

## Member Advisory Panel Meeting Minutes

<b>Location, Date &amp; Time of Meeting:</b>		<b>Committee Room 2, Council House, Coventry, 29.01.10, 15.00</b>
<b>Attending:</b>	<b>Members</b>	<b>Officers</b>
<i>Coventry</i>	Cllr Noonan (Vice Chair) Cllr Harvard Cllr Lee	Chris West John Mcguigan
<i>Solihull</i>	Cllr Wild (Chair) Cllr Hawkins	Jim Harte Paul Johnson
<i>Warwickshire</i>	Cllr Cockburn Cllr Whitehouse	Paul Galland
Project Transform Officers	John Daly, Andrew Walster, Kalen Wood,	
<b>Apologies:</b>	Cllr Sweet, Officers: David Clarke	
<b>Status:</b>	<b>Action:</b>	<b>Initials:</b>
<b>RED</b>	Amend previous minutes to include declarations of interest	Project Team
<b>RED</b>	Circulate copies of the presentation to Members	Project Team
<b>AMBER</b>	Make the presentation available on the web	Project Team
<b>GREEN</b>	Include declarations as a standard agenda item at all future meetings	Project Team
<b>GREEN</b>	Forward topics for future meetings to JD, AW or KW	All Members
<b>RED ACTIONS</b>	<b>AMBER ACTIONS</b>	<b>GREEN ACTIONS</b>
Requires urgent attention	Requires actioning before the next meeting (or within 2 months of the meeting- whichever is sooner).	Requires actioning for the next meeting

Meeting commenced 15:15

### 1 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Noonan –Councillor for Cheylesmore and resident in the locality of the existing Energy from Waste (EfW) facility.

Cllr Whitehouse – Is a financial contributor to Friends of the Earth

### 2 Minutes from Previous Meeting

Further to an amendment to the previous meeting's minutes re: the inclusion of declaration of interests to be stated at the beginning of each meeting. The Chair proposed that following the amendment, the minutes were an accurate reflection of the meeting held on 25/09/09.

Sign off of the minutes was formally proposed by Cllr Cockburn and seconded by Cllr Noonan.

The Chair expressed her thanks to the Project Transform team for arranging the visit to the EfW which was very informative. Cllrs Cockburn and Whitehouse also relayed their thanks.

### 3 Matters Arising

None raised

### 4 Presentation – (1) Pre-qualification (PQQ) and outline solutions (ISOS) process and (2) Revised Waste Flow Model

John Daly and Andrew Walster gave the presentation. Questions were taken during the presentation which are summarised in the notes below.

#### 4.1 PQQ Short-list

**Q – Proposed that bidders remove an additional 5% recyclable material from the residual waste before it is processed, what would this consist of?**

A – It is most likely that this will be metals however the bidder will propose what they consider it is feasible to remove with their technology.

**Q – The bidder will propose the capacity of the facility – have they been given any guidance on capacity?**

A – An indication of the likely forecast capacity required by the Project has been provided to the bidder in the procurement documents, which is the same as the data in the revised waste flow model. We have also informed them that the draft Outline Planning Application includes a proposal for a 320,000 tonne per year facility (based on 305,000 tonnes plus a 5% contingency), however it will be the contractor's decision on the treatment capacity to be included in their solution.

**Comment – The potential range of technologies seems a bit narrow compared to the potential range that could have come forward and the interest shown at the bidders day.**

A – The PQQ process focuses on a bidders' historical performance not the solution they will propose. Based on the PQQ submissions, there is potential for MBT and EfW solutions to be proposed as well as increased levels of recycling – it is unlikely that we will get gasification, pyrolysis or autoclave proposals, however we will not know until the Outline Solutions are submitted.

**Q – What technologies did the companies that were not shortlisted suggest?**

A – We can only refer to the information provided for the PQQ and therefore we can't be certain what they would have proposed, but based on their PQQ submissions only, the non-shortlisted companies had a track record of providing EfW, Autoclave and Gasification solutions.

**Q – How many consortia are bidding and what control do you have over them?**

A – There are four consortia – though the dialogue process, we will determine how they propose to work together and the formal legal contracting structure and how this will be managed.

**Q – How will bidders know what is important to us?**

A – The evaluation criteria, agreed by the Councils last December, makes clear the relative importance of the individual criteria. This criteria has been provided to the bidders as part of the ISOS documentation.

**Q – Compared to the level of interest shown at the bidders day, a lot of potential bidders have chosen not to bid for the contract – is this possibly linked to estimated tonnage of the facility?**

A – The tonnages provided to prospective bidders in the Outline Business Case (OBC) and Contract Notice were indicative – bidders would have been aware of this and that the waste flow model would be revised before financial close.

