

Minutes of Energy from Waste Stakeholder Group Meeting		
Date	20.07.2016	
Location	SEPA, Inverdee House, Baxter Road, Aberdeen	
Chairperson	Rob Jackson (RJ), Jackson Consulting	
Minutes	Pam Walker (PW), Aberdeen City Council	
Attendees	Raymond Clark (RC), Cove & Altens CC (part) Catherine Cowie (CC), Kincorth and Leggart CC (part) Cllr Andrew Finlayson (AF), Aberdeen City Council David Fryer (DF), Torry CC Ray Grant (RG) John Lawrie Group Pete Lawrence (PL), Aberdeen City Council Jo Mackie (JoM), Aberdeen City Council Ian Mitchell (IM), UFI Kevin Christie (KC), UFI	Tim Poole (TP), SEPA Simon McLean (SM), Torry CC Gary Mitchell (GM), Kincorth & Leggart CC Ian Booth (IB) Aberdeen Heat & Power Donald Raymond (DR) Aberdeenshire Council Tekena Fubara (TK), Torry CC Cllr Jean Morrison (JM), Aberdeen City Council Maureen Watt (MW), MSP
Item 1 Apologies	Stephen Cooper (SC), Moray Council, Cllr Alan Donnelly (AD) ACC, Michele McPartlin (MM) Cove & Altens CC, Linda Ovens (LO), Entec Solutions, George Smith (GS) SEPA, Heidi Thorsdalen (HT) Amec Foster-Wheeler, Sue Horrobin (SH) Aberdeenshire Council, Andy Giblin (AG) UFI	
	Action	Responsible
Item 2	<p>RJ – intro – explained actions since last meeting and that RJ would now chair. MW agreed that this was a good idea. RJ asked about proposer and seconder – PL said isn't part of terms of reference, agreed not required as group was about exchange of information and may not be necessary.</p> <p>Terms of reference – group is to encourage communication, gain views from community on the proposal.</p> <p><u>Previous Minutes & Actions</u> The minute was agreed as a true reflection of the last meeting.</p>	
	<p><u>Actions</u></p> <p>Matters Arising:</p> <p>Item 2: clarify changes required in minutes. DF not done as stated not his role. This was around the question raised in March regarding safety. Has not had a response. PL said there was a written statement on safety in the circulated project update. SM said there were 2 separate issues – one about complaint about the minutes, content of the update is separate. RJ said in interests of moving forward the group should discuss the safety issue rather than the minutes or complaint by the CCs. PL said agreed that issue of complaint is between CCs and the Council so will be set aside and dealt with in the usual manner and not for discussion at this meeting.</p> <p>Safety: RC asked about issues around Runcorn and can that be discussed. RJ can't discuss as is involved in the proceedings there. DF had visited Runcorn separately and met the campaign group. He heard about the history of the development and that the planning authority was originally opposed, the group said they had heard promises that were not fulfilled. Legal action has been launched with regard to the operation with 800 potential claimants.</p> <p>It has been suggested that some of the Runcorn campaign group are invited to present to the group which has been agreed. To be invited to next meeting, travel costs met by ACC. RJ asked what other safety issues need to be allayed other than those already covered in update note. RC said to accept the note, DF did not agree – RJ asked him</p>	

