the predictions made in the WCS. Members were reminded not to focus only on residual waste as a percentage, but also to look at it as actual tonnages (kg of residual waste generated per household); looking at residual waste in this way reveals that even if recycling

rates increase reducing the percentage of residual waste, residual waste arisings could continue to grow.

4.6 **Members ultimately agreed that their fallback strategy needs:**

- to deliver a solution that will deal with the WCS' predictions of waste arisings
- to deliver a solution that accepts existing recycling targets
- to encourage the council to do what it can to accelerate towards achieving the recycling targets of 60% and 70%
- to recommend that in entering any contract to treat residual waste, any guaranteed minimum tonnage should not act as a perverse incentive or prevent the ability of the council to continue to improve recycling performance

The potential mismatch in benefit/cost in increasing recycling between waste collection and disposal authorities was also recognised, and it was commented that this was a strong argument strengthening the inclusion of all Authorities to the Joint Waste Committee.

4.7 Once 'need' had been established members engaged in extensive discussion of the different technologies available to them, also including landfill and export as options. Some key considerations for a future decision were identified, with the track record of different technologies, the risk appetite of the organisation and value for money all being recognised as important. While it was agreed that further work needed to be done to build a complete consideration framework, it was agreed that a good starting point was the criteria used for the assessment of technologies for the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy. The following conclusions on where to go next were reached, shaping the group's work programme through to September 2014.

4.8 **Members requested further information on:**

- Waste export options need to be considered
- Landfill as a possible solution following pre treatment e.g. MBT
- MBT, EFW and ATT technologies including the production of a 'closed loop' diagram for each technology showing what goes in, what comes out, and what happens to those outputs

ACTION – Tony Childs

4.9 **Officers were asked to explore scenarios of:**

- MBT, EFW and ATT solutions for Gloucestershire using the assumptions of waste growth and targets for recycling performance at 60 -70% made within the Waste Core Strategy and Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy

ACTION – Tony Childs

4.10 **It was determined that the programme going forward would include:**

- Site visits to EFW, MBT and plasma arc plants to be arranged whenever possible outside of the group's current schedule of meetings
- Invitations to GlosVain and other speakers to share their views with the working group – this to be balanced by invitations to professionals and academics that

Item 2

could offer alternative perspectives. Members committed to hosting these groups within the existing meeting schedule through to Aug 2014

- It was suggested that this could take place in a single all day session
- Some specific people and organisations such as DEFRA/WIDP were mentioned

5. Arrangements for future meetings

5.1 Looking specifically at the agenda for the group's next meeting and noting that 3rd March was not far off considering the breadth of material members had requested, it was decided to try and arrange a site visit to New Earth Solutions in Avonmouth. If this could not be fixed and an alternative plan to invite interest parties to share their views with the group could not be arranged at short notice, the meeting was to be cancelled.

ACTION – Sidgorée Nelson/Tony Childs/Steve Read

5.2 A copy of the DVD 'Trashed' would be made available on request from democratic services for those who wish to borrow it.

ACTION – Sidgorée Nelson/interested members

5.3 Dates of future meetings through to December 2014 would be circulated.

ACTION – Sidgorée Nelson

END

**Residual Waste Working Group
Matters arising - action sheet
18th February 2014**

	REFERENCE IN MINUTES	ACTION REQUIRED	RESPONSIBILITY	OUTCOME
1	4.4 (5 th Nov)	Factual resource The Chair asked that a resource containing the key factual information necessary to produce a potential fallback strategy be created and updated regularly.	Tony Childs/Sidgorée Nelson	Complete – though it will be updated regularly at the Chair's request. Officers shared a first version of the resource in the form of a slide pack at the group's meeting on 18 th February. Further information will be added as appropriate.
2	4.8 (7 th Jan) 3.4 (18 th Feb)	Out of county capacity Members asked for a map to be draw up of facilities in adjacent counties that showed residual waste capacities.	Tony Childs	In progress. Officers shared a map with members showing the location of treatment plants on 18 th February. Members further requested an accompanying paper showing the available capacity at each location.
3	5.5 (7 th Jan)	Ecodeco plant Italy & Frog Island plant Members requested information on what amount of the residual waste entering each facility is diverted from landfill through MBT processes.	Tony Childs	Complete. A Shanks paper detailing the generic mass balance of their MBT plants was found and summarised by officers on 18 th February. The full report is available to members on request from Tony Childs
4	6.5 (7 th Jan)	Visits For the group's next meeting the Chair asked officers to put together a provisional list of waste treatment plants that could be visited.	Lisa Pritchard/Tony Childs	In progress. On 18 th February members narrowed the technologies they wanted to see in action down to a small handful. Officers have now been tasks with approaching treatment plants that meet these requirements and arranging visits to them. A schedule of proposed visits will be presented to members at the group's next meeting.
5	4.8 (18 th Feb)	Request for information Members requested information on: waste export options need to be considered; landfill as a possible solution following pre treatment e.g. MBT; MBT, EFW and ATT technologies including the production of a 'closed loop' diagram for each technology showing what goes in, what comes out, and what happens to those outputs	Tony Childs	In progress.

Item 3

6	4.9 (18th Feb)	<p>Exploring scenarios Officers were asked to explore MBT, EFW and ATT solutions for Gloucestershire using the assumptions of waste growth and targets for recycling performance at 60 -70% made within the Waste Core Strategy and Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy</p>	Tony Childs	In progress.
7	5.1 (18th Feb)	<p>New Earth Solutions Officers were asked to explore the possibility of a visit to New Earth Solutions Avonmouth on 3rd March.</p>	Sidgorée Nelson	Complete. A visit to New Earth Solutions Avonmouth was organised and took place on 3 rd March.
8	5.1 (18th Feb)	<p>Trashed At the request of one member, a copy of the dvd <i>Trashed</i> will be made available from Democratic Services for interested members.</p>	Sidgorée Nelson	In progress. A copy of the dvd has yet to be sourced.
9	5.3 (18th Feb)	<p>Meeting date through to December 2014 The Chair asked for confirmed dates of future group meetings to be circulated to members.</p>	Sidgorée Nelson	Complete – as on agenda