

CORNWALL ENERGY RECOVERY CENTRE

COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING MINUTES

Meetings

Monday 11 January 2016	2
Monday 14 March 2016	10
Monday 16 May 2016	19
Monday 25 July 2016	27
Monday 26 September 2016	36
Monday 28 November 2016	43

Meeting minutes

Subject	CERC Community Forum
Date	11/01/16
Location	Brannel Rooms, St Stephen
Recorder	Janine Sargent

Present:

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Julia Clarke	JC	St Dennis Parish Council	Chair (and Chair of this Forum)
Fred Greenslade	FG	Cornwall Council	Councillor, St Dennis and Nanpean
Dick Cole	DCo	Cornwall Council	Councillor, St Enoder
John Sibley	JS	Treviscoe Institute and Community Centre	Chairman
Chris Fry	CF	Community representative	
Steve Greenwood	SG	St Dennis and Nanpean Community Trust	Vice Chair
Dave Simpson	DS	St Stephen in Brannel PC	Councillor
Dave Hatton	DH	Community representative	
Ian Lobb	IL	St Dennis Parish Council	Councillor

Supporting Officers:

Michael Dobson	MD	SUEZ	Communications Manager
Mike Beckett	MB	Cornwall Council	Waste Manager
Lindsey Craik	LC	Cornwall Council	Communication and Engagement Specialist
David Chadwick	DC	Cornwall Council	Community Link Officer
Tim Caddy	TC	VINCI	Senior Project Engineer
David Mudge	DM	Environment Agency	Industry Regulation

Distribution:

Participants + Cllr Keith Wonnacott, John Betts, Cllr Des Curnow, Clerk of St Enoder Parish Council.

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	Welcome and Apologies	
1.1	Apologies were received from Keith Wonnacott and John Betts.	
2.0	Review and agree minutes	
2.1	The acceptance of the minutes was proposed by IL and seconded by JS.	
3.0	Matters arising from previous minutes	
3.1	Re. 5.4 MI was going to pull together the drawings for this, but is currently on paternity leave, so this is postponed until the next meeting.	
3.2	Re. 5.5 Fly tipping is on agenda (see below).	
3.3	Re. 6.8 flue gas monitoring system is on agenda (see below)	
3.4	Re. 8.1 John Betts had asked how long the CERC would be in the 'construction' phase and potential financial impact to the Trust. MD said that this was not something that could be answered yet by this Forum and with regards to the legal agreement with the Trust it would be best if he contacted the Council's legal team.	
3.5	Re. 8.4. Local charitable support - MD said he had looked into it for IL but the last of the community budget he held had been used for the Treviscoe Halloween disco.	
3.6	Re. 8.6 MD said that the site visit was organised for this Sunday (17 th January) and that the arrangements would be discussed further down the agenda. FG added that the Cornwall Council councillors who had taken the opportunity to visit the CERC as part of the PAC were very impressed with the scale of the project.	
3.7	Re. 8.7. These items have been added to today's agenda, as requested.	
4.0	Opportunity for members of the public to speak	
4.1	No members of the public were present.	
5.0	Update on stack lights, car parking arrangements, working hours and road signs	
5.1	MD said that all of the red lights in the middle section of the stack are now at a lower intensity, as agreed. Before Christmas, when the change was attempted, one red light had reverted to the higher intensity but this was sorted out on 4 January, when electricians were available. He added that, having had a drive around, the lights looked significantly less bright and he hoped that it is making a positive difference to local people. JC said she had been asked if the red lights had been dimmed for the benefit of SUEZ	