	<p>they are compromised by their involvement. In this case the EFW is part as ACCs wider waste strategy to deliver good waste management solutions and will comment on these policies.</p> <p>There is a judgement to be made on whether members should or should not vote on a decision. The decision remains with the member. They may take advice on this.</p> <p>RJ referred to last minutes where Cllr Morrison and Cllr Finlayson absented themselves from the last meeting during presentation on planning app. He also asked about comments in P&J article supporting the proposal. JM said comment was made as chair of ZWMSC. RJ asked if she would be absenting from voting – JM replied that she was taking advice on that matter. PL reiterated that the developer is not the same entity as the planning authority.</p> <p>Committee paper links do not work – abzre.net? Check with ICT.</p> <p>Mark Wilkie – chase up letter re transport?</p> <p>Newsletter to be sent to CCs when available.</p>	<p>Check links with ICT</p> <p>Follow up with MW</p>	<p>PW/ HL</p> <p>HL</p> <p>PW/LO</p>
Item 3	<p>Business Case</p> <p>PL provided a presentation on the business case for the project. Presentation will be circulated to the group.</p> <p>PL outlined the process that was gone through to get to its position regarding EFW as the preferred option.</p> <p>PL offered to meet separately with any individuals or groups who wished to discuss in detail.</p> <p><u>Questions:</u> SM – would like to see more documentation – risk assessment, what was considered. PL said there are different risk assessments at different stages e.g. financial, technical, planning, etc. SM asked about risk of this technology and PL replied there is a preference for standard EFW but still to go to market and each solution presented would be assessed.</p> <p>RC asked what was thinking behind the decision that Aberdeen provides the site? PL replied there are a number of factors such as achieving lowest cost, transport being an issue so site that is close to where most waste is. Factors also included regulations covering the permit which require high efficiency operation in terms of thermal heat that cannot be achieved by electricity only and must have heat user therefore site close to most potential heat users.</p> <p>CC asked why Torry? PL explained as part of development planning process following site search, the LDP identified the site as suitable for waste facility. This was covered at a previous meeting.</p> <p>RJ – financial viability as raised by RC earlier. Cost of installing heat network is significant at another £40m for phase 1 and 2 of pipeline. He would like to see more numbers around this from PL to understand what the options are and take best available option. We cannot continue to landfill therefore we have to do something different to the current scenario, comparable assessment – e.g. small plant vs large, etc. We must provide a solution for our waste, consequently there is no option but change. Council has taken advice from financial advisers, PL said he was happy to discuss OBC in more detail with individuals.</p> <p>The EFW project is primarily to deal with our waste and the heat</p>		

<p>network is a separate (but linked) arm to deliver heat into the city. There was a decision in June to proceed with engineering design of phase 1, this will have more detail on costs. Although in short term the current energy prices may be low, that may not be case in long term and the heat project is a long term project that will have known and stable costs.</p> <p>RC asked again about the financial detail? PL said capital cost is up to £150m, operating cost of around £118/ tonne. This compares with current cost of £128 which increases as landfill tax increases. Large part of that is finance repayment, council has secure borrowing rates so financial risk is low/known.</p> <p>RC asked if district heating costs are competitive. PL reiterated fundamentally this is a waste project with delivery of heat being a secondary separate activity and not part of this project. RC said it is sold as part of the planning process and asked if PL can provide some figures on this for next meeting. PL said he will do what he can to provide information. Currently there is district heating elsewhere in the city and provides competitive prices, as prices rise for other commodities making it more competitive.</p> <p>RJ asked about heat off-take by private sector and whether something could be included on what private sector uptake might be.</p> <p>MW stated recycling rates are not as high as we want and asked if we will still increase recycling rates? Yes. We will need waste to fuel plant and there is lack of fuel (waste) in some areas. Asked how we will lock in Shire and Moray? PL replied that plant is sized assuming significant improvement on current recycling rates. Intend to move up around 15% from current 38%. Aberdeenshire planning similar recycling improvements and Moray already high recycling rate so less room for improvement but they are a smaller contributor to the project. Also expected that population will increase but there is also an expected reduction of waste produced per household and this has been accounted for. There are assumptions that require to be used so these are educated estimates. Potential for household like commercial waste if required but this is not expected.</p> <p>KC mentioned a comparison of gas and district heating and it's impossible to do that at moment due to unknowns regarding what outputs of the EFW will cost. This work is ongoing. Can have costs of build but more difficult to know costs of the fuel at this stage so can work it backwards to see what EFW can afford to sell the heat for. RC asked if KC has done work on this, PL said a feasibility study has been done by the Council and next stage is now agreed to proceed. Also the "spare" heat may have a value but this is unknown currently. Ultimately without a heat network there is no project, as the plant will not be allowed to operate and the 3 authorities recognise this so will work towards a suitable agreement over revenues.</p> <p>RC asked if there about business plan and what assumptions have been made? PL represents EFW project that is based on financial analysis which shows it is cost effective to generate electricity and sell to grid consequently no assumption is being made for income from sale of the heat and this still represents better value.</p> <p>RC asked if we are still looking for figures on clarity regarding the district heating. PL will get figures that are available and supply to group.</p> <p>RJ asked about the minimum amount of heat and PL replied that it depends on solution however needs to operate at 35% thermal efficiency which will require both heat and electricity. This can be any</p>	<p>DHS figures to be brought to next meeting</p>	<p>PL</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	------------------

