



Putting Suffolk's waste to good use

Suffolk EfW Community Liaison Group - Minutes

Suffolk energy-from-waste facility board room
Tuesday 05 March 2019 – 6:30pm

Attendance:

John Field, Gipping Valley County Councillor
Penny Pearson, Somersham resident
Trevor Messenger, Great Blakenham resident
Chris Studd, Claydon Parish Council
Marion Little, local resident
Widge Bowman, Great Blakenham Parish Council
David Welham, Claydon Resident

Observers:

Oliver Morrall, SUEZ
John Tatton, SUEZ
Adrian Sherman, Environment Agency
Steve Palfrey, Suffolk County Council

Apologies

Cllr Roy Barker, Mid Suffolk District Council, Chair
Paul Newby, SUEZ

Discussion	Action
<p>Welcome, Introductions & Minutes Apologies received from Roy Barker and Paul Newby.</p> <p>Review of last minutes and actions: The minutes were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>Update on actions: Oliver updated that thank you emails have been sent to Graham Blair and Matthew Hicks.</p> <p>John Tatton noted that the economisers had never been replaced before, just cleaned in response to Paul's previous question regarding economiser repairs.</p> <p>Adrian noted that breach reports have been written up and are currently being reviewed before they can be sent to SUEZ.</p> <p>Oliver – recruitment for the CLG has not yet taken place. SUEZ will aim to recruit new members by the end of the summer period.</p> <p>Site update</p> <p><u>Performance</u></p> <p>Plant performed exceptionally well in 2018. OEE was 4% over the 2018 budget, and Suffolk was the leading plant within SUEZ. So far in 2019 the plant is performing very well. The facility has seen a good January and February, with the plant running at maximum capacity ahead of the April/May shutdown. During the shutdown, OEE will drop, but will increase again after.</p> <p><i>Widge – What is OEE?</i> OEE stands for Overall Equipment Efficiency and is used to assess the efficiency of the plant from a number of perspectives.</p> <p><i>John Field – When is the shutdown?</i> Our spring shutdown will be between 22 April and 18 May.</p> <p><i>John Field – Why does predicted OEE undergo a steady drop off?</i> This is where we expect to run through the year to meet our budget. We run the facility at maximum capacity during the start of the year for security.</p> <p><u>Maintenance</u></p> <p>The next shutdown will take place between the 22 April and 18 May. The key activities during this outage are significant repairs on the economiser; there will be a slight redesign. This will result in fewer blockages and a reduced back end temperature.</p> <p><i>John Field – What will the physical size of the economisers be?</i> The bundles of economisers will be about the length of the meeting room</p>	<p></p> <p>Adrian</p> <p>Oliver</p>

table. These will be put in in pieces.

The boilers will undergo repairs in passes 2 and 3 due to erosion. The damaged parts will be cut out and replaced. These replacement parts will be lined with Inconel to upgrade their longevity. Also a Martin grate overhaul to ensure it is mechanically working correctly. The bag houses will also be repaired. These have lasted five years and the casing has started to corrode.

Chris – Do these collect the dust? Yes.

Chris – Would Adrian see if these were damaged? Adrian notes that the EA monitor dust at the back end of the process via the CEMS dust hunter. Adrian noted that one damaged sock within the bag house would not change the performance. SUEZ would pick up on a damaged sock on their monitoring, and anything significant would have to be reported to the EA.

Siemens are carrying out an endoscope on the turbine. Previously a grub screw became loose and got wedged in the turbine. This has been fixed, but as a result, annual monitoring takes place by Siemens. Refractory repairs are taking place; these are standard repairs to the concrete lining in the furnace. Control valve overhaul and isolation valve replacements. This is a continuous improvement project that will allow us to work on a particular line when it is online.

Recruitment

James Clarke, the Technical Plant Engineer has moved onto a more regional role, however he will continue to be based here on site. James has been replaced by Robert Taylor who has previous experience with boilers.

Lean Maturity Audit

The Lean Maturity Audit is a modern management technique which aims to make a process more efficient. For example, visual management techniques are used to make a process simpler, eliminating chance for human error. The first audit took place in 2018. Due to everyone's hard work, the Suffolk EfW achieved a Silver Award.