	<p>offices and MD said that this was not the case, it was done solely in response to the request of local residents, in particular Mr and Mrs Fox. FG said that an awful lot of work had gone into this due to people's concerns. CF asked if it was just a matter of reprogramming the lights and if so, could the top lights also be changed. MD said that Newquay Airport had requested that the top lights were left at the current intensity, so this wasn't an option.</p>	
5.2	<p>Car Parking on the verges of the access road by CERC staff was discussed. MD said SUEZ and VINCI were looking into ways to rectify this. Parking is available for 276 cars at present, but today there were 330 people on site so despite some car sharing and bussing in of workers there is not always enough capacity. The plan is to extend the overflow car park to the left of you as you drive towards site down the access road. An NMA for this will be submitted shortly. DS asked if the extra capacity was just needed during the construction phase. MD said that higher numbers will be on site until at least April, so yes, it's just a temporary measure. MD added that VINCI were looking at storing some materials, such as ducts and pipes at the car park nearest the site and asked if anyone had any objections to this? Nobody did, as long as there would be enough car parking spaces overall. On the subject of car park lighting MD said that he was not aware of any further problems with this but if there were, to let him know.</p>	
5.3	<p>MD said that there was a Non Material Amendment application in to increase working hours from 15th January onwards. However the NMA was slightly delayed in coming back, with one Parish Council still to respond. MD explained that this would just be a continuation of the type of works that have gone on in recent months (i.e. quieter works at night such as cable pulling).</p>	
5.4	<p>MD asked for an update on missing road signs from members. A discussion ensued – St Dennis roundabout was mentioned (face missing from sign) and MD said he had noticed this one as well. IL said that on the High Street in Foxhole other signs were obscuring the CERC sign. IL said if the grass was cut back that would make the sign more visible. TC said he would have a look at this. JS said he would have a drive around the area and report back.</p>	JS and TC
5.5	<p>The discussion returned to working hours. CF had seen an article in the paper about there being no work on a Sunday – but last Sunday he had seen 20 cars in the car park. MD said there will sometimes be cars in the car park but no construction work was being undertaken last Sunday. TC said that staff were on site last Sunday to manage the surface water (after all the rain we have had), to stop it going where it shouldn't. MD said that apart from occasional light related issues SUEZ hadn't received any complaints about night working. IL said that now the cladding had gone up, night lighting was much better and he had not heard any noise from site at night.</p>	

5.6	<p>DS asked if there was a surface water management plan for the CERC, following on from what TC had said about water management. TC said that the current problems were to do with water discolouration, which was due to silt, but this wouldn't be a problem when the construction phase is finished. DS asked what happens if the pond overflows, TC said that it had been designed for a '200 year storm' situation, i.e. the pond has a huge amount of capacity. DM said that as TC said, silt was the problem, but once the hard surfaces were in, the problem would be resolved. He added that the EA were happy with the surface water management. DS asked if extra run off from the site (due to hard surfaces) had been allowed for, i.e. with regards to the impact on local watercourses. DS was concerned about extra surface water run-off overwhelming the system, and potential flooding downstream. DM said that the pond itself was treated as 'controlled water' but that if the pond overflows into the brook that is permitted as it's a natural thing for a pond to do. DS said his concern was that the CERC was a new development, which is bound to increase surface run-off, and could lead to flooding further downstream (which has occurred in the past so not unheard of). A discussion followed on areas vulnerable to flooding. DS mentioned the River Fal at Stamps. DM said he would look into this issue for the next meeting. TC said that there shouldn't be a large volume of water coming downstream from the CERC, i.e. there wouldn't ever be a deluge down the brook. There were all sorts of checks and measures to prevent this – e.g. hydro brakes and overflow pipework. A query was raised about the bridge at Stamps – if this was flooded is there an alternative route for lorries. JS said he didn't think it would overflow at Stamps, but there could be a problem if the bridge footings were washed out. Especially as there was no weight limit on the bridge. DH said that he thought that there was more likely to be a problem at Egypt (upstream of Stamps), where it had flooded before. IL suggested SUEZ could write a letter to the Parish Councils to explain how the surface water is to be managed. MD said that he would see if an extract from the relevant plan could be made available. DS said that he was concerned the public would say that no-one local raised the issue, if there was a problem in the future.</p>	DM, MD
6.0	Fly tipping, odour, and lighting (see 8.7 of November minutes)	
6.1	<p>The issue of fly tipping on the CERC access road, which was deferred from the last meeting was tabled. MB said he could see why people would be concerned but that Cornwall Council don't tend to put CCTV up where there are potential problems. He said that nationally fly tipping has been increasing, but it is now levelling off. If there are particular concerns, MB said that when the CERC was open the area would be monitored by his team. He added that fly tipping is not restricted to near waste sites. It was asked if the introduction of charges for certain items at HWRCs had increased fly tipping. MB said that whilst there had been an increase generally, and that the chargeable items had contributed to the increase, most of the items being tipped were things you could take to a HWRC for free anyway. MB said that there had been several prosecutions and if they had evidence they would prosecute. JS said that IMERYS had moveable cameras – but it was hard work as they had to have really clear images for the Police. MB said that CORY should respond within 48 hours to remove</p>	

