



INTEGRA

Project Integra – Strategic Board Minutes

Name of meeting	Project Integra Strategic Board	
Date of meeting	Tuesday 26 th October 2021, 10-12	
Venue	Online Meeting via Teams	
Attendees	<p>Councillors:</p> <p>Cllr Robert Mocatta (RM) Cllr Lulu Bowerman (LBo) Cllr Nick Adams-King (NAK) Cllr Kimberley Barrett (KB) Cllr Ian Bastable (IB) Cllr Steve Davies (SD) Cllr Stephen Hammond (SH) Cllr Edward Heron (EH) Cllr Rupert Kyrle (RK) Cllr Kelsie Learney (KL) Cllr Alan Oliver (AO) Cllr John Savage (JS) Cllr Maurice Sheehan (MS)</p> <p>Officers:</p> <p>Abigail Cooke (AC) Olivia Longley (OL) Linda Bratcher (LBr) Liza Brolly (LB) Zoe Clegg (ZC) David Emmett (DE) Mark Grey (MG) Sam Horne (SH) Samantha Kenyon (SK) Chris Noble (CN) Stevyn Ricketts (SR) Gale Smith (GS) Wayne Voller (WV) Ruth Whaymand (RW) Campbell Williams (CW) Paul Wykes (PW)</p>	<p>East Hants District Council Havant Borough Council Test Valley Borough Council Portsmouth City Council Fareham Borough Council New Forest District Council Gosport Borough Council Hampshire County Council Eastleigh Borough Council Winchester City Council Hart District Council Southampton City Council Rushmoor Borough Council</p> <p>Project Integra Project Integra Southampton City Council East Hants District Council Hampshire County Council Portsmouth City Council Veolia Hampshire County Council East Hants District Council New Forest District Council Gosport Borough Council Eastleigh Borough Council Gosport Borough Council Rushmoor Borough Council Winchester City Council Test Valley Borough Council</p>
Apologies	<p>Cllr Steve Leggett (SL) – deputised by Cllr John Savage Cllr Hayley Eachus (HE)</p> <p>Sean Herdman-Grant (SHG) – deputised by Samantha Kenyon Gary Squire (GS) Mark Bowler (MB) Paul Naylor (PN) – deputised by Gale Smith Chris Bradley (CB) Sarah Robinson (SR) Ashley Wild (AW)</p>	<p>Southampton City Council</p> <p>Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council East Hants District Council</p> <p>Fareham Borough Council Fareham Borough Council Eastleigh Borough Council</p> <p>Havant Borough Council Basingstoke and Deane BC Basingstoke and Deane BC</p>

		Actions
1.	Introductions and Domestic Arrangements	
1.1	Cllr Mocatta opened the meeting and round-the-room introductions were given.	
2.	Apologies	
2.1	Apologies as above.	
3.	Declarations of Interest	
3.1	There were no declarations of interest.	
4.	Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (reports 117)	
4.1	RM confirmed that there were no actions from the last meeting but gave updates on some of the issues discussed.	
4.2	Member involvement at working groups At the previous meeting in July, it was voted on and agreed that members would be involved in working groups. RM highlighted that only a small portion of members had done so, members were asked to tell AC their preference at the end of the meeting.	
4.3	Renaming Project Integra It was voted on and decided at the last meeting in July that Project Integra would be renamed, it was agreed that this name would need to be inclusive of the whole county including Southampton and Portsmouth as unitary authorities. AC has been working on this and a new name is under discussion with both Southampton and Portsmouth.	
4.4	National Update RM outlined that since the previous meeting in July there has been no new information on a national level, and we are still awaiting the government to release the consultation responses. It was acknowledged that the political climate and changes to government have had, and will likely continue to have, an impact on this. It is hoped there will be an update for the next meeting in February.	
4.5	MRF Update RM advised that an update on the new MRF would be covered under agenda item 7 of the meeting.	
4.6	The minutes were agreed to be a true record.	
5.	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Waste Domestic Seating: Complying with the Law	