Health and Safety

Health and Safety compliance was excellent in 2018. Our Safety in Mind program has seen a 210% increase in SIM conversations compared to 2017. Near misses have increased; we encourage all to report these. Our only issue can be drivers/third parties who have caused some property damage over the past few months.

Widge – weren't the gates altered to reduce this? We have fast acting gates now; these are not the issue. One example is that a

driver hit another's wing mirror. All drivers are inducted and trained, however accidents can still happen. All near misses and accidents are fed back to the corresponding companies.

Steve Palfrey noted that persistent offenders can be banned from site, and that districts know they will need to uptake action plans and retrain offenders.

John Field – are these offenders specific companies? The offenders are not necessarily serial offenders.

Environment

Adrian – The CCS score for 2018 is 8.8. Adrian is currently investigating any exceedances. Additional scoring will be given for these. This is a Band B performance. For context, the best score is Band A (no non-compliance) which is difficult to achieve. Band B is where most good operators fall within. Band C means a few minor non-compliance symptomatic issues. For Band D, effort is focused on these sites. Therefore Suffolk is a good performing site.

Adrian - In October, there were two TOC exceedances due to waste feeding and a fan tripping, resulting in a half hourly exceedance. A SO₂/HCL breach was caused by an emissions spike, most likely the result of a concentration of a waste with high SO₂/HCL content. Waste mixing procedures were reviewed. The operation of the abatement system was also reviewed with alterations made to improve abatement. Adrian noted that alarms were set at the correct level, so the operator was able to react as best as possible.

John Field – can anything be done to operate better in the future?
Adrian – the operator did everything possible with the system that they had in place.

Chris – What is the time limit on this? Adrian – this will be discussed in the March/April review, but it's not a straightforward fix. Everything was done that could have been done.

John Field – Is the current abatement system not good enough to react to an increase in HCL? Adrian - The reaction time was not good enough.

John Field – Is this due to human error? Adrian – no, this is due to the software. In this instance, we are talking about a reaction time of less than a minute. John Tatton – When the abatement system previously saw an exceedance of this size, it would switch to the default level. Now, the system will increase the dosage to the maximum level.

John Field – Why was it set up like this? It was set up this way from commissioning.

Widge – Will this affect what goes out the chimney? The new system will have more capability to deal with a breach. The key control measure is mixing the waste in the bunker.

Chris – Is sorting loads difficult? We regularly get drivers to tip waste on the floor in order to identify non-conforming waste. If particular offenders repeatedly bring in non-conforming waste, we stop their access to the site. Adrian – this exceedance was classed as an abnormal operation, as a failure/disturbance to do with the abatement system is not an exceedance. If the operator were to shutdown and start up again, this would increase emissions. This was only a short abnormal operation, and we will look at what can be done to improve this.

There were no environmental exceedances in November and December. In January a NOX half hourly was reported. This was due to issues with Urea. In response to questions – John explained that a new Urea supplier was used recently due to an issue with a load from the previous supplier. The new product caused a blockage so we have since gone back to the previous supplier.

Adrian – In two weeks time, an incident management audit will take place. This audit will determine what procedures are currently in place and update the EA incident management for this facility. The audit will look at continuous monitoring systems and the calibration of equipment.

David – What is the life expectance of the monitoring system, and will this be reviewed? Adrian – This is scheduled for this audit; the EA will look at the manufacturer's life expectance of equipment.

In response to questions about TOC exceedance and fan tripping. The fan tripped and waste stopped feeding. This was fixed and waste was fed again. The fan tripped a second time which was not noted. This led to an exceedance. Adrian has looked at the root causes and as a result, written procedures have been reviewed and updated. In this instance, it was found that the operator could have avoided this, so an additional non-compliance score has been given.

Visitor centre

2018 was a busy year for the visitors centre; we hosted over 1300 visitors. We are still just as popular, hosting monthly open days and an increased number of educational visits.

News

Penny Pearson recently attended the EfW Conference in London on the 27 February where she gave a speech on community liaison in Suffolk. The community liaison group thanked Penny for representing them at the conference.

AOB

Penny noted that lorries are regularly using Pound Lane as a cut through. Steve Palfrey is aware that Mid Suffolk Waste lorries use Pound lane but noted that it is not a restricted route, even in spite of signs which state the lane is not suitable for HGVs. Steve will feed back. John Field noted that the issue has been ongoing for five years despite contacting Mid Suffolk on several occasions. Steve Palfrey

Steve Palfrey

highlighted that they legally cannot be prevented from using this route as it is a public highway.