	fly tipped waste. They always look for evidence of who tipped it, and if they have enough evidence CC will prosecute. MB said that covert surveillance and the use of cameras could be arranged if the need arises.	
6.2	<p>JC asked at the last meeting for the topic of odour (when the CERC is up and running) to be discussed again at the January meeting. MD understood the concerns and said as had previously been discussed a process was in place to control odour. Odour at the CERC will be minimal as the plant is specifically designed to deal with it. The air that's used for combustion is drawn from the tipping hall, which draws the odour in at the same time. A discussion ensued about odour noticed at the Exeter plant (not operated by SUEZ) on a recent visit by members of the CERC Forum. MD said that SUEZ ran a large plant of similar design to the CERC in Suffolk and there were no odour issues there. DM said that odour was something the EA would tackle immediately, as there are permit conditions to do with odour (and noise). It was pointed out that there are houses only 60m from the plant in Plymouth and there hadn't been an issue there. CF said that the problem at Exeter was that the lorries were too big for the tipping hall so you couldn't shut the doors after them, leading to odour being released. DM said that the Exeter plant was a completely different design to the CERC so this wouldn't be an issue.</p> <p>DH asked about dispersion as he had noticed that the smoke from the Plymouth EfW stack never went straight up, but settled lower down, even if there was no breeze. DM said that extensive dispersion modelling had been carried out for the CERC and that the EA were satisfied that there will be no risk. He added that the 'smoke' that was visible from the Plymouth stack would be condensing warm air. JS said there was also the concern that clay dust would bring everything down with it. DM said that two thirds of the CERC was for flue gas treatment and that over 99% of the particulates would be removed. CF asked about waste lorries going through the villages – what about the odour from them. MD said that only local waste lorries will be going through the villages, so no different from today. DH said that if lorries didn't take the authorised route that could be a problem. MD said that if that became an issue SUEZ would deal with any drivers not using the haul road. JC said that the best thing would be for local people to monitor it themselves and then let SUEZ know if there were any problems.</p>	
6.3	Lighting has already been covered.	
7.0	Reporting of flue gas monitoring information when CERC operational	
7.1	MD explained that the provision of emissions information over a period of a month will be published onto a website, once they have been validated by the Environment Agency. DM said that the EA have 24/7 access to emissions and that every pollution incident will be treated like an emergency. The EA can walk in at any time to perform a check on the CERC. He added that the EA can force a shut down if there's a really big problem, but in his experience usually the company takes the initiative i.e. they contact the EA to say 'we have a problem and we've shut down'. An	

	investigation by the company would then be carried out, which the EA would follow up on. He reiterated how seriously monitoring was taken and that action would be swift if there was a problem.	
8.0	CERC construction update	
8.1	<p>TC gave his report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Composite cladding to the EFW building is almost completed with the Danpalon semi-translucent cladding progressing well even in the inclement weather conditions 2. The liner sheet to the EFW roof is complete and the top sheet will be installed as soon as weather allows 3. The fit out of the Admin block is progressing well with areas completed and handed over for first stage commissioning 4. The Western Power Distribution substation is complete and the electricity will be turned on in the next few weeks. This means the site can draw electric from the grid and begin commissioning of essential services and systems 5. The tipping hall is progressing well and the concrete slabs are 60% complete and the piping and electrical works are 50% complete 6. The fire suppression systems throughout the building are virtually complete but are yet to be tested/commissioned 7. The cabling and switch gear installation to the process equipment is very well advanced 8. The turbine installation is nearing completion 9. Insulation to the process plant and pipework is progressing well 10. Installation of the refractory lining to the furnace is going well 11. The weighbridges and gatehouse have been installed 12. Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) structural concrete has been completed 13. IBA floor slabs are around 60% complete 14. IBA structural steelwork is 60% complete 15. Drainage and ducting is ongoing with many underground tanks and chambers being installed 	
8.2	IL asked if the build was on target for completion. TC said that the purpose of the NMA (i.e. increased working hours) was to help catch up. TC added that progress will be easier/quicker from Easter onwards with lighter evenings and hopefully better weather. TC asked if there were any particular areas he could photograph for the Sunday visit, IL asked for photos of the tipping hall.	TC

