

**Norfolk County Council Waste PFI: Responses to WIDP Action Points**  
**Clarifications and Additional Questions 25 July 2008**

**Action Point 6 and Clarification Point 14**

Response: In the attached report by Enviros you will see we have made an initial review of the options and we will be making progress on them to determine a more defined technical, economic and environmental case which will assist in assessments of the potential for additional merit to the OBC. We would appreciate any guidance you may have to offer in this area so that we can ensure that we meet your expectations.

WIDP PROGRAMME OFFICE NOTE FOR EIR: Attachment is called *CHP Biogas Briefing 25072008 v1.0.pdf*

WIDP PROGRAMME OFFICE NOTE FOR EIR: REMOVED AS IT IS OUT OF SCOPE OF THE REQUEST

**Clarification Point 1**

Response: The capacity of the plant has been sized to manage the growth of MSW during the life of the contract.

In the early years of the contract the contractor will source third party waste to fill the gap between residual MSW arisings and plant capacity. The adjacent paper mill is expected to generate in excess of 200,000 tpa of waste materials which in the longer term Palm Paper envisages being able to treat itself but in the shorter term is looking to landfill. This will also ensure that future additional recycling/composting performance can be encouraged, planned and managed without the fear of crowding out any such improvements by requiring the capacity of the plant to be fully met from the MSW stream. See Clarification Point 8 for further confirmation of this point.

**Clarification Point 3**

Response: The figure for residual waste per kg/head in 2000 was 475.92. Significant increases in recycling, composting, home composting and waste minimisation incentives such as the Norfolk Real Nappy Scheme have contributed to a major reduction in this indicator. In 2006/07 this figure had reduced to 278.81 kg/head and is projected to fall to 240.16 kg/head in 2010, 231.05 kg/head in 2015 and 222.56 kg/head in 2020, thereby achieving Waste Strategy 2007 targets.

**Clarification Point 8**

Response: Norfolk has a large food processing industry which will undoubtedly be attractive to the contractor when sourcing third party waste in the early years of the contract for an MBT/AD Reference Project. This will enable the contractor to manage in partnership with the WDA any fluctuations in waste composition to offset WCA's collecting source separated food waste throughout the life of the contract.

The County Council also has within its control other organic waste streams, material generated by grounds maintenance and catering, that can also be called upon to boost the organic fraction of waste entering the residual waste plant if required. The adjacent paper mill being developed by Palm Paper will also generate in excess of 200,000tpa of sludge which in the longer term it envisages being able to treat itself but in the shorter term is looking to landfill.

WIDP PROGRAMME OFFICE NOTE FOR EIR: REMOVED AS IT IS OUT OF SCOPE OF THE REQUEST

**Additional Question 17072008c:**

**Norfolk County Council Waste PFI: Responses to WIDP Action Points**  
**Clarifications and Additional Questions 25 July 2008**

Question: The OBC appears to show WRATE output for only the efw, mbt and landfill options - was WRATE applied to the other options investigated?

Response: We applied Wrate to the options assessed in the 2008 'Review of Options Appraisal' report, appended to the OBC. This report took the short listed options of EFW and MBT with AD from the 2006 BPEO study. The 2006 study used Wisard to test the environmental impact of all the options considered in that study, which concluded the shortlist that we then carried forward into more detailed analysis.