Penny mentioned that drivers have never been allowed to visit the site for a tour of the facility. Steve Palfrey noted that all drivers are welcome to visit the site in their own time. In response, Penny suggested that they should be allowed to visit during work hours.

Widge asked whether there are currently people employed by the council to analyse black bins and noted it would be beneficial for them to visit the site. Steve – all refuse collectors have a duty to check what is in their dustcarts. The council also undertakes waste composition analyses where a sample of bins from across the county are analysed. This is carried out every 2/3 years to understand what Suffolk residents are disposing of. Widge noted that this is beneficial to stop instances such as the HCL breach. Steve – it is when waste from local shops and businesses is not homogenised.

Trevor asked about the agreement between Suffolk and Norfolk county councils and whether or not the agreement was still financially viable. Steve – the agreement with NCC is still in place; the EfW treats 20% of all waste from Norfolk and the agreement is financially viable to the Suffolk taxpayer.

Date and time of next meeting July 9 2019. The following meeting will be November 12 2019. To start at 6.30pm at the EfW, Lodge Lane.



Putting Suffolk's waste to good use

Suffolk EfW Community Liaison Group - Minutes

Suffolk energy-from-waste facility board room
Tuesday 28 May 2019 – 6:30pm

Attendance:

John Field, Gipping Valley County Councillor
Tony Adams, Barham resident
Penny Pearson, Somersham resident
Trevor Messenger, Great Blakenham resident
Chris Studd, Claydon Parish Council
Marion Little, local resident
Widge Bowman, Great Blakenham Parish Council
David Welham, Claydon Resident

Observers:

Oliver Morrall, SUEZ
Paul Newby, SUEZ
Emma Jordan, SUEZ
Kris Furness, SUEZ
Jane Hughes, Suffolk County Council
Paul West, Suffolk County Council

Apologies

Steve Palfrey, Suffolk County Council
Adrian Sherman, Environment Agency

Discussion	Action
<p>Welcome, Introductions & Minutes The following meeting was organised specifically to discuss the plans to increase the capacity of the facility.</p> <p>Apologies received from Adrian Sherman and Steve Palfrey.</p> <p>Review of last minutes and actions: The minutes were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>Update on actions: Paul noted that breach reports have not been received from Adrian and will follow this up shortly.</p> <p>Use of Pound Lane – Jane noted that this has been fed back and will be fed back again to Mid Suffolk. John agreed to take things up from his end.</p> <p>Oliver – recruitment for the CLG ongoing.</p> <p>Proposals to process more waste</p> <p><u>Background</u> As we enter our fifth year of putting waste to good use, the plant is performing well and working efficiently, so much so that it could process more waste. In 2014, the calorific value of waste was higher than it is today, and we have seen a drop off in the energy content of waste, making it possible to process more. This trend is likely to continue as less plastic is consumed overall and that which is used is more readily recyclable.</p> <p><u>Overview</u> We are proposing to increase the capacity from 269,000 tonnes to 295,000 tonnes. No changes will be made to the catchment area; waste will continue to come from the East of England. There will be no need to alter the visual appearance of the facility or change the way that we operate and lorry traffic will remain within the level forecast in the original planning permission. Emissions will remain within the limits of the environmental permit.</p> <p><i>Chris – Will waste from Norfolk increase?</i> Emma - There will be no changes to the agreement until the current arrangement is over. Jane – this will depend on the future of the agreement.</p> <p><i>John – Will the capacity be filled with commercial waste from Suffolk or will it be from mostly further afield?</i> In addition to household waste, businesses from the East of England will be able to dispose of waste.</p> <p><i>Chris – Will the plant be able to cope in shutdown periods?</i> The priority is Suffolk's residual waste. The first suppliers to be turned off ahead of a shutdown would be third party. The bunker level will be managed closely.</p> <p><u>Process</u> Kris - This will be a Section 73 application. We will be applying to</p>	<p></p> <p>Paul</p> <p>John</p>

vary a planning condition. In this case, one condition, the 269,000 tonne a year limit. Suffolk County Council planning team (not waste authority) will be provided with an air quality assessment and traffic assessment as part of the process. Regarding traffic, the original planning permission was based on how many vehicles we assumed would be needed for the 269,000 capacity. Currently we are operating at a lower level than this originally agreed planning permission, about 12 less than agreed. The capacity increase would see, on average, an extra 10 trucks visit the facility per day. Depending on the size of the load, this would equate to 1 per hour. Emma – the original assessment was based on loads in (waste, lime, carbon, etc.) and ash out. Furthermore, traffic does not coincide with peaks, rather it evens out across the day. Currently we have 87 visits a day, we would expect this to increase to 95.

