

## Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Tuesday 9 October 2018
Location	Sunbury Golf Centre
Recorder	Louise Morton

## Present

Name	Initials	Organisation	Title / Role
Ken Snaith	KS		Resident, Chair
Mark McCartney	MM	LOSRA – interim for Peter Francis	Resident
Richard Hewitt	RH	Shepperton Residents' Association	Resident
Diane Hall	DH		Resident
Julia Bachman	JB		Resident
Andrea Koskela	AK		Resident
John Seaman	JS		Resident
Peter Hughes	PH		Resident
Gareth Swain	GS	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Regional Manager
Jean-Claude Sartenaer	JCS	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Project Director
Justin Hampton	JHa	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Plant Manager
Louise Morton	LM	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Communications Manager
Jorge Hau	JHau	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Technical Coordinator
Sandra Dunn	SD	Spelthorne Borough Council	Councillor
Richard Smith-Ainsley	RSA	Spelthorne Borough Council	Councillor
Richard Parkinson	RP	Surrey County Council	Waste Group Manager
Chris Lowe	CL	Environment Agency	PPC/RSR Officer 1

Richard Walsh	RW	Surrey County Council	Councillor
---------------	----	-----------------------	------------

## Distribution

Participants and: Caroline Smith and Stephen Jenkins (Surrey County Council Planning); Richard James (Environment Agency); Tracey Wilmott French (Spelthorne Borough Council Environmental Health), PCSO Colin Gibbons (Surrey Police), Cllr Mike Goodman (Surrey County Council), Sandy Muirhead (Spelthorne Borough Council).		
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome</b>	
1.1	Mark McCartney was introduced as the interim representative for the Lower Sunbury Resident's Association, standing in for Peter Francis who is unfortunately unwell. The committee sent their best wishes to Peter.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
2.1	Cllr Colin Barnard, Cllr Tim Evans, Jim Walter, Malcolm Robertson and Alison Dodsworth	
<b>3</b>	<b>Approval of minutes from previous meeting</b>	
3.1	Accepted	
<b>4</b>	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
4.1	DH noted an inaccuracy in 6.3 and her comment on air quality.	
4.2	<p>JS questioned what happened to the material that was rejected from the pre-treatment process and whether it was sent to an incinerator. He thought this had been discussed in the previous meeting but it was not mentioned in the minutes.</p> <p>LM stated that she did not recall that being discussed in the last meeting.</p> <p>JHa answered the question and stated that as much of the material will be recycled as possible, but what cannot be recycled will go to an EfW Facility.</p>	
4.3	<p>AK questioned why the issue of Charlton Village representation wasn't covered in the meeting.</p> <p>LM noted that the attendees for the last meeting showed Alison Dodsworth as the new representative and Karen Howkins as the outgoing representative. And also that Alison was introduced as the new CVRA representative in the introductions.</p> <p>AK feels that the Terms of Reference are not clear and it was not understood that changes at the local resident's associations could affect membership of the CLG.</p> <p>RSA explained that it would be the same for local councillors and that any new councillor would attend the CLG to represent the people who elected them and if they were unelected they would also have to leave the committee.</p>	
4.4	Referencing 4.3, JS stated that he only knew of two locations where batteries could be deposited.	

	<p>RSA advised that battery collection was a commercial arrangement so the council did not have a list of all the battery collection points as there were so many. However he pointed out there was one in the reception of Spelthorne Borough Council.</p> <p>CL advised that there is a website called <a href="http://www.recyclenow.com">www.recyclenow.com</a> where you can go and type in your postcode and what you want to recycle and it will give you the nearest locations.</p> <p>RSA also suggested people buy rechargeable batteries instead.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Project update</b>	
5.1	<p>JCS presented on construction progress and talked through the progress made over the last few months and what will happen over the next period.</p> <p>Activities on the Anaerobic Digestion facility include connecting the electrical substation, fitting thermal lagging, installing fire safety equipment, fitting out the labs and offices as well as pre-commissioning activities.</p> <p>Work on the Gasification building has included testing the burners in the gasification unit, which involved lighting them for a short period, 30 seconds, to check they were working correctly. The admin section is almost complete now and the cedar cladding is being fitted to the outside of the building.</p> <p>JCS showed photos of the work conducted.</p> <p>JCS explained that over the next few months we expect to finish pre-commissioning of the AD facility, with food waste due in December to start hot commissioning. We also expect to complete mechanical and electrical work in the gasification facility and start commissioning the mechanical pre-treatment equipment with waste at the end of November, with first waste (RDF) to the gasifier expected in the New Year.</p> <p>SD asked if it would be possible to see photos of the boiler.</p> <p>JCS confirmed he would include pictures of the boiler next time.</p> <p>RSA asked about what happens to the waste during the commissioning of the pre-treatment equipment.</p> <p>JCS explained that the waste is turned into RDF (Refuse Derived Fuel) in the pre-treatment process, but that it will be transported off site to another suitable facility until such time as the plant is ready to start commissioning the gasification unit.</p> <p>KS asked if this is the same process for the AD.</p> <p>JCS answered that the AD is a single process and once the food waste comes in, it will stay on site and be processed as you need to keep the AD process running once it has been started.</p> <p>JHa added that there would be phased approach for the digestate and that he would be happy to provide more information on this at the next meeting.</p> <p>MM asked about the timescales for commissioning.</p> <p>JCS clarified that we expect to start processing food waste in December, although this may be January due to the Christmas period, and that we would be commissioning the mechanical pre-treatment for the gasification in November,</p> <p>JS asked if the planting arrangements for the landscaping had been agreed yet.</p> <p>JCS stated that they had not and that the planning application for the landscaping was currently with the authorities.</p>	<p>JCS</p> <p>JHa</p>

