

Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Tuesday 5 February 2019
Location	Sunbury Golf Centre
Recorder	Louise Morton

Present

Name	Initials	Organisation	Title / Role
Ken Snaith	KS		Resident, Chair
Jim Walter	JW		Resident
Richard Hewitt	RH	Shepperton Residents' Association	Resident
Diane Hall	DH		Resident
Alison Dodsworth	AD	Charlton Village Residents' Association	Resident
Julia Bachman	JB		Resident
Andrea Koskela	AK		Resident
Malcolm Robertson	MR		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
Tim Evans	TE	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).		
1	Welcome	
2	Apologies	
2.1	Cllr Colin Barnard, Mark McCartney	
3	Approval of minutes from previous meeting	
3.1	Accepted	
4	Matters Arising	
4.1	PH felt his questions were not sufficiently answered in 9.1.	
4.2	<p>AK noted that in 5.1 there is reference to waste being transported off site and asked if this will be impacted by Brexit.</p> <p>CL stated that the EA has identified all the major producers of refuse derived fuel to ensure they have adequate plans in place.</p> <p>AK asked what SUEZ's plans are.</p> <p>GS responded that SUEZ has confirmation that the existing arrangements will be honoured for the coming year and that, following that, we would understand any Brexit issues more comprehensively.</p> <p>AD asked how much RDF would be required at this point.</p> <p>JHa clarified that we expected to process approximately 5,000 tonnes of waste through the commissioning period through the mechanical pre-treatment process before processing any RDF through the gasification unit..</p>	
5	Project update	
5.1	<p>JCS informed the group regarding the results of the on site dust sampling, as this was requested by the group at the previous meeting.</p> <p>He explained that the process involves a sampling device which collects a dust sample over a period of time and this is analysed by an external independent body.</p>	

The data shows all results taken, sampled between June and October 2018, which show that the dust was below the 200milligrams per square metre per day (which is the fugitive dust nuisance limit in proximity to a Construction Site in the UK).

JW responded that there was a substantial amount of dust in his garden, as a result of the earthworks.

JHau explained that the agreed testing regime averages the results over a period, not every day, so some days may have been higher than others.

JCS provided an update on construction progress. The anaerobic digestion facility is complete from a construction perspective, apart from a few snags. Pre-commissioning without waste continues and food waste is currently expected to be input for processing for March.

On the gasification facility, the construction is 95% complete. The external cladding has been done, as well as most of the fit out in the admin building. There is still some cabling to be done, as well as continuity checks and pre-commissioning checks. First waste is expected into the mechanical pre-treatment later in February, with first fire on waste expected in March.

GS noted that when waste starts coming into the AD facility, the digestion tanks will need to be seeded, which requires bringing activated sludge in from other AD facilities. Therefore residents may see the tankers coming in over a 2-week period, about six per day.

JHa explained that during the commissioning of the Gasification facility, residents may also see steam coming from the roof of the building. This is a result of the steam blowing process, to give a final clean out the pipes prior to accepting waste, steam will be generated but the turbine will not be online, so residents may see steam being vented from the roof of the building which is normal for the commissioning of such a plant..

JW asked if the council is going to do anything about the roads, as they are already in a poor state, particularly at the junction with the dual carriageway.

TE said they would take that away and look at it.

RW explained that repairing pot holes is done on a 28-day cycle, however pot holes can only be repaired to a point, after that they need to be patched, which is a separate contract. He continued that Littleton roundabout had the same problem and now it's perfect. Funding for road maintenance is allocated by distance and does not take into account road usage, so heavily used roads in Surrey suffer more.

AK asked for more information on the first fire on waste process.

JCS explained that the gasification unit has to be heated slowly, to dry out the refractory and avoid cracking – a bit like a kiln. This will be done on oil first, and the burners for this were successfully tested a few months ago. Once the refractory is dried and heated, first waste will go into the fluidised bed. This will be waste that has been turned into refuse derived fuel through the pre-treatment process, then it goes into a bunker before going into the gasification unit.

AK asked for clarification on why it's not tested first and how it will be monitored.

JHa explained that this process is the testing process and that all systems will have been tested separately prior to first waste. The instruments and controls will monitor the process, for example, temperature checks, flow rates, pressures and emissions.

AK asked if there would be external monitoring.

JHa confirmed that the EA have approved the commissioning plans,

CL confirmed that there would be representation from the EA present to check everything.

JCS reiterated that there would be continuous monitoring of the emissions through commissioning, the same as there will be in operations.

AK asked if there was pressure to complete due to the project being late.

GS stated that it is critical to ensure the facility is delivered to the required specification and that this wouldn't be compromised.

CL confirmed that there are various processes and procedures that are standard to starting up a thermal treatment plant ensure everything is safe and that SUEZ is following these procedures.

