

## Devonport Incinerator Liaison Committee Meeting

Date: 9<sup>th</sup> April 2015

Tamar View Community Centre: 7 – 8 pm

### Present:

#### **Statutory bodies:**

- George Wheeler – GW (PCC)
- Jane Ford - JF (MVV)
- David Jarvis – DJ (MoD)
- Mark Turner – MT (SWDWP)
- David Mudge – DM (EA)

#### **Resident members:**

- Alex Battershill – AB
- George Cooke – GC
- David Angove – DA
- Steve Carder – SC
- Melv Chislett – MC
- Pat Patel – PP
- Diane O’Hanlon – DOH
- John O’Hanlon – JOH
- Sue Murphy – SM
- Dennis Murphy – DM
- Veronica Smerdon - VS

ITEM		ACTION
1.	<b>Apologies</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dee Tunnycliffe (resident)</li><li>• Graham Hooper (PPS)</li><li>• Sarah Taylor (EA)</li></ul>	
2.	<b>Minutes from previous meeting</b>	
	<p>JF offered to guide the group through the agenda as well as taking notes. November minutes to be put online (MVV website). Everyone introduced themselves as new resident members were present and welcomed</p>	<b>JF</b>
3.	<b>Commissioning activities</b>	
	<p><u>JF provided a commissioning update:</u> Steam blowing has been ongoing and examples of impact plates from early on and towards the end of this process were shown to the group.</p> <p>The next activity will be to start accepting waste at the Facility. DJ asked when this will happen and JF confirmed that this would be towards the end of April/early May.</p> <p>SC asked whether all of the waste will be delivered straight away and MT confirmed that all of the SWDWP local authority waste will be diverted from landfill to the Facility.</p> <p>GW requested clarification of waste vehicle routes, especially regarding Wolseley Road and waste coming from Ernesettle. MT explained that</p>	

	PCC routes have been configured and optimised to minimise delays and disruption. MT to clarify routes from Ernesettle to the Facility.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Residents' concerns</b>	
	<p><u>Air quality, emissions and traffic</u> DOH expressed concern over air pollution from the lorries passing so close to the school and sheltered housing at Camels Head junction and also from the stack. DM explained that the Environment Agency monitors the Facility in its entirety but not the traffic as this is PCC's responsibility. The air quality modelling, carried out prior to construction was based on emissions being at the maximum allowable limits and the impact was found to be negligible. Emissions from the stack are monitored continuously and extractive sampling is carried out periodically throughout the year.</p> <p>JF explained that additional off-site monitoring of particulates and Nitrogen Dioxide is also in place. DOH asked what would happen if limits were breached and/or levels of pollutants rise. MT confirmed that off-site levels and monitoring are the remit of the Public Protection Service.</p> <p>DOH enquired about the increase in traffic at the Camels Head junction and MT confirmed that it will be around 1%.</p> <p>JOH also expressed concern on behalf of the school and the sheltered housing and JF offered to send a link to the Air Quality Monitoring data on MVV's website.</p> <p>DM explained that although the Environmental Permit applies to the operational phase, the EA have already been on site to carry out some monitoring during the commissioning phase.</p> <p>GW stated that an Air Quality warning had been issued for the South East of England for the following day (Saharan dust) and asked whether the EA would take any action if the same were to happen in the South West. DM explained that the EA would liaise with their colleagues at PPS but the most likely measures under such circumstances would be to take a coal-fired power station off-line and to stop diesel traffic.</p> <p>MT explained that new technology is going in to diesel engines to make them cleaner and that Devon (Teignbridge) and Torbay have just replaced their waste collection vehicles with a fleet of modern ones.</p> <p><u>Location</u> DOH queried the location, in particular why Plymouth out of the partner councils. DM explained that when an application for an Environmental Permit comes to them, the EA look at what the activity is and what the impact of that activity will be. If there is no or negligible impact then they have no choice but to issue a permit.</p> <p><u>Regulation</u> DM explained that there are two sets of continuous monitoring equipment are installed in the stack, one is active and one on standby. Extractive testing of the flue gases will be done quarterly to start with and the EA have access to the continuous data as well as being able to</p>	<b>JF</b>

conduct both announced and unannounced site inspections. They will also conduct audits to look at MVV's emissions control and monitoring systems.

