

WEALDEN WORKS 3Rs PERMIT VARIATION APPLICATION

Appendix G: BAT Assessment

JER8584
Wealden 3Rs BAT
Assessment
2
2
12 October 2020

Quality Management

Version	Revision	Authored by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date
1	0	Alice Gibbs			11 September 2020
1	1	Alice Gibbs	Jennifer Stringer		16 September 2020
1	2	Alice Gibbs	Jennifer Stringer	Jennifer Stringer	18 September 2020
2	1	Alice Gibbs	Keith Riley		24 September 2020
2	2	Alice Gibbs	Jennifer Stringer	Jennifer Stringer	12 October 2020

Approval for issue

Jennifer Stringer

Technical Director



12 October 2020

File Name

201012 R JER8584 AG Wealden 3Rs BAT Assessment V2 R2

The report has been prepared for the exclusive use and benefit of our client and solely for the purpose for which it is provided. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by RPS Group Plc, any of its subsidiaries, or a related entity (collectively 'RPS') no part of this report should be reproduced, distributed or communicated to any third party. RPS does not accept any liability if this report is used for an alternative purpose from which it is intended, nor to any third party in respect of this report. The report does not account for any changes relating to the subject matter of the report, or any legislative or regulatory changes that have occurred since the report was produced and that may affect the report.

The report has been prepared using the information provided to RPS by its client, or others on behalf of its client. To the fullest extent permitted by law, RPS shall not be liable for any loss or damage suffered by the client arising from fraud, misrepresentation, withholding of information material relevant to the report or required by RPS, or other default relating to such information, whether on the client's part or that of the other information sources, unless such fraud, misrepresentation, withholding or such other default is evident to RPS without further enquiry. It is expressly stated that no independent verification of any documents or information supplied by the client or others on behalf of the client has been made. The report shall be used for general information only.

Prepared by:

Prepared for:

RPS

Britaniacrest Recycling Limited

Alice Gibbs

Environmental Consultant

6-7 Lovers Walk
Brighton, East Sussex BN1 6AH

T

E

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	ERF OPTIONS APPRAISALS	2
2.2	Selection of Treatment Technology	2
	Assessment of Technology Options	8
	Conclusions.....	11
2.3	NOx Abatement Selection.....	12
	Summary of environmental performance	14
	Summary of NOx Appraisal.....	16
2.4	Acid Gas Abatement Selection	16
	Summary of environmental performance	18
	Summary of Acid Gas Appraisal	19
2.5	Dioxin and Furan Abatement Selection	19
2.6	Control of Particulates.....	19
3	BAT CONCLUSIONS ASSESSMENT	20
3.1	Waste Incineration BAT Conclusions 2019.....	20
	General BAT conclusions:.....	21
	Summary	34

Tables

Table 2-1.	Summary of Technologies and Potential Energy Transfers.....	9
Table 2-2.	Summary of Air Quality Performance Associated with Releases of NOx	13
Table 2-3.	Summary of GWP Performance.....	14
Table 2-4.	Summary Ranking.....	15
Table 2-5.	Comparison of Costs.....	15
Table 2-6.	Comparison of Costs per tonne NO _x abated.....	16
Table 2-7.	Summary of Air Quality Performance Associated with Releases of Acid Gas Emissions	17
Table 2-8.	Summary of GWP Performance.....	17
Table 2-9.	Summary of Raw Material Consumption.....	18
Table 2-10.	Summary Ranking for Acid Gas Options	18

Appendices

Appendix G : BAT Assessment

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1 Britaniacrest Recycling Limited (Britaniacrest) is applying to vary their environmental permit (EPR/CB3308TD) for a waste transfer station (WTS) to relocate the WTS activity within a new building and to include a mechanical sorting and materials recovery facility (MSMR) and an energy recovery facility (ERF). The application also seeks to increase the permitted capacity from 200,000 tonnes per annum up to 230,000 tonnes per annum. The permitted facility is located at Langhurstwood Road, Horsham, RH12 4QD.
- 1.1.2 Details of the proposal are provided within the supporting information document.
- 1.1.3 This report will compare the installation activities against the relevant Best Available Techniques (BAT) conclusions set out in the revised Waste Incineration BREF¹ and associated implementing decision². It also addresses BAT options appraisal requirements as set out in EPR S5.01³ and confirmed via pre-application discussions with the Environment Agency (EA), specific to the ERF.
- 1.1.4 Section 2 assesses the choice of treatment technology, NO_x abatement, acid gas abatement, dioxin and furan abatement and particulate abatement against alternatives, qualitatively and quantitatively using the Environment Agency's H1 tool.
- 1.1.5 Section 3 reviews the site processes against each relevant Waste Incineration BAT conclusion.
- 1.1.6 The following information sources have been utilised to inform the BAT assessment:
- The permit itself;
 - Operational techniques;
 - Environmental management system, including operating procedures, management plans and facility description; and
 - Other supplementary information and data together with discussions with the operator.

¹ Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference Document for Waste Incineration, JCR Science for Policy Report, 2019
https://eippcb.jrc.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2020-01/JRC118637_WI_Bref_2019_published_0.pdf

² Waste Incineration BAT Conclusions <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32019D2010&from=EN>

³ How to comply with your environmental permit. Additional guidance for the incineration of waste (EPR 5.01). Available:
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/297004/geho0209bpio-e-e.pdf

2 ERF OPTIONS APPRAISALS

2.1.1 In section 3 of the main variation application document, a description of the proposed ERF has been provided, detailing those techniques that are considered to represent BAT for the proposed ERF. This section provides a BAT appraisal for the key items of plant as follows:

- Moving grate furnace;
- SNCR;
- Acid gas abatement;
- Injection of activated carbon; and
- Bag filters.

2.2 Selection of Treatment Technology

2.2.1 A brief review of available technologies for thermal treatment of the proposed waste material is provided in section 3.4 of the main variation application document. This review considered a wide range of technologies but concluded that moving grate and fluidised bed systems are the only proven systems for the application to the proposed waste material within the UK. Gasification and pyrolysis systems are recognised as emerging techniques however, their availability and reliability are yet to be proven technologies within the UK at the scale proposed for this facility.

2.2.2 This section provides further discussion on the following alternatives:

- Option 1: Moving Grate;
- Option 2: Fluidised Bed;
- Option 3: Gasification;
- Option 4: Pyrolysis;
- Option 5: Plasma Arc Gasification;
- Option 6: Biological Treatment (Anaerobic Digestion); and
- Option 7: Landfill.

Conventional Thermal Treatment Technologies

2.2.3 Conventional thermal treatment technologies are based upon the complete combustion of the incoming waste material. The application of conventional thermal treatment technologies to the burning of material derived from waste requires the ERF to comply with the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)⁴ and BATC. Fundamental requirements of the IED and BATC include the requirement to achieve a combustion temperature of > 850°C, with a residence time after the last injection of combustion air of at least 2 seconds. A number of variations exist based on the type of combustion plant. Options 1 and 2 in this assessment represent alternative types of conventional thermal treatment.

2.2.4 Conventional thermal treatment processes offer a proven technique, able to operate flexibly, to cater for a wide range of waste material inputs.

Option 1: Moving Grate

2.2.5 Moving grate technologies are the most widely used system for C&I waste, MSW and MSW-derived fuel applications and as such are well proven and reliable. The moving grate system is

⁴ Industrial Emissions Directive 2010/75/EU <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32010L0075&from=EN>

capable of burning MSW fuel as received as well as processed fuels such as RDF or SRF. A variety of designs are available, but typically the grate system will include a mechanism for distributing the incoming waste material across the grate and for transporting the combustible material forward, providing mixing as it traverses the length of the grate.

- 2.2.6 The waste material is burned with an excess of air that is typically drawn from above the storage bunker (as is the case for the proposed facility), providing a source of odour control. Primary air is generally fed through the grate with a secondary air supply above the grate to create turbulence.
- 2.2.7 Flue gases from the furnace will require treatment to achieve compliance with the emission limit requirements of the IED and BATC.
- 2.2.8 Moving grate systems will produce two residues, bottom ash (usually combined with boiler ash, but this can be collected separately) and air pollution control (APC) residues. Bottom ash, which is the larger (in quantity) of the two residues, has the potential to be reused as an aggregate. Uses for APC residues are available, subject to testing of the residue.

Option 2: Fluidised Bed Furnace

- 2.2.9 Fluidised Bed (FB) technology operates by feeding the waste material onto a bed of 'fluidised' sand particles. The fluidised bed technology requires a homogenous feedstock. In this respect fluidised bed would not be suited to all of the types of waste material proposed for the ERF.
- 2.2.10 FB technology is capable of achieving somewhat lower NO_x emissions in the raw gas than are typically achievable in moving grate systems. This is achieved through lower bed temperatures, which reduce thermal NO_x formation but may produce higher CO emissions. However, additional abatement using either SCR or SNCR will still be required to guarantee IED and BATC compliance.
- 2.2.11 Additional raw materials are required in the form of sand within the fluidised bed system.
- 2.2.12 Solid waste streams from the process typically include bottom ash, cyclone ash (usually mixed with the bottom ash), and APC residues. Although overall a similar total amount of residues will arise in a fluidised bed plant compared with that from a moving grate system, a higher proportion will be classified as hazardous waste. As for moving grate plant the bottom ash can be reused as an aggregate.
- 2.2.13 FB technology is employed in Europe, including in the UK, where it is operational at Allington in Kent and was previously employed in Scotland at Baldovie (near Dundee). The larger Allington plant has three lines with a combined capacity of approximately 500,000 tpa. UK experience with fluidised bed plant is reported as problematic, with both Dundee and Allington initially experiencing significant downtime, as reported in 2008⁵. Subsequent reports of operation at the Allington facility have indicated significant downtime in some years (e.g. annual availability 59% in 2010 and 72% in 2011⁶) and some further problems with the fluidisation technology: for example in 2014 loss of fluidisation was the single largest cause of downtime, with total

⁵ letsrecycle.com (2008): Allington Technology Defended as Repairs Near End [online], available: <https://www.letsrecycle.com/news/latest-news/allington-technology-defended-as-repairs-near-end>

⁶ Allington Quarry Integrated Waste Management Facility, Community Liaison Committee Notes, meeting 26 January 2012 (page 1) [online], available: <https://www.fccenvironment.co.uk/assets/files/Final%20January%202012%20Liaison%20Committee%20Minutes.pdf>

unavailability during 2014 of 19%⁷ and 16% in 2018⁸. In 2019, FCC Environment launched a consultation (with a DCO expected late 2020) on proposals to increase the capacity of the Allington plant to 850,000 tpa, but the new line would use moving grate technology⁹. It was anticipated that the end of the operational life of the Dundee facility would be April 2020¹⁰, after which the Dundee facility would be replaced with a moving grate facility. However, MVV have since stated that the FB facility can continue to operate for longer than anticipated and have applied to operate the FB and moving grate facilities in parallel for a period of up to 10 years from April 2020.