	LM reminded people that the reference number for the planning application was provided in the last monthly update sent out.	
<b>6</b>	<b>Operations update</b>	
6.1	<p>JHa presented on the Operations team. He provided information on the roles and structure within his team, along with their activities and responsibilities.</p> <p>SD asked if JHa was happy with the performance of the M+W Group, given the delay to the project.</p> <p>JHa explained about the complexity of the project and that, ultimately, it's about the final result. He stated that he and his team were happy with the quality of the work.</p> <p>GS reminded the group that Peter Francis had previously recognised and reported the high quality of work on site, to the group after one of the site visits by the technical sub-group.</p> <p>MM asked who was responsible for the commissioning.</p> <p>JCS responded that the commissioning is being done by M+W group with support from SUEZ staff, in particular the Operations team.</p> <p>RSA stated that M+W have responsibility as SUEZ don't accept the site until it's working.</p> <p>CL added that the permit is issued to SUEZ, not M+W Group.</p> <p>JB asked for clarification on the matter of who's responsible if something happens during commissioning.</p> <p>GS clarified that, ultimately, SUEZ is responsible for the site.</p> <p>JHa noted that the Eco Park will be the ninth energy from waste facility in the UK for SUEZ, and 55<sup>th</sup> worldwide, demonstrating that SUEZ has plenty of experience in commissioning such sites.</p> <p>MM asked if the crew was on batch shifts for the AD facility.</p> <p>JHa answered that the digestion process is constant and slow – 16 days in the digestion tank. To avoid having to re-seed the digestion tanks, the process would be continuous and that even during routine maintenance, the process would continue by alternating tanks, to ensure the micro-organisms were kept and preserved. In the event of an incident out of hours, the team would be called, however there would always be a shift on site anyway.</p> <p>MM asked if there was a similar shut down and re-start process for the gasification.</p> <p>JHa explained that the gasification facility would have two planned shut downs per year and that to re-start the process, fuel oil burners would be used to control the cool down and heat up of the refractory to avoid damage .</p> <p>JHau added that a maintenance inspection would be carried out on each shut down.</p> <p>RW requested that before the next meeting, he would like to request a written document for local residents that provides information on the site such as who to contact and the emissions, as there are concerns. He asked if the EA is available 24/7.</p> <p>CL confirmed that the Environment Agency have a 24 hour call centre and there is always someone on the end of the EA phone line.</p>	LM

	<p>JCS stated that this had been addressed before and that, in terms of emissions, we have to inform the EA if permit levels are breached and we have procedures in place for events such as a fire on site.</p> <p>JHa explained that the fire procedures had been developed with Surrey Fire and Rescue and that their JESIP procedures had been adopted on site.</p> <p>LM suggested it would be helpful if people stated what questions they would like answering, and this can be compiled.</p> <p>MM suggested the document should focus on conventional HSE safety issues, rather than technical incidents.</p> <p>JB stated that there are a few similar facilities starting up now and that they make alarming noises and would the Eco Park do this.</p> <p>JCS responded that there is a process called steam blowing, which has been explained before, and that this used to be a noisy and visible process. But on this project, technology has been selected so that it is quieter and will not make loud noises.</p> <p>LM reminded the group that this was discussed at the last CLG meeting.</p> <p>KS reminded the group that as part of their role on the community liaison group they have a duty to share information provided here.</p> <p>JB asked if there was an Eco Park social media page.</p> <p>LM responded that there was not, but information was provided on the website and CLG members were welcome to share updates to local Facebook groups. LM also offered to share the electronic copy of the newsletter so it could be shared digitally on social media groups and websites.</p> <p>RW stated that residents were not just concerned about noise but also by what comes out of the chimney, or what should come out.</p> <p>JHa stated that it's mostly steam, excess air and CO<sub>2</sub> that comes out of the stack.</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>LM</p>
<b>7</b>	<b>CRC and RBF operations</b>	
7.1	<p>GS updated on the CRC and RBF operations over the last quarter. The RBF is still operating on the interim processes, until the AD and gasification facilities are ready to accept food and residual waste respectively.</p> <p>Following the very hot period over the summer, the CRC saw a drop in the volumes of green waste, as expected. However, that also caused a 30% drop in volumes across other materials as fewer people came to site. Conversely, when we would expect the site to be quieter as the schools went back, the site was actually busier in September, but the team coped well.</p> <p>KS commented that he had visited the CRC a few times recently and found it to be easy, with no queuing.</p> <p>RW observed that the car stickers had been replaced, and this was a positive as the old ones had not stuck well.</p> <p>SD asked if all the bays were accessible yet.</p> <p>GS stated that some bays were still cordoned off for safety reasons, but that these would be released to the site once construction was complete,</p> <p>SD asked what the blue fence would be replaced with.</p>	