**Comments**

Members expressed disappointment that more varied technologies did not come forward through the PQQ process and that the majority of the companies have historical track record of EfW. JD commented that the solution needs to be deliverable and critically bankable and that banks will not lend to unproven solutions.

**4.2 Waste Flow Model**

The Waste Flow Model will be reviewed again with 2009/10 baseline data.

**Q – Could the model be reviewed with 2010/11 data?**

A – We will review the model as many times as possible before financial close. We will assess what data is available and how it fits in with the overall programme with respect to the 2010/11 review.

**Q – What is the assumption behind waste growth?**

A – The assumption used for the OBC is still considered prudent and has been used for the revised model (0.75%) which includes 0.5% to take account of forecast housing growth (per the RSS) and a very small rise (0.25%) in waste arisings.

JM informed the meeting that the Project Board was monitoring the model outputs and had asked for several sensitivities to be run.

**Q – Warwickshire is a two-tier administration - is it correct that the districts can make their own arrangements for the collection and marketing of recyclables?**

A – The Waste Collection Authorities (WCA's) can make their own arrangements for the collection, treatment and sale of recyclables. The County does have statutory powers of direction regarding where residual

waste should be treated or disposed of. However, the WCA's are working in partnership with the County Council to deliver Warwickshire's Waste Strategy and a consultative approach to how waste is managed in the County has been adopted.

**Q – How does the Staffordshire project [Project W2R] fit into the equation?**

A – WCC is a partner in Project Transform, however it is also proposing to send residual waste to the Project W2R along with Walsall and Sandwell Councils. The residual waste from North Warwickshire and parts of Nuneaton will be transferred to the facility in Staffordshire. WCC is working with Staffordshire on the development of a transfer facility and HWRC in North Warwickshire. Throughout the development of Project Transform, Warwickshire's involvement with Staffordshire has been taken account of and the tonnage to be delivered to Staffordshire (estimated 35,000 tonnes per year) factored into the Project Transform Waste Flow Model.

**Q – Has the additional 5% front end recycling been included in the model?**

A – This has not been factored into the model as it will occur after the residual waste has been taken to the new treatment solution.

**Q – Does the model assume an increase in recycling until 2041?**

We have discussed how we should model levels of recycling with our advisors, the Project's technical team and the District Waste Collection officers. We looked at the higher performing authorities and determined (based on information we have now) if we considered it feasible to go much higher than current performance, we also looked at the lower performing authorities (and again based on information we have now) and what performance they are likely to achieve. Taking this information into account we developed the recycling profile shown in the model.

**Q – What hasn't been included in the models assumptions?**

A – We have included prudent assumptions.. We haven't considered the potential impact of 'disaster scenarios' however we have considered how e.g. the failure of a critical MRF might impact on tonnages (essentially recycling a third less waste which will therefore need treating) this is shown in chart 2 of the presentation.

**Q – What about zero waste growth in the Regional Spatial Strategy**

A – The review of the RSS does refer to Zero Waste Growth, but the proposal is centred around Zero Waste to Landfill, focusing on SME's and Commercial and Industrial waste.

**Q – Would the bidder build a facility with a 284,000 tonne capacity or larger or smaller?**

A – We have left it for the bidders to propose the capacity of the facility. If they were to increase the capacity they would need to ensure that they could fill the surplus (over the Partnerships needs) capacity.

**Q – What tonnage will we be committing to?**

A – We will discuss and negotiate minimum tonnages with the bidders through the dialogue process.

**Q- Is there any statistics or feedback on the implementation of the ‘Blue bin scheme’ in Coventry?**

A – The statistics for the first quarter aren’t available yet but AW will report back once the data is available.

The presentation will be made available on the Project Transform Website.

Point for clarification – the reference site does not have planning permission for the development of a waste treatment facility. The outline planning application has not been submitted yet – it is intended to submit the application later in the year.

**5 Topics for Future meetings**

Members were asked to email the team (JD, AW or KW) with topics that they wish to cover at the next meeting of the Panel.

Suggested topics to be covered at the next meeting (planned for June 2010):

- Progress report on Outline Solutions stage
- Outline Planning submission update

**6 AOB**

It was acknowledged that in some instances (including the meeting today) that papers aren’t sent out to Members beforehand as it is preferential (for reasons of clarity) to talk through the issues/topics in question before the slides are distributed. However, Members would prefer to have copies of paperwork for the meetings in advance of the meeting in future (when considered appropriate by the Project Team).

**7 Date of Next Meeting**

A meeting was scheduled for April, however due to the project programme and the local elections, it was proposed that the next meeting is held in June 2010. The week commencing 7<sup>th</sup> June was proposed. Dates will be circulated accordingly.

Meeting closed 16:55

**Chair:**     Councillor Mrs Wild  
-----

<b>Circulated:</b>	All attendees	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Approved</b>	Member Advisory Panel Meeting	18.03.10
<b>Author</b>	KMW	08.02.10