Advanced Thermal Treatment

- 2.2.14 Gasification and pyrolysis treatment processes have a long history of application to fossil fuels and certain homogeneous waste streams (although these were not historically governed by the requirements of the IED or the former Waste Incineration Directive). Their application to MSW and RDF in the UK is limited at 'commercial scale', and this continued to be the position as described by Defra in 2013¹¹ with only three operational facilities identified at the time (Table 4 of the Defra document).
- 2.2.15 It is reported that six ATT projects in England and Wales have been allocated Contracts for Difference in the 2017 auction round¹², however only two signed contracts in 2019 (Round 3)¹³.

Option 3: Gasification

- 2.2.16 Gasification is the partial thermal degradation of a substance in the presence of oxygen but with insufficient oxygen to oxidise the feed material completely. This process produces gaseous fractions known as 'synthesis gas' or 'syngas', primarily a combination of carbon monoxide, hydrogen and methane. The synthesis gas offers the potential to be utilised in a number of ways, including combustion in engines, steam-raising boilers or other energy conversion processes, subject to gas quality and legislative requirements.
- 2.2.17 Gasification is reported by some as offering the opportunity for higher efficiency electrical generation compared to conventional combustion technologies.

⁷ Kent Enviropower Ltd (2015): Annual Report for Allington Energy from Waste Facility, Year: 2014 (pages 10-11) [online], available: <https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/260104/response/645233/attach/18/Annual%20Report%20for%202014%20Allington.pdf>

⁸ Kent Enviropower Ltd (2019): Annual Report for Allington Energy from Waste Facility, Year: 2018 [online], available: <https://ukwin.org.uk/library/136-AnnualPerformanceReport-2018.pdf>

⁹ letsrecycle.com (2019): FCC proposes Allington EfW upgrade [online], available: <https://www.letsrecycle.com/news/latest-news/fcc-proposes-allington-efw-upgrade/>

¹⁰ MVV Environment Baldovie Ltd (2020) Pollution Prevention and Control non-technical summary [online], available: https://www.mvv.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Ueber_uns/de/geschaeftsfelder_1/environment_1/dundee_and_angus_/planning_application/application_to_vary_permit/Pollution_Prevention_and_Control_non-technical_summary_update.pdf

¹¹ Defra (2013): Advanced Thermal Treatment of Municipal Solid Waste [online], available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/221035/pb13888-thermal-treatment-waste.pdf

¹² ACT and Biomass Schemes Backed in CfD Auction, 11 September 2017 [online], available at: <https://www.mrw.co.uk/latest/act-and-biomass-schemes-backed-in-cfd-auction/10023285.article>

¹³ Low Carbon Contracts Company (2019): Allocation Round three projects sign on the dotted line [online], available: https://www.lowcarboncontracts.uk/sites/default/files/2019-10/LCCC%20press%20notice-signed%20AR3%20contracts-20191018_0.pdf

-
- 2.2.18 Operationally, a homogeneous incoming waste stream with a high organic content is required to obtain consistent gas quality. Therefore, this technology is better suited to applications where the incoming waste material has been pre-treated.
- 2.2.19 The process requires energy input from supplementary combustion, likely to be using either natural gas or low sulphur oil, to achieve the temperature required for thermal treatment.
- 2.2.20 Ash and char are also produced from the gasification process. The ash from some gasification processes is suitable for re-use as an aggregate material. Residues from flue gas cleaning, similar to those from conventional combustion plant would be treated for reuse or disposed of as hazardous waste if a reuse route could not be found.
- 2.2.21 Combustion of the fuels from the gasification stage will be subject to the requirements of the IED and BATC. These emissions will require treatment and generally similar abatement to that applied to conventional plant to ensure compliance with emission limits¹⁴.
- 2.2.22 Currently there is limited experience of gasification technology employed for the treatment of waste materials, and there remains a low uptake of this technology in Europe, where experience has proven mixed or is limited.
- 2.2.23 Where it has been applied, such as the development at Avonmouth by New Earth Solutions (since acquired by Beaparc) to treat RDF, this technology has experienced extensive ongoing operational difficulties that have led to this plant being closed for long periods¹⁵. The most recent news found on the Avonmouth plant stated that it was to be closed until 2020¹⁶. Viridor's Glasgow facility has suffered construction ongoing delays due to its gasification technology Interserve provider leaving the market, whereas its sister plant at Dunbar based on conventional mass burn technology has reported a more straightforward construction¹⁷. In 2019, it was reported that more household waste was being sent to the Allerton plant due to closure of a landfill¹⁸. Four waste wood gasification facilities developed by CoGen (and various partners) are currently operational, which are at a smaller scale than the proposed ERF: Welland Bio Power; Ince Bio Power; Birmingham Bio Power; and Dartmoor Bio Power¹⁹. CoGen's Hooton Bio Power facility, which is the largest of their facilities at 270,000 tpa of MSW and therefore slightly larger than the proposed ERF, is currently under construction by EPC contractor BWSC. A FB gasification facility with RDF feedstock of smaller scale to the facility (100ktpa throughput), Levenseat Renewable Energy (LREL) in Scotland, was undergoing commissioning in 2018²⁰ but no subsequent information has been found regarding operation of the facility and so conclusions on the operational performance of this combination of technology choices cannot be drawn. An RDF gasification facility called Surrey Eco Park started hot commissioning in late 2019²¹, but it is too soon to draw conclusions on the operational performance.

¹⁴ Energy from Waste: A good practice guide, November 2003, The Chartered Institute of Waste Management

¹⁵ Troubled Gasification Plant to Stay Closed Until 2018, Resource [online], available: <https://resource.co/article/troubled-gasification-plant-stay-closed-until-2018-11585>

¹⁶ MRW (2018): Avonmouth plant closed until 2020 [online], available: <https://www.mrw.co.uk/latest/avonmouth-plant-closed-until-2020-04-06-2018/>

¹⁷ <https://www.endswasteandbioenergy.com/article/1451649/pennon-gives-efw-facilities-update>

¹⁸ <https://www.letsrecycle.com/news/latest-news/efw-boost-councils-mark-shift-away-landfill/>

¹⁹ Cogen UK, Projects [online]. <https://www.cogenuk.com/projects>

²⁰ Levenseat Renewable Energy (2018): Commissioning Update: Levenseat Renewable Energy's Power Plant enters Hot Commissioning [online], available: <http://lrel.levenseat.co.uk/community-update-on-commissioning/>

²¹ <https://www.letsrecycle.com/news/latest-news/eco-park-final-testing/>

2.2.24 Overall, while showing some recent success in certain cases, the technology remains in its infancy with few successful facilities of similar scale to that proposed. So far, no municipal waste gasification plant in the UK has achieved financial takeover, which introduces an issue of commercial viability as gasification projects are experiencing difficulties in securing financing.

Option 4: Pyrolysis

- 2.2.25 Pyrolysis is the thermal degradation of a substance in the absence of added oxygen. Like gasification, pyrolysis also offers the potential option of more innovative use of the pyrolysis syngas other than immediate combustion to produce heat. The process requires energy input from a combination of waste heat from the process and supplementary combustion, likely to be using either natural gas or low sulphur oil, to achieve the temperature required for thermal treatment.
- 2.2.26 Typical temperatures for pyrolysis are between 300-800°C²².
- 2.2.27 At the scale being considered, similar to gasification combustion of the fuels will be subject to the requirements of the IED and BATC. These emissions will require treatment, generally using similar abatement to that applied to conventional plant to ensure compliance with emission limits.
- 2.2.28 Solid residues from pyrolysis plant have a high carbon content. Unlike combustion bottom ash or the residue from some gasification plant, this material will require landfilling or further treatment. Residues from flue gas cleaning would require disposal to hazardous landfill.
- 2.2.29 There is limited experience of the application of pyrolysis technology for the treatment of MSW or RDF, its presence in the market is not well established and its commercial application is limited. A 2015 review of activity in the UK shows continued interest in research and pilot trials for some specific material streams, but no commercial scale or general MSW/RDF treatment facilities in the UK²³. It therefore cannot be considered to be fully proven at the current time and particularly not at the scale proposed for the ERF.

Other

2.2.30 In addition to the four technologies outlined above, which are subject to further discussion in the remainder of this section, three further alternatives are considered in brief below.

Option 5: Plasma Arc Gasification

- 2.2.31 Plasma arc gasification technology transforms waste streams into synthesis gas and a vitrified slag by means of thermal plasma. The plasma (also known as the fourth state of matter) is a mixture of electrons, ions and neutral particles (atoms and molecules).
- 2.2.32 Plasma technology has been reported by some as achieving a greater level of environmental performance in terms of emissions and residues. To date the process has been used mainly to treat hazardous wastes including organics, metals, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) (including small-scale equipment) and hexachlorobenzene (HCB).
- 2.2.33 Plasma Arc technology produces very high temperatures (5,000 to 15,000 °C) It involves heating up the syngas after gasification has taken place. Under these conditions, hazardous

²² The Viability of Advanced Thermal Treatment of Municipal Solid Waste in the UK, March 2004, Fitchner Consulting Engineers Limited

²³ Bridgewater, T. and Watkinson, I. (2015): Biomass and Waste Pyrolysis, A Guide to UK Capabilities. Aston University European Bioenergy Research Institute (EBRI). [online], available: <http://www.pyne.co.uk/Resources/user/UK%20Biomass%20and%20Waste%20Pyrolysis%20Guide%202015%20081015.pdf>

contaminants, such as tars, PAHs, PCBs, dioxins, furans, pesticides, etc, are broken into their atomic constituents.

- 2.2.34 The high temperature and oxygen starved environment is used to decompose the feed material into simple molecules as CO, CO₂, H₂, CH₄, etc., and also ash and slag.
- 2.2.35 Whilst plasma arc gasification is an established technology at small scale for some materials, the process can be very complex, expensive and operator intensive. There would be significant challenge in achieving the very high temperature throughout a solid waste mass at large scale and this is a practical constraint for scaling the application. Plans by Air Products to develop two major plasma arc gasification plants in Teesside eventually failed in 2016²⁴. Advanced Plasma Power has reported success with a pilot-scale plant treating MSW to produce biogas²⁵, albeit at a fairly small 1,000 tpa scale. Following the success of this small pilot plant, a larger 10,000 tpa BioSNG pilot plant was constructed and set to start operating in 2018²⁶, however no information on its operational performance could be found.
- 2.2.36 Plasma arc gasification is therefore not considered proven or viable at the scale of the proposed ERF and is therefore discounted from further consideration.

