

From: Rachel Feilden [<mailto:info@riverenergy.net>]

Sent: 19 April 2013 19:42

To: Gavin King-Smith; Anthony and Theresa Myers; Stephen Rice; Stephen Burroughs; Brian & Alison Shingler; Mike Ford; Guistina and Michael Ryan; Dave Holt; Grenville Ham; Grenville Ham2; Chas Warlow; John Blowes HLH; Julian Jones; Richard Body; Ann Harding; Chris Rowland; Peter Hill

Subject: Ten Things to make microhydropower easier

Dear hydro groups and community schemes,
I would be immensely grateful if you would circulate this to your group members.
Many thanks.

Ten Things to make microhydropower easier

During the Easter Recess our MP David Heath brought the Secretary of State for Energy, Ed Davey, to Tellisford Mill to discuss problems facing microhydropower. Mr Davey asked us to send him the ten top issues that, if resolved, would make hydropower easier. We said we would survey the microhydropower community, so please take up this opportunity.

You are welcome to answer **A and B** freeform by e.mail, letter or phone, or to use the checklist in the attached Word.doc file. In either case please **be specific**: we will then analyze, aggregate and summarize. All information will be treated in confidence.

A. Please list the barriers that you have encountered in planning, implementing or operating a hydropower project. Explain each issue succinctly, and describe what changes in policy, legislation, rules, guidelines, behaviour of officials, and so on would make hydropower easier. Your suggested solutions should be **Actionable**.

Here are some [illustrative examples](#) of barriers and issues – yours may be different: please give your own ranking.

- [1] [Agency bias and flawed formulation of the “Good Practice Guidelines”](#)
Comment: The EA, responsible for issuing licences for use of rivers, (a) has internal technical conflicts, (b) is over-influenced by in-house “pro-fish” staff and lobbyists, (c) has a financial conflict of interest of £25million, from rod licences, (d) lacks technical competence regarding hydropower, and (e) has no responsibility to deliver any hydropower “output”.
- [2] [Licences: Neither abstraction licence nor impoundment licence nor transfer licence are fit for application to hydropower, which needs its own licence.](#)
- [3] [Planning and heritage permissions, and how they relate to EA permitting](#)
[If this has been an issue for you, describe, and how to resolve?]
- [4] [Grid connection difficulties:](#)
[Comment what has been the barrier in your experience; how to resolve?]

[5] FIT banding: prevents sites from being developed to their full potential
[*Can you quantify the effect of gaming?*]

[6] Non-domestic (“business”) rates:
[*Comment?*]

[7] Other SPECIFY

B. Please describe your interest in microhydropower. Answer freeform if the format below does not fit your situation.

- i. Single hydropower of kW on your residential property
- ii. Hydroplant running as your own business: Total DNC kW
- iii. Community scheme of kW
- iv. Hydropower developer: Total capacity of all sites kW
- v. Manufacturer, Agent for equipment, Installer: Total kW commissioned kW
- iv. Other (specify)

How much of the capacity in (i) to (v) above is running now? kW

If an explanation would clarify, please explain.

All information will be treated in confidence.

e.mail info@riverenergy.net

post Tellisford Mill, Tellisford, Bath, BA2 7RL

phone 01373-830322

Many thanks for your help.

Rachel

--

Rachel Feilden
Director, River Energy Networks