JHa clarified that it's not in the interests of SUEZ to accept the facility from M+W Group unless it's working correctly.

DH asked if JHa was happy that C4 was measured together with other carbons.

CL stated that the measuring process is standard across the country and that they will measure for other compounds if they have a specific concern about a site.

JHa stated that he would check and confirm but that he and JHau believe the measurement is aggregated but quoted as C4. He also reiterated that the system monitoring acts as the policeman as primary control of emissions is by operating the process correctly. I.e. within the correct flowrates, temperatures and pressures.

CL stated that the EA will be checking the emissions and the monitoring process to make sure everything is correct and a part of that is making sure it's being operated by qualified people.

JHa pointed out that a benefit of this system is that the waste is much smaller, so the waste is first gasified and then combusted more completely and cleanly. He explained that the periodic sampling during commissioning is a standard way of monitoring plants such as this. He also clarified that the site has to comply with the Waste Incineration Directive, which has strict regulations, and this site is stricter than most, having a NOX limit that is half what it is at other sites. As well as restrictions on limits, there are regulations on operating processes and how quickly we react to certain things,

KS read out the question submitted on the agenda, which was 'What alarms are in place for the AD, particularly monitoring hydrogen sulphide? Please explain the process controls and protection alarms in place.'

JHa answered that there are a number of fixed gas detectors in the AD facility. Hydrogen Sulphide (H₂S) is a bi-product of the waste treatment process and it is H₂S that has a 'bad egg' smell. He also explained there were other ways to detect levels of H₂S within the process. There is a bio-chemical scrubber in the facility to remove H₂S in the AD facility.

MR stated that he could smell it driving past the site the other day.

CL explained that the group was currently sitting on an old landfill that was filled in prior to the existence of the EA and that the way this had been dealt with would not be allowed now. The site has passive ventilation so gases from the landfill are emitted, and this smell has been reported to the EA by golf club staff. This site is opposite the Eco Park and is recognised as a potential source of H₂S odour.

CL continued that landfill gas has a very distinctive smell and that we have a heightened awareness of it because we're talking about it. Due to prevailing winds, the smell from the golf course often goes over the Eco Park, giving the impression it's

	<p>coming from the Eco Park. But waste would have to be sitting for a long time in the Eco Park to biodegrade to that extent to give rise to that particular odour and waste is removed from site very regularly as required by the permit on the SUEZ site, so the Eco Park is not the source of the smell.</p>	
6	CRC and RBF operations	
6.1	<p>GS presented on the CRC and RBF operations update.</p> <p>He explained that the operations team had spent time planning prior to the Christmas period, to deal with the expected increased volumes. The planning involved making sure key outlets and required hauliers were identified, plus contingency arrangement planning. Additional bays were released by the construction team, on the CRC prior to Christmas, which gave additional capacity. This work was successful in the management of all of the additional waste generated at Christmas and delivered to the site was well managed and although the site was very busy, all waste was stored in the bays correctly in accordance with our interim arrangements throughout the difficult period with no waste being stored on the plaza..</p> <p>GS asked for feedback from the group on their experiences of the CRC over the Christmas period or if anyone had visited recently.</p> <p>AK commented that she hadn't used the CRC over Christmas, but that she used it recently and there were lots of gulls.</p> <p>GS stated that there are a number of bird control measures available and that currently SUEZ were using a hawk on site to manage the gulls.</p> <p>JW stated that he had used the CRC a number of times recently and had a positive experience with regards to efficiency of the visit and the positive attitude of the staff.</p> <p>TE also stated that he had had a good experience of the site on recent visits.</p> <p>SD and AD both commented that they had a positive interaction with a female member of staff at the CRC, who had been very helpful.</p> <p>GS thanked the group for their feedback and talked about the Revive shops, noting that last year over 800 tonnes of waste was diverted out of the waste stream and sold through the four existing Revive re-use shops. The charity scheme had also seen over £18,000 donated to local charities through the year, chosen by local residents.</p> <p>GS explained that the plan to use Ivydene cottage as a base for a Revive shop was being delayed due to construction works, so to bring the benefit of having a re-use shop to residents sooner, the proposal is to create a temporary shop on the CRC where the existing re-use area is located.</p> <p>The group was supportive of the temporary re-use shop idea and a number of members asked how they could get involved with local charities to benefit from the Reuse scheme.</p>	
7	Communications update	
7.1	<p>LM provided an update on recent communications, including the Frequently Asked Questions document, which was requested at the last meeting and covers a range of topics including emissions, safe operations and community engagement. The document was distributed at the end of the meeting, along with hard copies of the most recent newsletter.</p>	