Option 6: Biological Treatment (Anaerobic Digestion)

- 2.2.37 Anaerobic digestion (AD) involves biological decomposition of waste in air-tight containers to produce a methane-rich biogas. The process requires the control of temperature, pH and moisture to optimise microbe activity and thereby the gas production. Normally, the gas is collected and combusted with energy recovered in the form of heat or electricity. Source separated waste is essential if the solid residue (the digestate) is to have value in agricultural or horticultural application as opposed to disposal in landfill sites.
- 2.2.38 The incoming waste is screened and then mixed with previously digested material to achieve the correct consistency. This mixture is then pumped into the air-tight digester vessel where it is held for 2-3 weeks. Inside the digester the material is mixed and biogas formed, taken off and burnt for energy (typical methane content 55-65%). The solid waste digestate is extracted, de-watered and disposed of. Control of temperature is very important in the formation of the biogas. Temperatures must be maintained above 30°C for the gas production to occur at reasonable levels. The use of higher temperature systems is possible and increases the production of biogas, however, the process is faster and requires additional energy input.
- 2.2.39 Further, an AD solution would only be suited to the biodegradable fraction of the proposed waste streams requiring either further processing on site (increasing the capacity of the facility further) or securing an alternative feed material. On this basis an AD solution has been rejected.

Option 7: Landfill

- 2.2.40 Whilst landfill would be an alternative option for the proposed waste, this option landfill presents a number of environmental issues and for some time has been recognised as an unsustainable option for waste management. The proposed ERF option is expected to achieve R1 status and therefore qualify as a recovery operation whereas landfill although obliged to capture gas is not necessarily required to recover energy and will always represent a disposal option. Consequently, landfill has been discounted as an alternative to the proposed ERF.

²⁴ <https://waste-management-world.com/a/air-products-to-ditch-plasma-gasification-waste-to-energy-plants-in-teesside>

²⁵ Green gas trial hailed a success as preparations gear up for commercial operations [online] available at: <http://blog.advancedplasmawater.com/latest-news/green-gas-trial-hailed-success-preparations-gear-commercial-operations>

²⁶ <https://www.theccc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Biomass-response-to-Call-for-Evidence-Advanced-Plasma-Power.pdf>

Assessment of Technology Options

- 2.2.41 Based on the above overview, this section provides further discussion of the issues and impacts associated with moving grate; fluidised bed; gasification and pyrolysis techniques and describes the basis for concluding that moving grate represents BAT for this facility.

Emissions

- 2.2.42 All facilities based on combustion, gasification or pyrolysis technologies where they burn waste materials will be required to comply with the BAT conclusions and, where these aren't applicable, IED. Most technology providers will only provide IED and/or BAT conclusions limit guarantees and will include similar abatement for all technology options to ensure that these levels are met. On this basis, guaranteed emissions performance is considered similar for all options.
- 2.2.43 Flue gases from all of the options considered (including gasification and pyrolysis) will include trace levels of oxides of nitrogen, acid gases (sulphur oxides, hydrogen chloride, hydrogen fluoride), heavy metals and dioxin and furans.
- 2.2.44 However, in practice, different unabated emissions performance is achieved by the various technologies^{Error! Bookmark not defined.}.
- 2.2.45 Fluidised bed technology is capable of lower NO_x emissions and is capable of achieving levels below IED limits for NO_x without abatement, although in practice abatement for NO_x would be provided to guarantee compliance. Abated NO_x emissions would be expected to be dependent on the selected abatement technology and ultimately would be expected to be similar to that achieved for a moving grate system using the same abatement, although noting that lower reagent consumption would be likely. For other pollutants, emissions performance would be similar to moving grate. Lower NO_x levels are reported for some technologies which have the ability to meet IED limits using primary control methods only (i.e. without abatement).
- 2.2.46 Reported emissions for gasification and pyrolysis are generally accepted to be based on limited data. As a result, reported performance differs. Work undertaken for the Environment Agency by AEA Technology indicates that pyrolysis and gasification plant generally achieve similar emissions performance (following abatement) to those for moving grate systems²⁷. Other reference documents indicate the potential for improved performance including heavy metals and dioxins and furans, albeit at the expense of increased levels of these pollutants in residues^{Error! Bookmark not defined.}.

Global Warming Potential

- 2.2.47 The GWP is calculated through assessing all direct releases of greenhouse gases from the process (including the main process, associated abatement and energy related emissions) and indirect emissions of greenhouse gases from the primary source of heat or power imported for use in the process.
- 2.2.48 The purpose of all combustion processes is to fully oxidise a waste material and in an energy recovery process to use the heat energy released through the exothermic reaction of carbon (and hydrogen) with oxygen within a downstream energy conversion stage.
- 2.2.49 The quantity of CO₂ released from the combustion of the waste material, either directly or indirectly, will be fixed and the plant will not be able to control it. The same carbon in ash requirement applies for gasification and pyrolysis processes subject to the IED and BATC. The products of gasification/pyrolysis processes (a combination of syngas, liquid fuel and solid

²⁷ Review of BAT for New Waste Incineration Issues, Part 1 Waste Pyrolysis and Gasification Activities, Technical Report P4-100/TR, November 2001

residue) will contain the chemical energy associated with the same carbon input stream and will be converted by oxidation to CO₂ assuming these are combusted.

2.2.50 It can be noted from the above that the chemistry of the combustion process would be similar for each of the thermal treatment options considered, although the reactions might be optimised under differing conditions, giving rise to the same overall emission of CO₂ associated with a given waste feed material.

2.2.51 In this context, it is necessary to consider the efficiencies related to converting combusted/combustible gases resulting from a process to heat and power, the requirement for supplementary combustion of fuel to maintain the thermal treatment process and those measures to maximise internal energy efficiency of the plant itself (including the 'parasitic' load required to drive supporting equipment and plant).

Energy Conversion Efficiencies

2.2.52 The post combustion energy conversion technology for moving grate and fluidised bed will consist of recovering the energy from the hot combustion gases using a steam turbine unit to generate power, with the option of using a combined heat and power (CHP) unit to generate heat and power simultaneously if needed. In principle, this is independent of the primary combustion process and so it could be considered that the efficiency of this aspect of the ERF should not give rise to any difference between the technologies with respect to overall energy efficiency.

2.2.53 Fuels produced from gasification and pyrolysis (Options 3 and 4) might provide a more flexible option i.e. if treated/refined to an appropriate specification it could be used on site or piped/transported off-site, although in this case, the fuels would need to be used onsite. The fuel is typically either burned in a boiler to raise steam and electricity, with a lower overall efficiency than an EfW facility, or used as a fuel in an engine or turbine. A summary of energy transfers from each process is given in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1. Summary of Technologies and Potential Energy Transfers

Thermal Treatment Process	Output	Transfer of Energy
Conventional thermal treatment (moving grate and fluidised bed)	Hot flue gases	Pass hot gases through a boiler to produce hot water or steam. Steam is used in a turbo-generator to generate electricity. Where steam or hot water are raised for use in an industrial process, efficiency of electrical power generation is reduced but overall energy efficiency can be significantly improved depending on the demand.
Pyrolysis	Syngas Char Bio-oil	Use in steam boiler to drive a steam turbo-generator. Use pyrolysis oil as an engine fuel.
Gasification	Syngas Char	Use in steam boiler to generate process steam only Use as a fuel in a steam turbo-generator Use in a stationary gas engine/turbine to generate electricity at approximately 40% electrical energy conversion efficiency.

Note: Modified from SLR report (2008)²⁸.

2.2.54 Data for the gross efficiency of ATT technologies using MSW are not available in the public domain on a comparable basis with conventional incineration techniques, due to the limited number of operational plants. Differences in the quoted gross efficiencies of ATT technologies and incineration can arise due to a number of factors, which include:

- differences in the assumed CV of the feedstock (which does not apply in this case);

²⁸ Costs of incineration and non-incineration energy from waste technologies, January 2008, SLR Consulting Limited

- net power or gross power output (depending on technique used for conversion);
- whether the parasitic load includes any power consumed in the preparation of the feedstock (which does not apply in this case); and
- size of the steam/gas turbine, which influences conversion efficiencies.

2.2.55 A desire to maximise the efficiency of the conversion process is recognised for any thermal treatment technology. The overall efficiency will be dependent on the efficiencies of the steam turbine and heat exchange/boiler design. The principal difference between the overall energy efficiency of each conventional thermal treatment technology option (i.e. fluidised bed or moving grate) is likely to arise from the parasitic load, although there would be only minor variation in parasitic load (relating to internal material flow transfer, pre-treatment and flue gas treatment).

2.2.56 Each stage of the conversion process combustion/gasification/pyrolysis, energy recovery and secondary energy conversion technologies will reduce the overall conversion efficiency and will have space and layout implications. Specifically, the syngas cleaning stage can affect the overall efficiency of the plant and normally requires cooling of the gas, resulting in the loss of sensible heat from the syngas that cannot be fully recovered.

Indirect Energy

2.2.57 Energy requirements related to the indirect energy input (i.e. fuel for auxiliary/support burners) would be similar for conventional thermal treatment options and therefore a similar quantity of CO₂ would be produced from each option. Unlike gasification or conventional combustion technologies, pyrolysis also requires supplementary combustion to achieve the temperature required for thermal treatment that is likely to be provided by either natural gas or low sulphur oil.

Plant Energy Requirements

2.2.58 General energy efficiency techniques for the proposed ERF were considered earlier in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** This includes operational, maintenance and housekeeping energy efficiency measures. There is nothing to prevent similar techniques for energy efficiency being applied to any of the four options remaining under consideration. Varying degrees of waste pre-treatment, with associated energy demands, are required for fluidised bed, gasification and pyrolysis technologies. For the proposed ERF, some wastes will be processed using the on-site mechanical pre-treatment but the proposals also include for material to be accepted directly into the ERF.

Residue Generation

2.2.59 The residues generated by moving grate systems are either similar or lower in quantity compared to the alternatives, and compared to those for ATT there is the potential for lower hazards associated with the residues due to lower heavy metals, dioxins and furans **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.2.60 Although moving grate and fluidised bed systems generate similar overall quantities of residues, greater volumes of hazardous waste (APC residues) would be generated from a fluidised bed plant compared to a moving grate plant.

Odour

2.2.61 For all options, odour management is capable of ensuring that odour nuisance is not an issue and therefore for the same waste effects are considered similar.