	<p>beneficial use for either district heating or industrial. Also potential to link into existing district heating.</p> <p>DF had understood that tonight's presentation would be on financing – capital and revenue and that we should test the assumptions. Would like to see financial information. Convener of planning committee said it should go to full council due to financial considerations first and environmental next so wasn't this key? There is a ban on biodegradable waste to landfill and asked if there will still be some landfill and what happens to ash as it is toxic (fly ash). PL responded they have not rushed into this decision and it has taken 4-5 years to consider this and please look at links to documents. If anyone wants to discuss particular issues he is happy to do that.</p> <p>RJ suggests that anyone wishing to do so, emails PW. SM said he would welcome a discussion.</p>		
		Anyone wishing to discuss in detail send email to wastestrategy@aberdeencity.gov.uk	
Item 4	Project Update/Planning application update		
	<p>As per document circulated before meeting.</p> <p>Inter Authority Agreement will tie the 3 authorities into the project in the long term and as part of this there will be financial repercussions in the form of a requirement to recompense the others for any costs incurred as result of withdrawal.</p> <p>Public hearing is 24th August. Additional information submitted and now out for consultation. Closing date 11th August.</p> <p>DF asked for clarification as CCs all received bundle of documents and wondered what were these for? These are hard copies of the additional consultation information which had been sent to all CCs as they had also had copies of initial submission and these were copies provided for the CCs use. DF said he hasn't seen notice of consultation? PL suggested going to planning portal as it planning service responsibility. DF urged all to attend the public hearing.</p>		
Item 5	Communication		
	<p>Circulating info to community group contacts as per JoM's list.</p> <p>Will we advertise planning hearing? Can do so – send details to contact list.</p> <p>PW urged CC's to use their websites and social media sites to publicise.</p> <p>JM said the public hearing will be advertised in local press.</p> <p>DF pointed out that it is a hearing ahead of the decision being made so planning authority is inviting developer and objectors to bring forward evidence and information which will feed into planning process.</p> <p>JM – said it also gives elected members the opportunity to ask questions of both developer and objectors/representations.</p>		<p>HL</p> <p>HL/ PW/ PL</p> <p>Community Councils</p>
Item 6	Visit to Proposed EfW Site at East Tullos		
	<p>17th August before next Stakeholder Mtg – JoM said meeting could be at community wing of Tullos school.</p> <p>Proposed to meet at EfW site at 3.30 pm.</p>	JoM to check availability.	JoM

	PL to check access to site.		PL
Item 7	AOCB Dundee visit is likely to be September. Delays due to leave, contract issues, etc. GM asked if the Runcorn visitors can they come day before for a pre-meeting? Preferable for all members of group to have access to the visitors. PW asked all to check their e-mail details on the circulation list and make any necessary corrections. JM – 17 th is full council meeting. RJ wrote 20 questions some time ago and requested the group make notes on those and send details of any issues to wastestrategy@aberdeencity.gov.uk		All
Item 8	Date of next meeting Proposed to meet on proposed EfW site at 3.30pm (tbc). Wednesday 17 th August 2016, 4-6pm at East Tullos, then Tullos School (tbc)		