	<p>JHa stated that there would be another fence, and indicated on the map where the new fence would be, between the gasification building and the CRC. He also stated that this would create more parking spaces on the CRC.</p> <p>KS asked for an update on plans for a re-use shop at Ivydene Cottage.</p> <p>GS explained that the shop can't be developed while construction is still ongoing as it would not be sensible to mix construction traffic with members of the public, for safety reasons and safety is always our number one priority.</p> <p>GS explained that he expected the four existing Revive re-use shops to divert 900 tonnes of waste out of the waste stream this year. The Charlton lane shop would have its own charity scheme, as the other shops do, where residents can chose a local charity to benefit from a donation from the revenues generated at the shop.</p> <p>GS stated that he expected the shop to be open next year in time for the summer.</p>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Communications</b>	
8.1	<p>LM provided an update on recent communications, including a summary of the comments and complaints that had been received.</p> <p>LM explained that the platform used to send the electronic newsletter was changing and that this had required some changes to the website so old articles and progress updates are now stored on the website if people want to go and look at previous editions.</p> <p>LM also showed photos of cheques from the Revive charity scheme being donated to charities chosen by the four existing shops.</p>	
<b>9</b>	<b>Questions</b>	
9.1	<p>LM read questions on the agenda submitted by PH. The questions were A) How many weeks is the project behind schedule? B) For which reasons? C) Have extensions of time been awarded? D) How much extra will these cost the Employer?</p> <p>JCS stated that the current programme shows food waste being introduced in December, with the pre-treatment equipment for the gasification being commissioned in November and first residual waste starting in January. He also stated that commissioning is expected to take two to three months.</p> <p>JHa stated that the commissioning process needs to be comprehensive, with no shortcuts. It's not about how long it takes but about getting it right.</p> <p>KS asked how this impacts the contract to take black bag waste to Grundons.</p> <p>RP explained that the waste goes to various places so there are a number of options open to Surrey, but SUEZ has spoken to Grundons about a phased approach.</p> <p>JCS explained that there was no single reason for the delay, it was simply a result of the complexity of the site, the planning restrictions and the focus on quality and getting it right. He reiterated that everyone is working closely together and determined to complete construction as soon as possible.</p> <p>SD asked if SUEZ is contracted to find in-house solutions for the interim.</p>	

	<p>RP explained that it can be in-house or through third parties.</p> <p>SD asked where the cash came from to fund the extra period of waste disposal.</p> <p>RP explained that this was tied up in the contract details, but essentially SCC is not paying for the Eco Park waste disposal costs until it is handed over.</p> <p>SD asked if that meant the risk was transferred to SUEZ.</p> <p>RP confirmed that this was a commercial matter between SUEZ and M+W and not a matter for SCC.</p> <p>LM read out the comments from JW regarding the dust from the soil screening activities.</p> <p>RSA stated that it was agreed that there would be dust suppression.</p> <p>JCS confirmed that there is dust suppression and that this is monitored by SUEZ on a daily basis.</p> <p>CL stated he had previously spoken to the SUEZ H&amp;S contact for the site, Calum James, regarding moving the mobile plant off the top of the bund as no amount of dust suppression would inhibit dust at that height. He requested that this is followed up and monitored.</p> <p>JS asked if dust measurement had taken place.</p> <p>JCS confirmed this should be the case and will report back to the group.</p> <p>LM read out point 4 from the questions, and explained that the soils will not just be used for the landscaping but also to backfill areas of the site such as the construction compound and car parking areas, hence the difference in volume.</p>	JCS
<b>10</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
10.1	JHa followed up on an action from the previous meeting and stated that SUEZ had been in contact with a representative from the Scout hut adjacent to the site and that there was a plan in place to do the work previously committed to.	
<b>11</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
11.1	Tuesday 5 <sup>th</sup> February 2019 at 6.30pm	