Raw Materials

- 2.2.62 Raw material usage of moving grate systems is less than that required for fluidised bed systems primarily as a result of the requirement for fluidisation sand. ATT options require similar air pollution abatement systems and therefore similar raw materials.
- 2.2.63 There is the potential for variable usage of raw materials, depending on the raw gas concentrations of pollutants. Given that moving grate systems can present higher raw gas NOx concentrations, the alternatives offer lower reagent usage.
- 2.2.64 Pyrolysis systems require the addition of supplementary fuel to maintain the treatment process. Whilst all systems will require the use of supplementary fuels during certain operational conditions e.g. start-up/shutdown or occasionally to maintain minimum IED temperatures, their consumption would be much lower than that for pyrolysis.

Noise and Vibration

- 2.2.65 Noise and vibration emissions from all options are considered similar.

Accidents

- 2.2.66 All options will handle similar raw materials and reagents and therefore each present similar chemical hazards. ATT systems producing gaseous fuels introduce additional fuel handling hazards.

Costs

- 2.2.67 Reliable data concerning costs for each of the Options is very difficult to obtain – a fact that has been recognised in published reviews. This is particularly relevant in the case of ATT options where there are no relevant examples in the UK that have achieved commercial operation . In many instances cost data is only based on estimates and has not been tested commercially, therefore possibly resulting in over optimistic estimates.
- 2.2.68 In addition to the type of plant proposed, the supply contract type can also have cost implications. For example, a turnkey contract can often attract much higher contract costs compared to a supply and install only contract. Notwithstanding that, it is generally recognised that moving grate represents the most cost-effective option.
- 2.2.69 For the advanced thermal treatment options, as already recognised, estimated costs are highly variable and range from lower than moving grate to significantly higher, but with a general consensus that the costs would be higher.

Conclusions

- 2.2.70 The various options for thermal treatment of the proposed combination of waste materials have relative benefits and disadvantages. All four options are capable, subject to appropriate abatement measures being taken, of performing within IED and BATC emissions limits (albeit limited emissions performance data are reported in respect of gasification and pyrolysis). Whilst moving grate systems generate higher raw gas pollutant concentrations, the application of abatement, which is still required for all options, enables compliance with IED and BATC limits and in many instances performance well below these levels.
- 2.2.71 The performance of the various options in terms of carbon dioxide releases is recognised as being dependant on the carbon within the waste material which the thermal treatment technology seeks to optimise in the energy conversion process. For the waste materials to be accepted at the ERF, carbon dioxide releases associated with the combustion of the waste material will therefore be limited by the throughput capacity.
- 2.2.72 Whilst this addresses the potential for carbon dioxide releases directly associated with the waste material, the potential releases of carbon dioxide associated with: the efficiencies of

techniques for converting combusted/combustible gases resulting from the process to heat and power; the requirement for supplementary combustion of fuel to maintain the thermal treatment process; and measures to maximise internal energy efficiency of the plant itself (including the 'parasitic' load required to drive supporting equipment and plant) are also considered relevant.

- 2.2.73 The discussions above illustrate that, compared with the other options considered, moving grate systems have similar or improved performance in all three areas.
- 2.2.74 Moving grate has either a similar or an improved performance compared to the other options in relation to electrical efficiency, residue generation, odour, raw material consumption, noise and potential for accidents.
- 2.2.75 In this context and alongside in particular the fact that its reliability at a commercial scale is proven and that it provides a cost-effective option, moving grate has been selected as the thermal treatment technology and is considered BAT for the proposed ERF on this basis.

2.3 NOx Abatement Selection

- 2.3.1 Within the EA Sector Guidance for this sector, there is a requirement for undertaking a site-specific appraisal of the selected abatement plant for NOx control. The following options for NOx abatement have been considered as part of the assessment:

Option 1: Moving grate with Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR);
Option 2: Moving grate with Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR);

- 2.3.2 For all options, it is assumed that the same primary measures for minimising the formation of NOx are in place (see section 4.1 of the main variation application document for details).
- 2.3.3 In terms of comparing the environmental impacts of SCR and SNCR, the key issues are emissions to air, global warming potential and ozone creation potential (associated with energy use and emissions of NOx). Waste production and raw materials usage are also considered relevant issues for comparing the NOx abatement options in terms of their impact on the environment. As both options have been assessed using the same dosing reagent, ammonium hydroxide, the accident risks are considered similar and therefore have not been assessed.

Flue Gas Recirculation (FGR)

- 2.3.4 FGR is reported as providing a two-fold benefit:
- Reduced NOx levels.
 - Increased energy efficiency.
- 2.3.5 FGR is often selected where the oxygen content in the flue gases is to be reduced and/or improved mixing of the flue gas in the first boiler pass is required. The recirculated flue gases have a lower oxygen content and when mixed with fresh secondary air the combined larger volume promotes mixing. In practice, good mixing is achieved through appropriate design of the secondary air injection process.
- 2.3.6 However, despite the reported benefits most energy from waste facilities operate without FGR, and in a number of cases have been reported to retrospectively remove the FGR.
- 2.3.7 Although FGR can reduce NOx levels, it would still require additional abatement to be installed to achieve the emissions level required by the IED. If the take-off point for the FGR system is installed after the APC plant the ducting will need to be installed with electrical trace heating and would outweigh any energy efficiency benefits in terms of secondary air savings. The requirement for electrical trace heating is primarily to prevent condensation of flue gas constituents in the duct.
- 2.3.8 The alternative of installing the FGR off-take direct from the boiler is reported as introducing corrosion problems as a result of dew point corrosion due to SOx in the recirculation ducting and abrasion problems due to the fly ash particles and lower oxygen level in the recirculated

gas. The main cause of corrosion in FGR is low O₂ levels of around 6% and below. In practice this leads to operational problems typically requiring replacement of ducting and blower blades after a relatively short time.

- 2.3.9 Some grate suppliers design their combustion systems to operate with FGR while others reduce NO_x through the control of primary and secondary air and the grate design.

Air Quality Impacts of NO_x Emissions

- 2.3.10 Table 2-2 provides the long-term emission concentrations used in this assessment. Estimated long-term concentrations for each option were scaled from achievable concentrations reported in the updated waste incineration BREF. Short-term emission concentrations are based on IED limits for NO₂ and on the higher end of quoted ranges in the waste incineration BREF for NH₃ and N₂O. As the short-term emission levels used are generally the same for SNCR and SCR, only long-term concentrations are compared in the table below.
- 2.3.11 Given the purpose of this assessment is to provide an assessment of the relative performance of the options, the various options have not been modelled and the comparison is made using the H1 default software values which provides a consistent approach for all options. However, it should be noted that for the selected option (option 1) the values given may differ from those reported within other sections which are based on dispersion modelling.

Table 2-2. Summary of Air Quality Performance Associated with Releases of NO_x

Option	1 SNCR	2 SCR
Achievable emissions concentrations (in mg/Nm³) long-term⁽¹⁾		
NO ₂	120	50
N ₂ O	10	10
NH ₃	10	2
Long-term % Process Contribution (PC)/Environmental Assessment Level (EAL)		
%PC/EAL NO ₂	1.75	0.726
%PC/EAL NH ₃	0.0323	0.00645
Long-term % Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)/Environmental Assessment Level (EAL)		
%PEC/EAL NO ₂	31.5	30.5

Note: PC for N₂O has not been calculated as there is no EAL for N₂O.

Note that these are achievable emissions – the guaranteed levels for NO_x and ammonia are in the Air Quality Assessment (Appendix B). Note that SNCR can achieve lower emissions of ammonia, but 10 mg/Nm³ has been used in this assessment to be conservative.

- 2.3.12 In terms of NO₂ performance SCR can achieve lower NO_x concentrations in the flue gases than SNCR with similar associated long term and short term impacts. With either of the options considered the achievable releases are always a balance between pollutant reduction and reagent/raw material usage.
- 2.3.13 The effect on the predicted environmental concentrations (PEC) shows that the long-term PEC for NO₂ for SCR (Option 2) is only slightly better than that for SNCR (Option 1) at 12.2 mg/m³ compared to 12.6 mg/m³ respectively. The short term PC for SNCR and SCR is 95.3 µg/m³.
- 2.3.14 Deposition of NO_x for both options exceeds the insignificance criteria. However, the air quality assessment within Appendix B which includes an assessment of deposition demonstrates that no significant impacts are predicted using SNCR. As SCR gives rise to lower long-term releases of NO_x, it can be concluded that no significant deposition impacts would be expected for this option.
- 2.3.15 SCR is shown to perform better in terms of ammonia releases. Although this again only gives rise to a slight improvement in the process contributions with the long-term PC for SCR at 0.0117 µg/m³ compared to 0.0581 µg/m³ for SNCR. The short-term PC for SCR and SNCR is

4.77 µg/m³. The long and short-term PCs for ammonia for both options screen out at less than 1% or 10% respectively of the relevant EAL.

2.3.16 The release of nitrous oxides (N₂O) does not give rise to localised air quality effects, however it does have global warming effects and therefore the impact of this emission is discussed further below.

Photochemical Ozone Creation Potential (POCP)

2.3.17 Releases of nitrogen dioxide can give rise to the potential for ozone creation. The POCP performance is dependent on the abatement choice with SCR achieving a lower POCP than SNCR at 195 compared to 467 respectively. However, this is based on the assumption that all NO_x is NO₂ with a POCP of 2.8. In reality the split is typically 90-95% NO and 5-10% NO₂. NO when released into the atmosphere reacts with atmospheric ozone removing it, NO therefore has a negative POCP, at -47.2. If the POCP is re-evaluated on this basis then with higher NO_x emissions, primarily comprising NO, SNCR would in fact have a lower POCP than SCR.

Global Warming Potential

2.3.18 Global warming potential (GWP) has been considered through the discharge of nitrous oxides and carbon dioxide releases associated with the additional energy requirements to operate the abatement plant.

2.3.19 The energy requirements to operate an SCR system are higher than those for SNCR due to the requirement to reheat the flue gases to between 300-400°C (the range at which the catalytic process operates). SNCR does not require any reheating and therefore energy input is only required to operate associated plant.

2.3.20 The GWP of the two options considered is summarised in Table 2-3 below.

Table 2-3. Summary of GWP Performance

Option	1	2
	SNCR	SCR
Global Warming Potential	4,338	6,194

Raw Materials

2.3.21 Both SNCR and SCR require the injection of a reducing reagent (ammonia or urea). In addition, SCR requires a catalyst which periodically needs replacing. Annual consumption of raw materials is overall similar, SNCR would require marginally more ammonia but SCR requires a catalyst.