5.1	<p>ZC gave a presentation on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in waste domestic seating which provided an in depth look into what POPs are and how they will impact services in Hampshire.</p> <p>At the end of the presentation, members were invited to offer suggestions and ask questions.</p>	
5.2	<p>RM asked whether the ERF facilities in the county have capacity to accommodate additional POPs material. SH outlined that the facilities do not have capacity and that HCC is in discussions with Veolia to work out a solution. This may involve displacing other material from incineration however, POPs have a high calorific value which will have implications when deciding what material to displace. It is estimated that 1.5 tonnes of black bag waste are equivalent to 1 tonne of POPs material in terms of calorific value, this factor is being considered in discussions.</p>	
5.3	<p>RM asked for clarification on the timeline and when Hampshire needs to have a strategy in place. ZC explained that information around the timeline is quite complex, by the end of 2022 HCC need to write to the Environment Agency explaining where the county is at achieving compliance with POP regulations. However, the Environment Agency has said that they understand that authorities who currently dispose of domestic waste seating in landfill face a significant challenge. The Environment Agency have indicated that they will be enforcing regulations from summer 2023.</p> <p>SH reiterated that the 1st of January 2023 is the date from which Veolia will no longer be able to landfill waste domestic seating and this is when a strategy will need to be in place.</p> <p>ZC outlined that there are significant concerns around how authorities will implement a compliant system by the 1st of January 2023 and highlighted that these issues have been raised with DEFRA and the Environment Agency.</p>	
5.4	<p>RM asked whose responsibility it is to comply to the regulations, collection, or disposal authorities. ZC outlined that ultimately it is the WDA's responsibility to properly dispose of POPs but as WCAs everyone has a duty of care.</p>	
5.5	<p>RM asked whether there are any examples of local authorities separating out POPs material at HWRCs. ZC outlined that there are none that HCC is aware of at this time.</p>	
5.6	<p>SK asked whether all landfills including hazardous waste sites will be affected. SH confirmed that the only viable option for POPs material will be incineration. SK asked whether exporting the material would be an option. ZC outlined that there are rumours that companies who accept this waste type are already shutting down their operations in this area due to the POPs issue so it is unlikely this will be an option.</p>	
5.7	<p>SD asked whether there will potentially be a review of the Fire Safety Regulations. ZC outlined that currently manufacturers are required to meet certain fire regulations and it has been suggested that manufacturers are over applying POPs chemicals to ensure they pass the regulations. There is currently no set chemical level the regulations, and there is some indication that a review into fire safety regulations would include chemical figures for</p>	

	<p>manufacturers to meet regulations, whilst reducing the amount of chemicals used. This would bring the UK more in-line with Europe.</p>	
5.8	<p>JS outlined that the presentation mentioned confidentiality and asked whether the POPs issue could be brought up in other settings, explained that he sits on a scrutiny panel for the river Itchen who are meeting in a few weeks. ZC outlined that now the Environment Agency has sent round a letter informing groups of the regulations that it should be ok to mention.</p>	
5.9	<p>JS asked whether other materials that are also flame retardant such as clothing will be impacted by POPs regulations. ZC explained that a new National Implementation Plan was published on POPs, this outlined new POPs and material that might be considered going forward including textiles, mattresses, and food packaging. It is likely that other materials will be classified as POPs in the future.</p>	
5.10	<p>MS asked whether when collecting bulky waste, the whole POPs item will need to be separated or whether certain parts could be removed and separated such as foam padding. ZC confirmed the whole item will need to be separated. MS asked whether wood from these items could be separated and recycled. ZC outlined that wood sections could be irreversibly transformed and sent to biomass facilities.</p>	
5.11	<p>MS asked whether implementing food waste and diverting it from incineration will help with capacity at incinerators. ZC outlined that it will free up space but the wet content in food waste helps bring the overall calorific value down, POPs waste has a high calorific value that results in spikes in incineration which is challenging to manage.</p>	
5.12	<p>LBo asked ZC to expand on the potential re-use of domestic waste seating. ZC explained that currently re-use can happen at any point of the waste management system, for example some authorities sort their bulky waste material at an intermediary site for reuse and landfill. However, the Environment Agency has said that this cannot continue, all re-use will need to take place at the point of collection. In bulky waste collections operatives will have to decide on-site whether an item is suitable for re-use and in HWRCs only items placed in designated re-use areas will be able to be considered, operatives will no longer be able to remove items or intervene if a member of the public is throwing a suitable item in the general waste section. LBo asked whether HWRC operatives have had training on this issue. ZC outlined that some training had been done but an important part in ensuring re-use will be educating the public.</p>	
5.13	<p>IB asked whether fly-tipped items that contain POPs material can be separated or whether the whole fly-tip will need to be sent for incineration. ZC explained that it will depend on the nature of the fly-tip, if the fly-tip contains a sofa that is obviously damaged and therefore poses a contamination risk then the whole fly-tip will need to be treated as POPs. However, if the fly-tip contains a whole undamaged sofa then it can be separated out and the rest of the material can be treated as normal.</p>	
5.14	<p>KL asked what material will be diverted away from incineration to accommodate POPs items. ZC outlined that it is not known at the moment which material will be diverted but HCC is in discussions with Veolia currently to establish the options.</p>	