Chris – What time do vehicles deliver to site? Is there a limit?
Vehicles deliver between 6am and 10pm.

Kris – Regarding other planning applications, when we first applied, other committed developments were on the radar of the planning department. Traffic assessments were required to take into account these committed developments (such as Snoasis). Any new applications since this would have to take into account our traffic assessments based on our highest figures. All work done for the facility here and other developments will have assessed the impact of vehicles on the roads.

Chris – Highways will need to take note of the proposed developments in the area and prioritise waste. John noted that highways will need to be informed and that the length of queues will need to be considered. John also noted (to the best of his knowledge) that there were no issues at the moment but would need assurance that there would be no gridlock on the roads.

Paul – We have a good relationship with Eagle Freight and work closely to minimise issues on Lodge Lane.

Tony, Chris and Marion all noted that they had not experienced issues with traffic in the immediately local area. Widge noted that increased traffic in the area is related to domestic travel, rather than HGVs.

David – Will this be more artic lorries? It will be an even spread of RCVs and artics.

Emma – We will be applying for a similar variation for the environmental permit.

John – Are the emissions acting at less than originally planned? Emissions levels are set at the same level, regardless of capacity. A 100,000 tonne facility would have the same levels as a 500,000 tonne facility. The filtration and flue gas treatment on site will be able to cope with the increased capacity.

Marion – Now that the recycling centre is no longer accepting black plastic, will this increase the CV of the waste coming in? Jane –

black plastic is difficult to recycle because the optical sorters cannot recognise it as a plastic. Supermarkets are already moving away from using black plastic due to the new Waste and Resources Strategy and the introduction of extended producer responsibility. Emma – we are future proofing the facility. We report our annual average CV to the authority and have seen it decrease over the past 5 years. People are using less plastic and recycling more.

Chris – what happens to black plastic? Jane – Black plastic will end up at the EfW. The information is currently in the public realm, a new leaflet has been produced.

Community engagement

We first contacted the CLG, local ward members and the local parishes. We delivered a newsletter to 13,000 homes and a newsletter with a covering letter to the nearest 400 homes. We promoted the capacity increase via twitter, *In Touch*, and our website. On the 28 May, the East Anglian Daily times visited. Since the meeting an article has been published. We are happy to attend parish council meetings, and will be attending the next Great Blakenham PC in June. Finally, we used the Suffolk Show to promote. Drop in sessions planned for the 07 and 08 June. We received very little response. Only one complaint was received from a local resident.

Penny and John stated that they had not received the newsletter. We would only expect an 80-90% delivery rate and of the newsletters delivered, many are ignored. There is no perfect method for newsletter delivery so we supplement this with other communication channels. This will be followed up.

John, Chris and Trevor stated that they had not received any complaints about the capacity increase.

AOB

John discussed future of Masons landfill. At last visit he was informed they would be extending the life of the landfill until 2035. This would have a substantial effect on local traffic. Jane noted that this is something to take up with planners, but that generally landfilling is decreasing across the UK so extending the life is necessary to fill them.

Penny asked whether recycling loads are being sent here to the EfW now that the MRF is closed. Jane – recycling is being bulked up at a transfer station and sent to other viridor sites. Jane agreed to check on this.

Widge – When will the application be submitted? June, after the drop in sessions. We will be taking comments at the session.

Date and time of next meeting July 09 2019. The following meeting will be November 12 2019. To start at 6.30pm at the EfW site, Lodge Lane.