Waste

2.3.22 Other than APC residues, which are similar for each option, SNCR produces no wastes requiring disposal whilst SCR uses a catalyst. The catalyst will require periodic disposal, with spent catalyst needing to be replaced approximately every 5 years. This averages out to an annual waste disposal of approximately 27 m³ per annum for the system. The spent catalyst is classified as a hazardous waste and cannot be treated and recovered, therefore the material will require disposal at a hazardous waste landfill.

Summary of environmental performance

2.3.23 To establish BAT for the proposed ERF, the performance of each of the potential options needs to be considered for each of the relevant environmental areas considered. To summarise the assessment above, the performance of SNCR and SCR for each of the relevant issues identified in paragraph 6.4.4 are ranked in Table 2-4 below.

Table 2-4. Summary Ranking

Option	Ranking	
	1	2
	SNCR	SCR
Performance Ranking		
NOx performance	2	1
Ammonia Performance	2	1
GWP performance	1	2
POCP performance	1	2
<i>Sub total</i>	6	6
Raw Material Consumption:		
Ammonium hydroxide & Catalyst (SCR only)	1	1
Waste	1	2
<i>Sub total</i>	2	3
Environmental Performance Total	8	9

2.3.24 From the table above the overall environmental performance of the SNCR option is better than that for SCR, but on some key issues SCR performs better than SNCR. To determine BAT further consideration of costs is relevant and a cost benefit analysis of NOx and ammonia emissions has been provided.

Costs

2.3.25 A summary of the costs has been provided within Table 2-5 below and the H1 Assessment included as Appendix G1 sets out the basis for the data presented and associated assumptions. Costs have assumed a 25 year operating life for both options. The equivalent annualised cost for SCR is more than 2.5 times the cost of SNCR.

Table 2-5. Comparison of Costs

Option	Total Capex	Total Opex per annum	Equivalent annual cost
1	£933,100	£214,010	£294,080
2	£3,732,400	£324,398	£644,678

2.3.26 The unabated emission level for NOx of 360 mg/Nm³ was provided by Britaniacrest. This is a conservative estimate based on previous air emissions studies^{29,30,31}. The total tonnes of NOx abated per annum was calculated from the operational hours of 8,000 hours per annum and the assumed abated emissions at the achievable levels as given in the WI BREF, i.e. 120 mg/Nm³ for SNCR and 50 mg/Nm³ for SCR. The equivalent annual cost for each option was divided by the tonnes of NOx abated to give the cost per tonne NOx abated, as set out in Table 2-6.

²⁹ Svoboda, Baxter & Martinec (2006) "Nitrous Oxide Emissions from Waste Incineration" Institute of Chemistry, Slovak Academy of Sciences.

³⁰ Werther, J., Fuel Energy Abstr. 36, 373 (1995)

³¹ Quina⁽¹⁾ Bordado⁽²⁾ and Quinta-Ferreira⁽¹⁾ (2009) "Air Pollution Control in Municipal Solid Waste Incinerators", (1) Research Centre on Chemical Processes Engineering and Forest Products Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Coimbra (2) Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, IBB, Instituto Superior Técnico Portugal.

Table 2-6. Comparison of Costs per tonne NO_x abated

Option	Unabated NO _x (tpa)	NO _x after abatement (tpa)	Tonnes abated (tpa)	Cost per tonne NO _x abated
1	502.14	167.38	334.76	£879
2	205.14	69.74	432.40	£1,491

2.3.27 Ammonia is released as a consequence of operating the NO_x abatement via ammonia slippage. Ammonia slippage has been calculated using the H1 software (Appendix G1) and annual mass releases are 6.9 tonnes per annum for SNCR and 2.8 tonnes per annum for SCR. On this basis SCR offers a reduction of 4.1 tonnes per annum, this improvement comes with an increased equivalent annual cost of £388,646 or additional cost of circa £95,000 per tonne of ammonia saved.

Summary of NO_x Appraisal

2.3.28 The assessment of NO_x abatement has considered both the environmental performance of the options and also the costs for installation and operation of the abatement plant.

2.3.29 Whilst SCR has improved NO_x and ammonia emissions performance this is achieved at significant additional cost. Given the overall environmental performance is considered similar the additional costs are not considered justified.

2.3.30 The NO_x performance of the proposed system is good, achieving levels well below the IED limits and in accordance with BAT Conclusion BAT AELs. Overall it is concluded that Option 1 is BAT for this installation.

2.4 Acid Gas Abatement Selection

2.4.1 Similar to NO_x abatement, the EA sector guidance note requires an options appraisal to be provided for the selected acid gas abatement. The following options have been considered for the proposed ERF:

- Option 1: Dry system;
- Option 2: Semi-dry system; and
- Option 3: Wet scrubber.

2.4.2 Each scenario assumed the ERF is operating at 8,000 hours / 217,000 tonnes per annum after routine shutdowns and maintenance.

2.4.3 The plant has been designed to give rise to no process emissions to water. A wet system (Option 3), would introduce a process discharge to water. For this reason, and consideration that has been given to plume creation during the planning process, the wet system has not been considered further in this options appraisal.

2.4.4 For all options, it is assumed that the same primary measures for minimising the formation of acid gases are in place (see section 4.1 of the main variation application document for details). These options are assessed using the H1 Software tool, full details of this assessment are provided in Appendix G1.

2.4.5 The options considered for control of acid gases have been assessed on the basis of the following environmental criteria:

- raw material consumption;
- air quality impacts;
- photochemical ozone creation potential (POCP);
- global warming potential (GWP); and
- waste hazard.

2.4.6 Both options are considered to present similar noise, accident hazard and visible plume potential. No releases to water are generated from the dry and semi dry abatement options considered. Consideration of these environmental effects has therefore been excluded from this assessment.

Air Quality Impacts

2.4.7 Table 2-7 provides the long term emission concentrations used in this assessment. Estimated concentrations for each option were based on achievable emissions given in the WI BREF. Where a range was given, i.e. 10-40 mg/Nm³ SO₂ for a dry system, the lower end of the achievable range has been used in this assessment. Where an upper limit, i.e. <1 mg/Nm³ HF for a semi-dry system, the upper limit has been used, with the exception of SO₂ for a semi-dry system as the upper limit of the achievable emissions (40 mg/Nm³) is higher than the BAT-AEL, so the BAT-AEL of 30 mg/Nm³ has been used. Short term emission concentrations are based on guaranteed values (IED emission limits) and are the same for all abatement options.

Table 2-7. Summary of Air Quality Performance Associated with Releases of Acid Gas Emissions

Option	1	2
	Dry	Semi-dry
Achievable emissions concentrations (in mg/Nm³)		
SO ₂	10	30
HCl	5	2
HF	0.3	1
Long term % Process Contribution (PC)/Environmental Assessment Level (EAL)		
%PC/EAL SO ₂	0.291	0.871
%PC/EAL HCl	-	-
%PC/EAL HF	0.0133	0.0441

2.4.8 Overall the dry scrubber system (option 1) provides the lowest release concentrations for acid gas, although these differences are only marginal. The PCs for HCl were 0.0291 µg/m³ for option 1 compared to 0.0117 µg/m³ for option 2, while PCs for HF were 0.00212 µg/m³ for option 1 compared to 0.00706 µg/m³ for option 2, and PCs for SO₂ were 0.0581 µg/m³ for option 1 compared to 0.175 µg/m³ for option 2.

2.4.9 Given that both options will guarantee IED and BATC limits, short term releases for all options are the same and are therefore not considered further as part of this assessment.

Photochemical Ozone Creation Potential

2.4.10 Emissions of sulphur dioxide to air are also considered under photochemical ozone creation potential (POCP). Option 1 achieves a POCP of 67, whilst option 2 has a POCP of 200.

2.4.11 Option 1 provides the best POCP performance.

Global Warming Potential

2.4.12 In this assessment for acid gas abatement, global warming potential (GWP) is considered through the energy requirements associated with the selected abatement plant options (in terms of CO₂). Table 2-8 below summarises the GWP for each of the options.

Table 2-8. Summary of GWP Performance

Option	1	2
	Dry	Semi-dry
GWP	1,063	2,303

2.4.13 Option 1 provides the best option in terms of GWP performance.

Raw Materials

2.4.14 In this assessment for acid gas abatement, raw material consumption is considered through the water and reagent (hydrated lime) requirements associated with the selected abatement plant options. Table 2-9 below summarises the raw material consumption for each of the options.

Table 2-9. Summary of Raw Material Consumption

Option	1	2
	Dry	Semi-dry
Hydrated lime (tpa)	3,600	2,170
Water (tpa)	1,000	65,100

2.4.15 Option 1 consumes slightly more hydrated lime than Option 2, whilst Option 2 has a significantly higher water demand than Option 1. Overall Option 1 consumes less raw materials. Note that consumption of activated carbon is similar for both systems.

Waste

2.4.16 Both options generate waste streams for disposal as a result of excess reagent and reaction products.

2.4.17 Residues from both options would be hazardous in nature and the disposal route would be the same. Option 1 gives rise to a slightly lower waste hazard and disposal score than option 2, with impact scores of 2,448,000 for option 1 and 4,149,900 for option 2. The assessment has assumed that both options would include control of reagent dosing to minimise wastage.

Summary of environmental performance

2.4.18 To establish BAT for the proposed ERF the environmental performance of each of the potential options needs to be considered for each of the relevant environmental areas considered. To summarise the assessment above, the performance of each abatement option for each relevant issue are ranked in Table 2-10.

Table 2-10. Summary Ranking for Acid Gas Options

	Ranking	
	Dry (Option 1)	Semi-dry (Option 2)
Emissions to Air		
SO ₂	1	2
HCl	2	1
HF	1	2
GWP performance	1	2
POCP performance	1	2
<i>Sub total</i>	6	9
Raw material usage	1	2
Waste hazard	1	2
<i>Sub total</i>	2	4
Environmental Performance Total	8	13

2.4.19 Options 1 performs well for key parameters and overall has a better total environmental performance compared to option 2. As the best environmentally performing option is selected consideration of costs is not necessary.

Summary of Acid Gas Appraisal

- 2.4.20 The assessment of acid gas abatement has considered the environmental performance of the options.
- 2.4.21 The semi-dry system involves the evaporation of water, which means that the flue gas temperature at the inlet to the abatement system is higher for the semi-dry system than the dry system and hence more power is available for generation if a dry system is used. This then affects the GWP.
- 2.4.22 It is concluded that a dry acid gas abatement system can achieve lower emissions performance for SO₂ and HF. The POCP of the dry system is also lower than that for semi-dry and the dry system provides a lower GWP effect.
- 2.4.23 The selection of a dry acid gas abatement system (option 1) provides a proven and reliable system for control of acid gases. The performance of the proposed system is good, achieving levels well below the IED and BATC limits. It is concluded that Option 1 is BAT for this installation.