9.0	Environment Agency Update	
9.1	<p>DM gave the EA's report:</p> <p>The EA are still working through the pre-operating conditions with SUEZ. The commissioning plan is the main one at the moment, mainly how SUEZ will cover environmental aspects and meet their legal obligations. This covers every aspect of the operation from waste acceptance (e.g. what happens with waste that won't be accepted), and combustion to cleaning the flue gas. The Agency is on site every 4 weeks and there is a lot of correspondence in between times. CF asked about job cuts at the EA and how this would affect EA monitoring at the CERC. DM said that a lot of admin functions had been pulled together with other organisations (e.g. Natural England) to save money. He added that all EfWs (including the CERC) would be deemed priority sites – so would be monitored. During similar times in the past, sites have been categorised as proactive and reactive and this might well happen again.</p>	
10.0	Community Fund Update	
10.1	<p>SG gave the Community Trust's report:</p> <p>The website is near enough up and running. The Community Trust are currently formulating the funding agreement with Cornwall Council and SUEZ. There are still 'nuts and bolts' to do, such as getting the money into a bank account, and then they will be onto the next phase, which will include handling the launch events. They have had issues with registration with the Charity Commission and at times progress has seemed painfully slow, but it is important to get things right first time and they are definitely getting there now. At the next Community Trust meeting the final agreement will be signed. A local organisation will be handling the administration on behalf of the Trust, so they will be signing an agreement with them too. The website has been put together by a sub-committee, it has taken a long time but everyone who has seen it has been very positive about it and said it gives the right image for the Community Trust. SG added that there has been a good cross section of people on the panel, with different skills, and it has been enjoyable to work on it. The Trust are thinking of having a media sub-committee to think about how to 'sell' the Community Trust to the general public. The Trust feel that they cannot expect applications to come through the door without marketing it. JS said the most important thing is that the money is not wasted. IL said a lot of people were fed up with waiting and that when it is available, it may counteract some of the negative feelings about the CERC.</p>	
11.0	Arrangements for next site visit	
11.1	<p>MD asked members to turn up at 10am at the Gatehouse. There would be plenty of parking. Due to the weather conditions there would not be a walkabout.</p>	
12.0	AOB	

12.1	CF asked when the information would be available re. 8.1 (Community Trust query about how long the construction phase lasted and impact on funding matters). MD said that the Trust needed to speak to the Council's legal team about this. FG said his understanding was that it was £200K/year, available from the signing of the revised project until the first electricity was produced and exported to the National Grid.	
12.2	IL told the group about a Steam and Vintage Rally taking place in April and encouraged the organisations present to take a stand at the rally. The dates are 2 nd /3 rd April. IL asked anyone who would like a space in the trade stand area to contact him over the course of the next month.	
13.0	<p>Date of next meeting:</p> <p>Monday 14th March, 7pm at the Brannel Rooms, St Stephen.</p>	

DRAFT Meeting minutes

Subject	CERC Community Forum
Date	14/03/16
Location	Brannel Rooms, St Stephen
Recorder	Janine Sargent

Present:

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Fred Greenslade	FG	Cornwall Council	Councillor, St Dennis and Nanpean
Dick Cole	DCo	Cornwall Council	Councillor, St Enoder
John Sibley	JS	Treviscoe Institute and Community Centre	Chairman
Chris Fry	CF	Community representative	
Steve Greenwood	SG	St Dennis and Nanpean Community Trust	Vice Chair
Dave Simpson	DS	St Stephen in Brannel PC	Councillor
John Betts	JB	St Dennis and Nanpean Community Trust	Chair
Ian Lobb	IL	St Dennis Parish Council	Councillor
Keith Wonnacott	KW	St Stephen in Brannel Parish Council	Councillor

Supporting Officers:

Michael Dobson	MD	SUEZ	Communications Manager
Matt Ives	MI	SUEZ	Project Development Manager
Verity Palk	VP	Cornwall Council	Waste & Environmental Contracts – Team Leader
Lindsey Craik	LC	Cornwall Council	Communication and Engagement Specialist
David Chadwick	DC	Cornwall Council	Community Link Officer
Tim Caddy	TC	VINCI	Senior Project Engineer
David Mudge	DM	Environment Agency	Industry Regulation

Members of Public Present: Elizabeth Hawken (local resident)