Emma

Jane



Putting Suffolk's waste to good use

Suffolk EfW Community Liaison Group - Minutes

Suffolk energy-from-waste facility board room
Tuesday 09 July 2019 – 6:30pm

Attendance:

John Field, Gipping Valley County Councillor (Chair)
Penny Pearson, Somersham resident
Trevor Messenger, Great Blakenham resident
Chris Studd, Claydon Parish Council
Marion Little, local resident
Widge Bowman, Great Blakenham Parish Council
David Welham, Claydon Resident

Observers:

Paul Newby, SUEZ
Emma Jordan, SUEZ (Recorder)
Jane Hughes, Suffolk County Council
Adrian Sherman, Environment Agency

Apologies

Steve Palfrey, Suffolk County Council
Oliver Morrall, SUEZ

Discussion	Action
<p>Welcome, Introductions & Minutes JF opened the meeting.</p> <p>Apologies received from Steve Palfrey and Oliver Morrall.</p> <p>Review of last minutes and actions: The minutes were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>Update on actions: Breach reports - Adrian explained that more work needed to be done to bottom out the root cause of the emissions breaches and confirmed scores would be issued.</p> <p>Use of Pound Lane – Jane had raised this again, asking Babergh and Mid Suffolk to ask their contractors not to use this route. John added that he was due to meet the Mid Suffolk chief executive the following day and would raise the issue with him. Members noted that although use of this road was unrestricted, it was unsuitable for lorries.</p> <p>New CLG members - Emma updated that some Great Blakenham residents who lived nearby had expressed an interest in joining the group when attending the recent drop in sessions and the Oliver was following this up.</p> <p>Newsletter delivery – Oliver had spoken to the delivery company who confirmed they had covered Somersham even though some residents hadn't received a newsletter. Emma confirmed SUEZ would use a different supplier or different delivery method for the next newsletter, adding that SUEZ published information in several different places about the capacity increase plans to mitigate the fact that door to door delivery doesn't provide full coverage. Penny noted that <i>In Touch</i>, which carried an article about the capacity increase, had been delivered late that month.</p> <p>Destination of recyclable during materials recycling facility (MRF) refurbishment – Jane explained that from March to June, recyclables had been sent to MRFs in Crayford (1,700t), Milton Keynes (750t), Costessey (5,500t) either directly or bulked from the MRF.</p> <p>Operational update</p> <p><u>Site Update</u> The facility has had a good year so far, with overall equipment effectiveness (OEE) on target. The load was reduced in the run up to the recent shutdown when the facility experienced a few technical issues with boiler tube leaks. It's now running at a reduced set point (52tph whereas previously 55tph) to remain with the tonnage limit in the environmental permit for the year.</p> <p><u>Shutdown</u> The economiser replacement was the single biggest task during the</p>	<p>JF</p>

shutdown. Other tasks included boiler tube repairs, an overhaul of the grate, replacing the cope hood (ring) at the top of the stack, bag house repairs, an endoscope survey of the turbine, refractory repairs and valve replacements.

In response to a question, Paul explained there had been one odour complaint during the shutdown, reporting a burning smell. This had been reported before and the reports coincide with hot weather. The complaints were investigated and staff couldn't find a cause but don't believe they are linked to the facility.

Widge noted the shutdown had been longer than previous shutdowns and that the diversion of waste to the nearby landfill had led to amenity issues such as dust, odour, flies and birds. Adrian confirmed the Agency had received a complaint about the landfill operated by Viridor.

In response to a questions about the shutdown works Paul explained that:

- new economiser should have a minimum five year life
- SUEZ is considering cleaning or repainting the stack to improve its appearance

Health and safety during the shutdown

Work took place 24/7 for 26 days with 40 different contractors with 257 staff. Over 1,300 safety conversations took place, 22 near misses were reported and there were five accidents (none requiring off site medical treatment and all have been fully investigated to prevent reoccurrences).

A number of rescue exercises were conducted, including a live casualty rescue from a confined space at height and the team performed well.

Recruitment

SUEZ has recently employed a new cost control administrator who lives locally in Claydon and is currently recruiting for an administration apprentice. The team are hosting two work placements in July for further education students. Oliver to confirm which colleges students attend.

In response to a question PN confirmed apprentices spend a day a week studying.