2.5 Dioxin and Furan Abatement Selection

- 2.5.1 Activated carbon has been selected for control of dioxins and furans, combined with the primary measures detailed within section 3.10 of the main variation application document. Dioxins and furans can also be controlled by the use of catalytic abatement systems. These have the advantage of destroying the dioxins and furans rather than removal and transfer into the APC residues. However, activated carbon also controls mercury emissions whilst catalytic systems do not and therefore activated carbon would also be required.
- 2.5.2 Given that activated carbon is effective for the removal of all three pollutants, this is considered to represent BAT and has been selected for the proposed ERF.

2.6 Control of Particulates

- 2.6.1 There are a range of options available for particulate control including:
- Fabric Filters;
 - Ceramic Filters;
 - Electro-static Precipitators (ESPs); and
 - Wet Scrubbers.
- 2.6.2 Wet scrubbers and ESPs are not considered to represent BAT on their own as they cannot achieve the emission level performance of other techniques. Ceramic filters can achieve high removal efficiencies of particulates, but applications have generally been limited to small scale uses operating at high temperatures. They are also more susceptible to mechanical failures and blinding than fabric filters.
- 2.6.3 Fabric filters provide reliable abatement of particulates and are generally accepted as BAT for particulate control. The bag filter system will include multiple compartments which permit isolation of a compartment in the event of bag failure (see section 4.1 of the main variation application document for further information). The use of trends in particulate emissions and pressure drop measurement will provide a reliable system for detecting bag filter failures and allows investigation to identify and isolate the failed compartment. The proposed system for particulate control at the ERF is therefore considered to be BAT.

3 BAT CONCLUSIONS ASSESSMENT

3.1 Waste Incineration BAT Conclusions 2019

- 3.1.1 The responses to the relevant waste incineration BAT conclusions for the ERF activity to be undertaken at the ERF3Rs site are set out in the table below.

General BAT conclusions:

Environmental Management Systems

BAT 1

In order to improve the overall environmental performance, BAT is to elaborate and implement an environmental management system (EMS) that incorporates a list of features (as identified in the BAT Conclusions document).

Britniamcrest has an existing environmental management system (EMS) in accordance with ISO14001 which will be reviewed and updated to reflect the changes in operations at the Wealden Works 3Rs facility. All updated procedures will be in place prior to the facility becoming operational.

The EMS will include standard operating procedures and safe working practices that minimise the environmental risks and impacts of the normal operations and include contingency plans to minimise the effect of breakdown, accidents etc. These will include procedures relating to other than normal operating conditions (OTNOC), waste stream management and environmental monitoring.

The EMS will include the following sections/procedures:

- EMS Manual
- Environmental Policy
- Operating Techniques
- Environmental Aspects and Impacts
- Accident Management Plan
- Register of Applicable Legislation
- Complaints Log and Investigation Procedure
- Environment Audit Procedure
- Emergency Preparedness and Response Protocols
- Safe Working Procedure
- Nonconformity and Corrective Action Procedure
- Maintenance and Training Programmes and Records
- OTNOC Management Plan
- Environmental Monitoring and Measurement
- Residues Management Plan
- Site Closure Plan

Response/evidence

The contents of the EMS will be updated in accordance with the requirements of BAT 1 and will comply with the requirements of BAT 1 once they are in place.

Monitoring

BAT 2

BAT is to determine either the gross electrical efficiency, the gross energy efficiency, or the boiler efficiency of the incineration plant as a whole or of all the relevant parts of the incineration plant.

Response/evidence

The ERF gross electrical efficiency will be determined by carrying out a performance test at full load during the commissioning stage. The expected efficiencies and associated management have been set out in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the main variation application document and in the Energy Balance provided as Drawing 7. Details of this testing will be incorporated within the commissioning plan.

BAT 3

BAT is to monitor key process parameters relevant for emissions to air and water

Response/evidence

As set out in **Error! Reference source not found.** of the main variation application document, continuous measurement of the following process parameters will be carried out within the ERF, in accordance with BAT 3:

- Flow, oxygen content, temperature, pressure and water vapour content of flue gas
- Temperature of the combustion chamber

Monitoring of flow, pH and temperature of wastewater from wet flue gas cleaning is not applicable as wet flue gas cleaning will not be carried out. Monitoring of flow, pH and conductivity of wastewater is also not applicable as ERF proposals do not include treatment of bottom ash onsite.

BAT 4

BAT is to monitor channelled emissions to air with at least the frequency given and in accordance with EN standards. If EN standards are not available, BAT is to use ISO, national or other international standards that ensure the provision of data of an equivalent scientific quality.

Response/evidence

Error! Reference source not found. of the main variation application document sets out the proposed monitoring to be undertaken in relation to emissions to air from the ERF as well as the monitoring standards to be used for each pollutant. These comply with the relevant standards and frequencies for each pollutant as set out in BAT 4.

Continuous measurement of the following will be carried out: NO_x; NH₃; CO; SO₂; HCl; Dust; Hg; and TVOC.

As permitted under Annex VI Part 6, continuous measurement of HF will not be undertaken on the basis that the acid gas abatement system will operate to guarantee that the emission limit for HCl will not be exceeded. Periodic measurement of HF will be carried out at the ERF.

Periodic measurement of the following will be undertaken: HF, N₂O; Metals and metalloids (except Hg); PCDD/F; Dioxin-like PCBs; and Benzo[*a*]pyrene. Frequencies are provided in **Error! Reference source not found.**

BAT 5

BAT is to appropriately monitor channelled emissions to air from the incineration plant during other than normal operating conditions (OTNOC).

The monitoring can be carried out by direct emission measurements (e.g. for the pollutants that are monitored continuously) or by monitoring of surrogate parameters if this proves to be of equivalent or better scientific quality than direct emission measurements. Emissions during start-up and shutdown while no waste is being incinerated, including emissions of PCDD/F, are estimated based on measurement campaigns, e.g. every three years, carried out during planned start-up/shutdown operations.

Response/evidence Monitoring of emissions to air during OTNOC will be set out in the facility Operations & Maintenance (O&M) manual, control, review, updating and auditing of which will be defined within the EMS.
Direct emission measurements will be used for the pollutants that are monitored continuously. Emissions during start up and shutdown while no waste is being incinerated will be estimated for pollutants monitored periodically based on a calculation informed by measurement campaigns carried out every three years during planned start-up/shutdown operations.

BAT 6 BAT is to monitor emissions to water from flue gas cleaning (FGC) and/or bottom ash treatment with at least the frequency given below and in accordance with EN standards. If EN standards are not available, BAT is to use ISO, national or other international standards that ensure the provision of data of an equivalent scientific quality.

Response/evidence Not applicable as there will be no process emissions from flue gas cleaning to water and bottom ash treatment will not be carried out on site.

BAT 7 BAT is to monitor the content of unburnt substances in slags and bottom ashes at the incineration plant with at least the frequency given below and in accordance with EN standards.
Monitoring of the following is required at least once every 3 months:

- Loss on ignition or total organic carbon

Response/evidence As set out in **Error! Reference source not found.** of the main variation application document, total organic carbon (TOC) in bottom ash will be monitored quarterly (at least every 3 months).

BAT 8 For the incineration of hazardous waste containing POPs, BAT is to determine the POP content in the output streams (e.g. slags and bottom ashes, flue-gas, waste water) after the commissioning of the incineration plant and after each change that may significantly affect the POP content in the output streams.

Response/evidence Not applicable as the waste to be incinerated will not be hazardous.

General environmental and combustion performance

BAT 9 In order to improve the overall environmental performance of the incineration plant by waste stream management (see BAT 1), BAT is to use all of the techniques (a) to (c) given below, and, where relevant, also techniques (d), (e) and (f).

- a) Determination of the types of waste that can be incinerated
- b) Set-up and implementation of waste characterisation and pre-acceptance procedures
- c) Set-up and implementation of waste acceptance procedures
- d) Set-up and implementation of a waste tracking system and inventory
- e) Waste segregation
- f) Verification of waste compatibility prior to the mixing or blending of hazardous wastes

Response/evidence The plant will only accept the waste types set out in the list of EWC codes in Appendix M (BAT 9a). An overview of the waste pre-acceptance and acceptance procedures is set out in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** of the main variation application (BAT 9b and 9c). The procedure for tracking waste deliveries is also set out in Section **Error! Reference source not found.** (BAT 9d). These procedures will be documented within the site's EMS.

BAT 9e is not applicable as the waste types that will be accepted to the ERF will have similar properties, so there is no need for segregation into different waste types for easier or safer storage and incineration. However, the mechanical sorting and material recovery plant on site will remove PVC from incoming waste. This will therefore mean the residual waste from the waste treatment activities that is deposited in the ERF bunker is free of PVC and this will improve the environmental performance of the ERF. Mixing or blending of hazardous wastes will not take place at the site and BAT 9f is therefore also not applicable.

BAT 10

In order to improve the overall environmental performance of the bottom ash treatment plant, BAT is to include output quality management features in the EMS (see BAT 1).
Output quality management features are included in the EMS, so as to ensure that the output of the bottom ash treatment is in line with expectations, using existing EN standards where available. This also allows the performance of the bottom ash treatment to be monitored and optimised.

Response/evidence

Not applicable as bottom ash treatment will not be carried out on site.

BAT 11

In order to improve the overall environmental performance of the incineration plant, BAT is to monitor the waste deliveries as part of the waste acceptance procedures (see BAT 9(c)) including, depending on the risk posed by the incoming waste, the elements given below:
For MSW and other non-hazardous waste:
 — Radioactivity detection
 — Weighing of the waste deliveries
 — Visual inspection
 — Periodic sampling of waste deliveries and analysis of key properties/substances (e.g. calorific value, content of halogens and metals/metalloids). For municipal solid waste, this involves separate unloading.

Response/evidence

Waste deliveries to the Wealden 3Rs facility will be weighed at the weighbridge, where a radioactivity detector will also be kept. Visual spot checking of waste deliveries will be carried out during unloading and periodic sampling and analysis will be undertaken. The frequency of sampling will be set out in the waste acceptance procedures to be developed prior to the facility accepting any waste.