	<p>LM also gave an update on the CLG membership, stating that there had only been one applicant for the vacancies. The person had relevant technical experience but lived in Guildford, so not within the immediate vicinity of the site. LM stated that the group could decide whether or not to accept his application.</p> <p>She also stated that the group may wish to consider the purpose of the CLG, and therefore who would be suitable members, as the plant moves into operation. Perhaps considering that local community groups such as charities or schools might be interested in having representation on the CLG to ensure the community gets maximum benefit from the facility.</p> <p>JW commented that there are lots of school locally, who could benefit from the visitor centre.</p> <p>JB asked whether visitors would be able to see the plant in operation.</p> <p>JHa explained that there was a need to balance H&S requirements against the needs to show visitors around, so it may not be possible to take young children around the site, but we would look to find an interactive experience instead.</p> <p>GS stated that as the facility moves into the operational stage the group should look to focus on developing the understanding of waste treatment and resource management for example of children being able to see how the facility produces RDF from black bag waste and what refuse derived fuel actually looks like, to fully understand what happens to their waste and why it so important that all materials are managed effectively.</p> <p>RW suggested we hold the vacancies for the time being, until the site is operating.</p> <p>TE agreed with this proposal.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p>Surrey County Council update</p>	
<p>8.1</p>	<p>RP provided an update on Surrey County Council, explaining that the council is under enormous financial pressure. Consultations were launched in November to review various services, including libraries, children’s centres and community recycling centres. Overall there were 28,000 responses, with the CRC consultation receiving 12,000 – so significantly more than any other survey. This is due to the CRCs being a universal and extremely popular and appreciated service.</p> <p>The proposals looked at closing up to six CRCs as well as introducing charging for construction wood and roofing felt, and charges for van and trailer permits.</p> <p>A cabinet meeting on 29th January confirmed the introduction of new charges but recommended delaying the closure of four smaller sites pending a review of the government’s waste strategy, released in December, and to allow time to look for alternative funding for the sites to keep them open.</p> <p>There are other changes being made to the service that were not consulted on, which include a trial of mechanical black bag sorting. The sites already sort through black bag waste to extract all recyclable materials, but this is done by hand. The trial will see if further recyclables can be recovered using a mechanical process instead.</p> <p>There are also plans to sell advertising space at the recycling centres, and increase our re-use offering to generate more revenue for the council.</p> <p>KS asked for confirmation again that, as stated in the previous meeting, the council’s costs are not affected by the delay to the Eco Park.</p>	

	RP confirmed that the council is protected from the delay costs by the contract with SUEZ.	
9	Questions	
9.1	<p>RSA informed the group that the date for representations on the waste plan had been extended due to a mix up on the form, so residents now had until 10th March to provide feedback.</p> <p>JS asked for information about the company that signs off the facility and who they report to.</p> <p>RP explained that it's the role of the independent certifier (IC), who issue the acceptance certificate once they are satisfied that the site is operating correctly and they report to Surrey County Council. He also noted that they also have a technical consultant who provides supervision as well.</p> <p>AK asked if there is an end date in the contract between Surrey County Council and SUEZ as the facility was late.</p> <p>RP confirmed that there was provision in the contract and it was 18 months after the target completion date, which would be May 2019.</p> <p>AK asked whether this meant there was additional pressure to complete the site.</p> <p>RP stated that the terms of the contract gave them the right to intervene, but also the right not to intervene and, ultimately, they would look at who was best placed to finish the project for Surrey County Council.</p> <p>KS stated that the planning application for the landscaping has been delayed in the process.</p> <p>GS confirmed that the decision is now expected towards the end of February.</p> <p>KS asked about plastics, and whether this was being hoarded as a result of the difficulties with China.</p> <p>GS stated that, as plastic degrades over time, it is never best stored for extended periods of time, however he agreed there is still an issue with the difficult market for mixed plastics and contamination of loads, which makes it harder to find a market for the material but confirmed there are no issues with any material from Surrey..</p> <p>RSA asked what the industry was doing about the problem of black plastic.</p> <p>JHa explained that the government's waste strategy looked at this issue, amongst others, and is investigating working with producers and retailers to reduce or remove problem materials such as black plastic. Some retailers have stopped using it already, others are looking at take back schemes for some materials, often called Extended Producer Responsibility.</p> <p>SD stated that there should be a national standard. Others agreed.</p>	
10	AOB	

10.1	<p>CL confirmed that he was moving on to a new role within the EA and that his replacement was called Anna von Borzyszkowska. CL stated that Anna has previously looked after the incinerator at Edmonton so has experience of other thermal treatment facilities. CL expressed his intention to attend the next meeting, as part of the handover process, if he is available.</p> <p>KS thanked CL for all of his contribution to the group and his hard work on the project and wished him good luck in his new role.</p>	
11	Date of next meeting	
11.1	Tuesday 14 th May 2019 at 6.30pm	