Environment

There were four reports to the Environment Agency in April and none in other months since the last meeting. In April:

- the facility suffered a boiler tube failure and it's thought that

OM

<p>the moisture released by this affected the instrumentation, increasing the emissions readings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On a subsequent occasion total organic carbon was briefly over the half hour level in the permit due to wet waste from the leak not being sufficiently blended with drier material. - A fault with the lime dosing system caused HCl to be raised over the permit levels, this is considered abnormal operation. - In later April total organic carbon was briefly over the half hour level in the permit due to waste moving on the grate. Wear on the shark fins was identified during the shutdown, these were replaced and going forwards will be replaced six monthly rather than annually. <p>Adrian confirmed the Agency had been notified of all exceedances, which were short in duration, only just over the permit limits and unlike to have had a significant impact at ground level. Root cause investigations are ongoing and SUEZ has already taken action to prevent reoccurrences.</p> <p>In response to a question, Paul explained that the boiler tube leak happened the week prior to the shutdown. The tubes were then checked during the shutdown and any showing signs of thinning were replaced to prevent reoccurrences. The team has also increased the frequency of refractory inspections.</p> <p>Adrian reported that on 27 March he had carried out an audit of the facility's accident management and incident preparedness procedures. Overall these were found to be good and generated some useful ideas for managing major incidents such as being able to access plans of the facility remotely. The audit picked up a few minor issues relating to document control and review periods. The facility's monitoring equipment has also been checked. All Agency reports are available on its public register and Adrian will send a summary to John once this is available.</p> <p>Chris noted it was reassuring that the Agency carry out checks and audits.</p> <p>With regard to odour reports, Adrian explained that the Agency regulates a number of sites in the area and encouraged members to call the Agency's 0800 number to report any complaints. The Agency hadn't been able to attribute the burning smell mentioned earlier to a particular site. The Agency had previously received similar odour reports in 2017 and had identified an odour in the vicinity of the nearby Premier Inn.</p> <p>The Agency had received one complaint about the nearby landfill. Widge suggested that if future shutdowns are extended it would be</p>	<p>AS</p> <p>OM</p>
---	---------------------

helpful for members to be notified so that they can let local people know.

Adrian noted that the Agency and SUEZ share information on complaints and work together to investigate.

Health and Safety

Documentation is being reviewed to implement the recommendations from the Agency's audit.

Health and safety culture at the facility remains strong and the team reached 500 days without a lost time accident on 29 March.

April and May saw an increase in near misses due to the shutdown. All personal injuries since the last meeting were minor and treated on site by first aiders.

Visitor centre

Attendance remains high with visitor numbers at:

March – 192

April – 64

May – 10

June – 246

An email feedback survey is being trialled which saves paper and time manually inputting responses.

The facility is taking part in Heritage Open Day on Saturday 14 September with pre-bookable tours.

Emma updated on recent community initiatives including:

- Sponsorship of the Somersham Wheelie Fun Day
- A donation to Somersham Primary School PTA towards summer fete costs
- SUEZ Communities trust grant for improvements to Great Blakenham parish room
- A donation to Claydon High School towards its Duke of Edinburgh award scheme
- The Suffolk Waste Partnership presence at the Suffolk Show
- SUEZ team entering Needham raft race
- A beach clean scheduled for 23 August

In response to a question, Jane confirmed new Mid Suffolk councillors have been offered a visit to the facility.

Capacity increase update

Paul had been interviewed by the East Anglian Daily Times which ran a story shortly before the drop in sessions, timed to encourage attendance. Ten people had attended the drop in sessions. Paul presented to Great Blakenham parish council on 19 June about the plans. One phone call and one email had been received commenting on the plans and feedback overall was largely positive with questions about traffic, emissions and shutdown arrangements.

The planning and permit applications have been submitted and members will be updated when the planning application is available for comment.

Paul is presenting to Barham Parish Council on 02 September about the plans.

AOB

John noted that the energy-from-waste process was mature and queried why design changes were considered. Paul explained that SUEZ reviews the process and will consider changes and improvements as part of a Continuous Improvement process.

For example the new cope hood on the stack is stainless steel and the expense of this was deemed worthwhile due to the corrosion on the previous cope hood which was a standard material.

Over time, SUEZ learns about the facility and makes investments that wouldn't be provided as part of a turnkey contract. Learning is shared throughout the energy division of SUEZ, both in the UK and globally, and the findings of continuous improvement projects shared.

Date and time of next meeting 12 November 2019, 6.30pm at the EfW facility, Lodge Lane.

OM