5.15	<p>RM asked what authorities need to do to meet compliance and when. ZC indicated that all authorities need to be compliant by the 1st of January 2023. RM asked whether authorities would need to be separating out POPs material by this date. ZC confirmed that as Veolia will not be landfilling any POPs material from the 1st of January that the WCAs will need to be separating POPs materials in line with this.</p>	
	<p>SH outlined that Veolia is working hard to ensure there is a system in place ready for the 1st of January 2023 and they are confident this can be delivered. However, it was noted that this will not come without cost or complications. SH explained that there will be some areas in the county where transfer stations will not have the capacity to accept POPs material and that details of this will be shared as soon as possible. It was also highlighted that PI is going to set up a POPs working group to look at the issue.</p>	
5.16	<p>RM asked who is responsible for commercial POPs waste. ZC explained that the Environment Agency is the regulator for both commercial and domestic waste however the issue being raised currently is around domestic seating and business waste items such as car seats are not included. There are some concerns that the Environment Agency has not informed smaller businesses yet and therefore they might be unprepared. There is the potential that the Environment Agency will ask local authorities to pass on the message, but HCC will push back against this.</p>	
	<p>RM asked what will happen after the 1st of January if a house clearance company takes POPs material to a HWRC and is refused. SH explained that the proper route would be for that company to source an external company who will dispose of the material correctly however recognised that some companies may dispose of materials illegally. RM asked whether the county is likely to see more fly-tipping as a result. SH outlined that this is possible but will push for the Environment Agency and DEFRA to produce a national comms campaign to inform the public and businesses of the issue and how to prevent it. SK asked whether waste operators are passing on information to smaller waste businesses. SH outlined that he hoped this is the case, but it is unlikely that the message will be fully communicated and there is already a problem with unregulated fly-tipping and waste management.</p>	
5.17	<p>KM asked whether there has been any indication of potential funding help. ZC outlined that funding help is unlikely at this stage, it was hoped it would be covered under new burdens, but it has been made clear it will not and although it has suggested it will be included under an EPR scheme it will not be in place in time to help with the initial costs.</p>	
5.18	<p>AO highlighted that there is a licensing scheme for waste operators that all small waste businesses should be a part of, acknowledged that it is likely some are operating illegally, but asked why the Environment Agency cannot use this to contact businesses. Outlined that local authorities should be pushing back on this issue. ZC confirmed that all waste carriers should have a license and the Environment Agency will have their details, the issue regarding contacting businesses has been raised.</p>	
5.19	<p>SH shared that he and ZC have been working hard at a higher level and through working groups to raise and respond to issues around POPs. Hampshire is fortunate that it has its own incineration facilities, even though</p>	