The EA can enforce sanctions, financial penalties and prosecution. Fines can be paid effectively to the community, rather than the treasury. DM also pointed out that under the 'Industrial Emissions Directive' (which has replaced the Waste Incineration Directive), EfW is the most heavily regulated industry.

DOH asked whether anything comes out of the chimney and DM clarified that there will be some emissions but that any potentially harmful substances will be present only in infinitesimal amounts. DM also clarified that monitoring is carried out at the stack because once particles are out in the environment there is no way of attributing them to a particular source.

GC expressed concern that penalties from the EA come after the event and people will already have suffered. DM explained that the operator (MVV) has to report any breach of limits immediately (and within 24 hours at the very most). If, for example, the acid gas abatement is not working then the Facility will be shut down immediately until the situation is remedied.

MT confirmed MVV's commitment to environmental standards and DM stated that the Facility has an additional system which he has never seen on another plant for sampling the flue gases before they are treated.

PP expressed concerns over cover-ups (eg. In the USA) and requested assurances about this Facility. DM explained that falsifying evidence is a criminal activity and whilst some operators may be unscrupulous, there is an element of 'gut feeling' involved when working with a more professional operator such as MVV. He also explained that outside of environmental monitoring, there are laws governing Directors of companies and that is where the axe falls. MT added that the reputational damage to a company would prohibit them from falsifying records.

PP asked about examples in Plymouth of delayed reporting. DJ confirmed that no nuclear incidents go unreported to the EA and DM confirmed that the EA is the regulating body for the MoD (in spite of them both being Government bodies).

GW asked about particulate monitoring at the stack and DM confirmed that this is continuous for particulates smaller than 10 micrometres. The EA looked at particulate emissions at the planning stage and JF will send everyone a link to MVV's Environmental Permit.

Waste types and deliveries

SC asked whether MVV could take waste from Derriford Hospital if their incinerator went down. DM explained that this would not be possible as MVV do not have a permit for clinical waste (Code 18).

AB queried whether MVV could take clinical waste from households and DM explained that such waste would not include sharps, scalpels and

JF

	<p>body parts.</p> <p>AB asked how many lorries a day would be coming from Torbay and why the waste couldn't be brought in by boat. MT confirmed that there would be 8 lorries a day from Torbay and that transport by sea has been looked into however it would require the appropriate infrastructure at both ends, which doesn't currently exist.</p> <p>AB also asked what the IBA ships will be bringing back from Holland and JF confirmed that they will not be bringing anything back to MVV.</p> <p>GC asked about the C&amp;I waste vehicles and JF confirmed that they are included in the total vehicle numbers previously discussed. JF also explained that the weighbridge includes automatic number plate recognition so additional vehicles will not be able to sneak into the Facility.</p> <p>DA asked about the steam vents on the roof and JF offered to provide a hard copy of a picture of the roof. DM explained that it is only steam and the way to tell is that there will be a small gap between the chimney/roof vent before the 'cloud' of steam becomes visible due to cooling. Residents were encouraged to imagine the difference between a chimney from a household fire, which releases smoke with no gap between the chimney and the emissions, and a kettle, which releases steam but with a visible gap between the spout and the cloud of water vapour.</p>	<b>JF</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
	<p><u>Recycling</u></p> <p>PP pointed out that the more we recycle the less residual waste there will be and that the EU fine countries for not hitting their recycling targets. The possibility of fortnightly brown bin collections instead of the current green ones was discussed as a way of sending out this important message. MT explained that the City now has a new Materials Recovery Facility so more can be recycled.</p> <p>DOH and MC asked if a site visit could be arranged for the ILC – JF to organise.</p> <p>MC asked the MoD about noise from the Dockyard a couple of weeks ago but DJ was unable to comment in the absence of any actual dates or times. DJ advised the group to ring Drake Main Gate if they experience disturbance from the Dockyard. DA and SC pointed out that Network Rail have also been laying track.</p>	<b>JF</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
	<p>Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015, 11am @ Devonport EfW CHP Facility</p>	