BAT 12

In order to reduce the environmental risks associated with the reception, handling and storage of waste, BAT is to use both of the techniques given below.
 a) Impermeable surfaces with an adequate drainage infrastructure
 b) Adequate waste storage capacity

Response/evidence

The surface of the waste reception, handling and storage areas will be impermeable and fitted with an adequate drainage infrastructure. The integrity of this surface will be checked regularly. The drainage strategy is provided in Appendix P to the main variation application document. The bunker will hold up to approximately 2,900 tonnes or 12,500 m³ of waste material, which will allow for up to 5 days' storage of waste at the nominal CV. The maximum waste storage capacity will not be exceeded, taking into account the characteristics of the wastes (e.g. regarding the risk of fire) and the treatment capacity. The quantity of waste stored will be regularly monitored against the maximum allowed storage capacity.

BAT 13

In order to reduce the environmental risk associated with the storage and handling of clinical waste, BAT is to use a combination of the techniques given below.

Response/evidence

Not applicable as clinical waste will not be accepted.

BAT 14	<p>In order to improve the overall environmental performance of the incineration of waste, to reduce the content of unburnt substances in slags and bottom ashes, and to reduce emissions to air from the incineration of waste, BAT is to use an appropriate combination of the techniques given below.</p> <p>a) Waste blending and mixing b) Advanced control system c) Optimisation of the incineration process</p> <p>BAT-associated environmental performance levels for unburnt substances in slags and bottom ashes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOC = 1-3 dry wt-% • LOI = 1-5 dry wt-% <p>*either TOC or LOI BAT-AEPL applies.</p>
Response/evidence	<p>Waste blending and mixing will be carried out in the waste bunker using an overhead crane as described in Section 3.4 of the main variation application document (BAT 14a). The advanced control system and how the combustion process, waste feed and furnace design will be optimised as well as optimisation of the waste composition are set out in Section 3.4 of the main variation application document (BAT 14b and BAT 14c). The continuous emissions monitoring system (CEMS) will feed back to the combustion control system so the combustion conditions will be able to be adjusted as required.</p> <p>Either TOC or LOI will be monitored in accordance with the permit requirements to demonstrate that a TOC of <3% or LOI of less than 5% is achieved (see BAT 7 response).</p>
BAT 15	<p>In order to improve the overall environmental performance of the incineration plant and to reduce emissions to air, BAT is to set up and implement procedures for the adjustment of the plant's settings, e.g. through the advanced control system (see description in Section 2.1), as and when needed and practicable, based on the characterisation and control of the waste (see BAT 11).</p>
Response/evidence	<p>The distributed control system (DCS) to be installed at the ERF will be designed to control the process to ensure operations meet IED and/or BAT-AEL requirements, minimise emissions that can be influenced by operating conditions on the grate (CO, NOx and VOC), achieve a constant level of steam production and maintain operation within the design envelope. The DCS will incorporate a combustion control system, described in further detail in Section 3.4 of the main variation application document. The system will be an advanced control system as it will involve the use of a computer-based automatic system to control the combustion efficiency and support the prevention and/or reduction of emissions, including the use of high performance monitoring of operating parameters and of emissions</p>
BAT 16	<p>In order to improve the overall environmental performance of the incineration plant and to reduce emissions to air, BAT is to set up and implement operational procedures (e.g. organisation of the supply chain, continuous rather than batch operation) to limit as far as practicable shutdown and start-up operations.</p>
Response/evidence	<p>The ERF has been designed and will be operated to ensure that start-up and shutdown operations, including emergency shutdown scenarios are carried out safely and without significant environmental impact. The plant has been designed for continuous operation, is expected to operate for 8,000 hours per year. See Section 3.4 of the main variation application document.</p> <p>The procedures for start-up and shutdown will be documented, these procedures will be in place prior to commissioning of the ERF.</p>
BAT 17	<p>In order to reduce emissions to air and, where relevant, to water from the incineration plant, BAT is to ensure that the FGC system and the waste water treatment plant are appropriately designed (e.g. considering the maximum flow rate and pollutant concentrations), operated within their design range, and maintained so as to ensure optimal availability.</p>

Response/evidence	<p>The flue gas cleaning system will be appropriately designed, operated and maintained in order to reduce emissions to air. Details on the proposed techniques are set out in Section 4.1 of the main variation application document. Waste acceptance, treatment within the MSMR for some wastes to remove certain wastes e.g. PVC and bunker management will all assist with controlling the waste feed to the ERF and assisting in ensuring it is well mixed. The advanced control system will regulate the combustion phase to keep within the design range which seeks to minimise pollutant formation. The flue gas cleaning system will also be monitored and automatically controlled to ensure it is operated within the design range set out by the manufacturer and that it is regularly maintained to ensure optimal availability.</p> <p>No wet flue gas cleaning plant is proposed therefore associated wastewater treatment is not carried out.</p>
BAT 18	<p>In order to reduce the frequency of the occurrence of OTNOC and to reduce emissions to air and, where relevant, to water from the incineration plant during OTNOC, BAT is to set up and implement a risk-based OTNOC management plan as part of the environmental management system (see BAT 1) that includes all of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — identification of potential OTNOC (e.g. failure of equipment critical to the protection of the environment ('critical equipment')), of their root causes and of their potential consequences, and regular review and update of the list of identified OTNOC following the periodic assessment below; — appropriate design of critical equipment (e.g. compartmentalisation of the bag filter, techniques to heat up the flue-gas and obviate the need to bypass the bag filter during start-up and shutdown, etc.); — set-up and implementation of a preventive maintenance plan for critical equipment (see BAT 1(xii)); — monitoring and recording of emissions during OTNOC and associated circumstances (see BAT 5); — periodic assessment of the emissions occurring during OTNOC (e.g. frequency of events, duration, amount of pollutants emitted) and implementation of corrective actions if necessary.
Response/evidence	<p>OTNOC management will be included within the Facility O&M Manual and be controlled by the EMS, in conjunction with BAT 1, and will cover the elements set out in BAT 18. Review, updating and auditing of the OTNOC procedures will be in accordance with the requirements of the EMS.</p>
Energy efficiency	
BAT 19	<p>In order to increase the resource efficiency of the incineration plant, BAT is to use a heat recovery boiler.</p>
Response/evidence	<p>Energy is recovered from the hot flue gases within the steam boiler. The resulting high-pressure steam is directed to the steam turbine, generating electricity which is exported to the grid. The ERF will be designed to be CHP-Ready (see the CHP-Ready assessment in Appendix I to the main variation application document), but no heat load has been secured at the time of submitting the permit variation application.</p>
BAT 20	<p>In order to increase the energy efficiency of the incineration plant, BAT is to use an appropriate combination of the techniques given below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Drying of sewage sludge b) Reduction of flue-gas flow c) Minimisation of heat losses d) Optimisation of the boiler design e) Low-temperature flue-gas heat exchangers f) High steam conditions g) Cogeneration

	<p>h) Flue-gas condenser</p> <p>i) Dry bottom ash handling</p> <p>BAT-AEELs for new plant incinerating MSW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gross electrical efficiency, 25-35% • Gross energy efficiency, 72 – 91%
Response/evidence	<p>The flue gas flow will be reduced through the design of the primary and secondary air distribution. The volume of both primary and secondary air will be regulated by an automatic combustion control system, as set out in Section 3.4 of the main variation application (BAT 20b).</p> <p>Heat losses will be minimised where possible, for example through the use of an integral furnace-boiler and insulation of plant as set out in Section 3.4 of the main variation application document (BAT 20c).</p> <p>The boiler design will be optimised, as described in Section 3.4 of the main variation application document (BAT 20d).</p> <p>The facility has been designed to be CHP ready, as set out in the CHP-Ready assessment in Appendix I to the main variation application document (BAT 20g).</p> <p>The electricity only scenario has an estimated efficiency of 31.8 % which is within the stated BAT-AEEL range. The ERF will be designed initially for electricity export and has therefore been optimised for this mode of generation.</p>
Emissions to air	
BAT 21	<p>In order to prevent or reduce diffuse emissions from the incineration plant, including odour emissions, BAT is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — store solid and bulk pasty wastes that are odorous and/or prone to releasing volatile substances in enclosed buildings under controlled subatmospheric pressure and use the extracted air as combustion air for incineration or send it to another suitable abatement system in the case of a risk of explosion; — store liquid wastes in tanks under appropriate controlled pressure and duct the tank vents to the combustion air feed or to another suitable abatement system; — control the risk of odour during complete shutdown periods when no incineration capacity is available, e.g. by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + sending the vented or extracted air to an alternative abatement system, e.g. a wet scrubber, a fixed adsorption bed; + minimising the amount of waste in storage, e.g. by interrupting, reducing or transferring waste deliveries, as a part of waste stream management (see BAT 9); + storing waste in properly sealed bales.
Response/evidence	<p>The incoming waste will be stored in an enclosed building under controlled subatmospheric pressure and the air from the building is extracted for use as combustion air, as described in Section 3.4 of the main variation application document. The control measures for fugitive emissions and odour are set out in sections 4.4 and 4.5 respectively of the main variation application. As the availability of the facility will be high (8,000 hours per year), normal operations with these systems in operation will be happening most of the time.</p> <p>No liquid wastes will be accepted into the site.</p> <p>In the case of shutdown, the amount of waste in storage will be minimised by stopping/diverting deliveries and/or having run down waste beforehand (if a planned shutdown), as described in Section 3.4 of the main variation application document Error! Reference source not found..</p> <p>There will also be an active filtering system in place which will discharge through the main stack. Management of unplanned shutdowns will be set</p>

out in the O&M Manual and other relevant procedures controlled by the EMS. Management of odour during normal and abnormal operation is dealt with in the odour management plan in Appendix O to the main variation application document.

BAT 22	In order to prevent diffuse emissions of volatile compounds from the handling of gaseous and liquid wastes that are odorous and/or prone to releasing volatile substances at incineration plants, BAT is to introduce them into the furnace by direct feeding
Response/evidence	Not applicable as gaseous and liquid wastes will not be accepted at the ERF.
BAT 23	In order to prevent or reduce diffuse dust emissions to air from the treatment of slags and bottom ashes, BAT is to include in the environmental management system (see BAT 1) the following diffuse dust emissions management features: — identification of the most relevant diffuse dust emission sources (e.g. using EN 15445); — definition and implementation of appropriate actions and techniques to prevent or reduce diffuse emissions over a given time frame.
Response/evidence	Not applicable as treatment of slags and bottom ashes will not be carried out at the ERF.
BAT 24	In order to prevent or reduce diffuse dust emissions to air from the treatment of slags and bottom ashes, BAT is to use an appropriate combination of the techniques given below.
Response/evidence	Not applicable as treatment of slags and bottom ashes will not be carried out at the ERF.
BAT 25	<p>BAT 25: In order to reduce channelled emissions to air of dust, metals and metalloids from the incineration of waste, BAT is to use one or a combination of the techniques given below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Bag filter b) Electrostatic precipitator c) Dry sorbent injection d) Wet scrubber e) Fixed- or moving-bed adsorption <p>BAT-AELs to be complied with are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dust, <2 – 5 mg/Nm³, daily average - Cd+Tl, 0.005 – 0.02 mg/Nm³, average over the sampling period - Sb+As+Pb+Cr+Co+Cu+Mn+Ni+V, 0.01 -0.3 mg/Nm³, average over the sampling period
Response/evidence	<p>A bag filter (BAT 25a) and dry injection of activated carbon (BAT 25c) will be used at the ERF, as described in Section 4.1 of the main variation application document.</p> <p>The ERF will comply with the BAT-AELs for new plant and will perform at or below the limits set out in Table 4.1 of the main variation application document under normal operating conditions.</p>
BAT 26	In order to reduce channelled dust emissions to air from the enclosed treatment of slags and bottom ashes with extraction of air (see BAT 24(f)), BAT is to treat the extracted air with a bag filter (see Section 2.2).
Response/evidence	Not applicable as there will be no treatment of slags and/or bottom ashes.