	<p>they are at capacity, as other authorities are facing huge costs to export their material out of area. SH recognised that this is a tricky issue but reassured members that HCC and Veolia are working to have a solution in place by the 1st of January 2023.</p>	
6	<p>Economics of Waste and Recycling</p> <p>6.1 SH gave a presentation on the economics of waste which included information on what drives the cost of waste both globally and in Hampshire.</p> <p>At the end of the presentation, members were invited to offer suggestions and ask questions.</p> <p>6.2 AO asked whether Veolia has considered new technology such as carbon capture, what the process is for exploring new technologies and how the partnership can make suggestions. SH explained that Veolia operate the infrastructure on behalf of the partnership, as part of this they continually explore new technologies and look into ways to improve efficiency. MG expanded on this and shared that Veolia is looking at carbon capture across plants nationally but the infrastructure in Hampshire is relatively old and the team need to ensure it is the right thing to do before taking it forward.</p> <p>6.3 IB highlighted that he had recently attended a meeting with manufacturers including Coca Cola who indicated that 100% of their packaging will be covered under DRS, asked whether any modelling has been done on DRS in Hampshire. SH confirmed that HCC has done three stages of modelling and have established what it will mean for Hampshire in terms of tonnage and income. SH added that the timeline for DRS is complicated, at the earliest it will be 2025 before it is implemented but with the government changes it is possible it will be delayed. It is feasible that EPR and consistency will be implemented first and DRS will be re-evaluated. SH outlined that EPR, and consistency combined with packaging innovation going forward may be a better approach.</p>	
7.	<p>Updates</p> <p>7.1 Inter- authority Agreement (IAA)</p> <p>SH outlined that feedback on the IAA has been collated and sent to the legal team to make tweaks, this will include changes to the residual waste arising target. An updated version of the agreement will be shared as soon as possible.</p> <p>AC is still waiting for feedback on the governance arrangement option, SH asked authorities to send their preference to AC.</p> <p>SH shared that HCC is still hoping to have an agreement with a governance approach in place approved early next year.</p> <p>7.2 MRF</p> <p>SH shared that the business case for the MRF was approved by HCC at the beginning of October however timelines did not align, and it still needs to be</p>	ALL

	<p>approved by PCC and SCC, it is hoped this will be completed in the next few months. Last week the planning application for the Eastleigh site was approved, this is good news and work has already started on detailed designs, procurement, timeline, and market conditions. It is hoped that by mid-2025 the facility will be up and running.</p> <p>AO asked whether the infrastructure would accommodate all recyclable materials, including food waste. SH confirmed that food waste is in the plans however it will not be processed at the Eastleigh MRF, HCC will provide infrastructure however it is a separate process that will require its own facilities. Hampshire currently uses a 3rd party to process food waste and there are discussions as to whether this will be continued or whether new infrastructure is built, but nothing has been decided at this stage.</p> <p>LBo asked whether the new MRF will be able process plastic pots, tubs, and trays. SH confirmed that the MRF will be built to accommodate materials listed in the Environment Act including plastic pots tubs and trays, cartons, and eventually soft plastics.</p> <p>SK asked whether the new MRF will impact on where authorities tip their waste. SH explained that the waste flow has been mapped and there will be some changes, but the authorities affected have already been contacted.</p>	
<p>9.</p> <p>9.1</p> <p>9.2</p> <p>9.3</p> <p>9.4</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>RM suggested scheduling an in-person workshop for members to discuss the future of waste in Hampshire. It was agreed that this would be beneficial, a date before the next board meeting will be scheduled and sent out.</p> <p>AC shared details of the Project Integra working groups and members were reminded to tell AC their preference at the end of the meeting.</p> <p>AC explained that the Contamination Working Group had been working on a radio advertisement project. The advert has now gone live and will be played daily on Heart and Smooth radio over the next 6 months. AC to share advert audio with the minutes.</p> <p>RM outlined that it had previously been agreed that the Project Integra board meeting will take place in person once a year and the remaining two meetings would take place on teams, asked members if they were still happy with this arrangement. There were no objections, and it was agreed this format would continue.</p>	<p>AC</p> <p>AC</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>Proposed: Tuesday 21st of February 2022, 10-12pm. The meeting will be held on Teams.</p>	