BAT 27	<p>In order to reduce channelled emissions of HCl, HF and SO₂ to air from the incineration of waste, BAT is to use one or a combination of the techniques given below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Wet scrubber b) Semi-wet absorber c) Dry sorbent injection d) Direct desulphurisation e) Boiler sorbent injection
---------------	--

Response/evidence Dry injection of hydrated lime (BAT 27c) will be injected into the boiler post-combustion area (BAT 27e) for reduction of acid gases. A portion of the APC residues will be recirculated to allow for use of any unreacted residue. The BAT case for this approach has been set out in the options appraisal in Section 2.4 of this document.

BAT 28	<p>In order to reduce channelled peak emissions of HCl, HF and SO₂ to air from the incineration of waste while limiting the consumption of reagents and the amount of residues generated from dry sorbent injection and semi-wet absorbers, BAT is to use technique (a) or both of the techniques given below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Optimised and automated reagent dosage b) Recirculation of reagents <p>BAT-AELs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCl, <2-6 mg/Nm³, daily average • HF, <1 mg/Nm³, daily average or average over the sampling period • SO₂ mg/Nm³, 5-30, daily average
---------------	--

Response/evidence Reagent dosage will be optimised and automated as set out in Sections 2.4 and 4.1 of the main variation application document (BAT 28a). Dosage rates of hydrated lime will be controlled and monitored to ensure usage is optimised and to avoid overdosage resulting in increased quantities of unreacted material within the APC residues. Dosage will be controlled against raw gas concentrations of SO₂ and HCl. Flow of reagent will be monitored and alarmed to indicate a failure. A portion of the APC residues will be recirculated to allow for use of any unreacted residue.

The ERF will comply with the BAT-AELs for new plant and will perform at or below the limits set out in Table 4.1 of the main variation application document under normal operating conditions.

BAT 29	<p>BAT 29: In order to reduce channelled NO_x emissions to air while limiting the emissions of CO and N₂O from the incineration of waste and the emissions of NH₃ from the use of SNCR and/or SCR, BAT is to use an appropriate combination of the techniques given below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Optimisation of the incineration process b) Flue-gas recirculation c) SNCR d) SCR e) Catalytic filter bags f) Optimisation of the SNCR/SCR design and operation g) Wet scrubber
---------------	--

	<p>BAT-AELs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NO_x, 50-120 mg/Nm³, daily average • CO, 10-50 mg/Nm³, daily average • NH₃, 2-10 mg/Nm³, daily average
Response/evidence	<p>The optimisation of the incineration process is described in Section 3.4 of the main variation application document (BAT 29a). Selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR) will be in place for NO_x reduction at the ERF (BAT 29c) as described in Section 4.1 of the main variation application and the options appraisal in section 2.3 of this document. The SNCR reagent injection points have been optimised during the detailed design stage, during commissioning the injection of reagents will be optimised, and during operation feedback from the emissions monitoring will be used to continually optimise reagent dosing (BAT 29f). The BAT position on flue gas recirculation is set out in Section 2.3 of this document.</p> <p>The ERF will comply with the BAT-AELs for new plant and will perform at or below the limits set out in Table 4.1 of the main variation application document under normal operating conditions.</p>
BAT 30	<p>In order to reduce channelled emissions to air of organic compounds including PCDD/F and PCBs from the incineration of waste, BAT is to use techniques (a), (b), (c), (d), and one or a combination of techniques (e) to (i) given below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Optimisation of the incineration process Control of the waste feed Online and offline boiler cleaning Rapid flue gas cooling Dry sorbent injection Fixed- or moving-bed adsorption SCR Catalytic filter bags Carbon sorbent in a wet scrubber <p>BAT-AELs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TVOC, <3-10 mg/Nm³, daily average • PCDD/F, <0.01-0.04 ng I-TEQ/Nm³ average over the sampling period <0.01-0.06 ng I-TEQ/Nm³ long-term sampling period • PCDD/F + dioxin-like PCBs, <0.01-0.06 ng WHO-TEQ/Nm³ average over the sampling period <0.01-0.08 ng WHO-TEQ/Nm³ long-term sampling period <p>Either PCDD/F or PCDD/F + dioxin-like PCBs BAT-AEL applies.</p>
Response/evidence	<p>As set out in the response to BAT 29, the optimisation of the incineration process is described in Section 3.4 of the main variation application document (BAT 30a). Both online and offline boiler cleaning will be carried out at the ERF (BAT 30c). Flue gas is cooled rapidly as set out in the description of the boiler design in Section 3.4 of the main variation application document (BAT 30d). Dry injection of activated carbon (BAT 30e) will be used at the ERF, as described in Section 4.1 of the main variation application document.</p> <p>The waste feed is controlled through only accepting permitted waste codes, removal of PVC in the sorting process and mixing in the bunker (BAT 30b).</p>

The ERF will comply with the BAT-AELs for new plant and will perform at or below the limits set out in Table 4.1 of the main variation application document under normal operating conditions.

BAT 31	<p>In order to reduce channelled mercury emissions to air (including mercury emission peaks) from the incineration of waste, BAT is to use one or a combination of the techniques given below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Wet scrubber (low ph) b) Dry sorbent injection c) Injection of special, highly reactive activated carbon d) Boiler bromine addition e) Fixed- or moving-bed adsorption <p>BAT-AELs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hg, <5-20 µg/Nm³ daily average or average over the sampling period, 1-10 µg/Nm³ long term sampling period <p>Either of the above BAT-AELs applies.</p>
---------------	--

Dry sorbent injection of activated carbon (BAT 31b) will be used at the ERF, as described in Section 4.1 of the main variation application document.

Response/evidence

The ERF will comply with the BAT-AELs for new plant and will perform at or below the limit set out in Table 4.1 of the main variation application document under normal operating conditions.

Emissions to water

BAT 32	<p>In order to prevent the contamination of uncontaminated water, to reduce emissions to water, and to increase resource efficiency, BAT is to segregate waste water streams and to treat them separately, depending on their characteristics.</p>
---------------	---

Response/evidence

Not applicable as there will be no process water discharge.

BAT 33	<p>In order to reduce water usage and to prevent or reduce the generation of waste water from the incineration plant, BAT is to use one or a combination of the techniques given below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Waste-water-free FGC techniques b) Injection of waste water from FGC c) Water reuse/recycling d) Dry bottom ash handling
---------------	---

Dry injection of activated carbon and hydrated lime (BAT 33a) will be used at the ERF therefore no waste waters are generated from flue gas cleaning (see Section 4.1 of the main variation application document).

Response/evidence

Process waste waters (i.e. from boiler blowdown, boiler water regeneration and process area cleaning) and rainwater will be collected for re-use where possible, as described in Section 2.4 of the main variation application document (BAT 33c). Excess water from the bottom ash quench on the belt conveyors will drain back into the quench bath for reuse (BAT 33 c).

BAT 34	In order to reduce emissions to water from FGC and/or from the storage and treatment of slags and bottom ashes, BAT is to use an appropriate combination of the techniques given below, and to use secondary techniques as close as possible to the source in order to avoid dilution.
	Primary
	a) Optimisation of the incineration process and/or of the FGC system
	Secondary
	b) Equalisation
	c) Neutralisation
	d) Physical separation
	e) Adsorption on activated carbon
	f) Precipitation
	g) Oxidation
	h) Ion exchange
	i) Stripping
	j) Reverse osmosis
	k) Coagulation and flocculation
l) Sedimentation	
m) Filtration	
n) Flotation	

Response/evidence Not applicable as there will be no aqueous process emissions from flue gas cleaning and the storage and treatment of slags and IBA is not carried out onsite.

Material efficiency

BAT 35 In order to increase resource efficiency, BAT is to handle and treat bottom ashes separately from FGC residues.

Response/evidence IBA and FGC residues will be collected separately at the ERF to be sent off site separately for recovery/disposal, as set out in Section 2.5 of the main variation application document.

BAT 36 In order to increase resource efficiency for the treatment of slags and bottom ashes, BAT is to use an appropriate combination of the techniques given below based on a risk assessment depending on the hazardous properties of the slags and bottom ashes.

Response/evidence Not applicable as there will be no treatment of slags and/or bottom ashes.

Noise

BAT 37	<p>In order to prevent or, where that is not practicable, to reduce noise emissions, BAT is to use one or a combination of the techniques given below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Appropriate location of equipment and buildingsb) Operational measuresc) Low-noise equipmentd) Noise attenuatione) Noise-control equipment/infrastructure
Response/evidence	<p>Operational measures (BAT 37b) will include inspection and maintenance of equipment; closing of doors and windows of enclosed areas, if possible; operation of equipment by experienced staff; and provisions for noise control during maintenance activities. Low-noise equipment such as low-noise compressors, pumps and fans will be installed at the ERF (BAT 37c). Noisy plant and equipment will be contained within enclosed buildings (BAT 37d) and noise control equipment/infrastructure at the site will include exhaust silencers and equipment insulation (BAT 37e). See the Noise Assessment in Appendix C for more detail.</p>

Summary

- 3.1.2 Based on a review of all the available information that has been assessed, the site/operator will be compliant with all of the requirements of the above applicable BAT conclusions before operational.
- 3.1.3 There are no BAT conclusions that the operator requires derogation from at this point in time.

A large, stylized graphic on the page. It consists of a light grey, rounded rectangular shape on the right side, containing the word "Appendices" in a dark purple font. On the left side, there is a dark purple, rounded rectangular shape that overlaps the grey one, forming a large, abstract letter 'P' or 'R' shape.

Appendices

Appendix G.1

H1 Tool