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	Welcome and Apologies	
1.1	Apologies were received from Julia Clarke, St Dennis PC and Dave Hatton, St Stephen in Brannel PC.	
1.2	In JC's absence FG agreed to act as Chair for this meeting.	
2.0	Review and agree minutes of meeting held on 11 January 2016	
2.1	VP, on behalf of Mike Beckett, asked for an amendment of the wording recorded to be made to 6.1. MD noted the details and agreed that this would be done.	
2.2	The minutes were then approved.	
3.0	Matters arising from previous minutes	
3.1	Ref. 5.4 (road signs) – TC had looked into this and it had been dealt with as far as practicable.	
3.2	Ref 5.6 (surface water management) - this will be covered later in the agenda.	
3.3	CF asked about lighting when the CERC was operational. MI said that this would be covered later on the agenda.	
3.4	CF asked for an update on lorries not using the agreed routes to the CERC. MD said that on 03/03/16, VINCI had sent route details and map to all relevant companies which reiterated that only these routes should be used.	
3.5	CF asked about Sunday working as he had seen a number of people working on the CERC roof on Sunday 13 th March. MI said that following the extremely high winds of last week, staff were checking the roof for damage and re-attaching any cladding that had come loose. CF said there was an awful lot of people working on the roof of both the EfW building and the IBA building, and a lot of cars in the staff car park. MI said there were approximately 56 cars in the car park on Sunday, but many of these belonged to the 27 people who were doing administrative tasks in the welfare facilities that day. FG said that, in his opinion, the sooner the CERC is up and running the better it will be for everyone concerned as this would cut down on the construction traffic at shift change over times and should also help with the car parking issues. CF said that site staff could work 24/7 Monday – Friday so couldn't understand the need for Sunday working. MI said that they didn't always work 24/7 as at this time of year for some activities the amount of task lighting needed might cause disturbance to local residents and hence the identification of activities for	

	late evening/overnight was key. He added that later in the year staff will be able to make use of the natural daylight and work longer hours.	
3.6	<p>CF raised the issue of odour when the CERC is operational, referring to problems that another EfW had apparently encountered (MVV plant at Plymouth) which had been in the local news. DM said that the problems at the EfW in Plymouth had mainly been during commissioning which have now only just been reported in the news article. Basically 'snagging' issues, which have now been resolved. For example, fire vents had remained open after testing, and the system had not alerted staff to this. The EA had received a lot of complaints about odour during commissioning, but were not getting anywhere near the number of complaints now. CF asked if the same problems were likely at the CERC. MI said that theoretically they shouldn't happen as the building design is different and that SUEZ has taken experience from other projects and passed this onto VINCI to ensure that this is considered in the design.</p>	
3.7	<p>Ref 12.2. KW said that he was unhappy that the St Dennis Steam and Vintage Rally had been raised at the last meeting and included in the minutes. This was not what the forum was for. IL explained that the purpose of raising it was to invite the organisations at the meeting (e.g. SUEZ, CC, EA) to have a free stand at the rally if they wished, to share information with local residents. It was agreed that in future matters such as this would not be raised at the meeting.</p>	
3.8	<p>FG read out an email regarding the air quality monitoring that St Stephen in Brannel Parish Council would be carrying out. The email FG read out at the meeting is below:</p> <p>Dear all</p> <p>Re: Air Quality Monitors Ltd</p> <p>Just a short message to you all.</p> <p>I have asked Pat, Charmian and Ken to forward this email to persons who may be concerned, so that the relevant persons will be able to see my comments on the reported association of the Company known as Air Quality Monitors Ltd with Exeter University.</p> <p>To be absolutely clear the company who will be doing the Monitoring and supplying equipment, for St Stephen-in-Brannel Parish Council, have no connection with Exeter University.</p> <p>This statement of association was incorrect and I apologise for any confusion arising from it being made. However this will not affect the effectiveness of the monitoring.</p> <p>Air Quality Monitors Ltd are a highly respected company and can be found on the web for further information. Air Quality Monitors Ltd. Registered in England. Company No. 7724392.</p> <p>Steps have been taken to address this mistake. This email being one of them.</p>	

	Regards Fred Greenslade, Cornwall Councillor St Dennis and Nanpean Division.	
4.0	Opportunity for members of the public to speak	
4.1	On this occasion, being the only member of the public present, Elizabeth Hawken was at the Chairs' discretion able to seek clarification on things during the meeting.	
5.0	Update on bottom ash, surface water management, future lighting and traffic management system	
5.1	MI opened the discussion on surface water management at the CERC (when it is up and running), by showing the group a plan. The plan was submitted as part of the CERC's planning conditions and has been approved by the planning authority and the EA. MI explained that there were a number of components that manage the surface water on site prior to being discharged. A big part of this is 'rainwater harvesting', i.e. water will be captured from the CERC's roof, and then be re-used on site. The car park will be block paved, allowing rainwater to be slowly released into the surface water system. This will be combined with surface water from the site's roads and fed into the site's filter drains, then swale and then into the attenuation pond. This system allows the amount of water being discharged, and the rate of discharge to be controlled. The system has been designed to cope with a 1 in 1,000 year storm, and climate change has also been factored into the design. DM said that the surface water flow from site should be no more than when it was a green field (on account of the various systems being implemented to manage the surface water).	
5.2	MI moved on to talk about the permanent lighting at the CERC, once it was complete. He shared some plans and images with the group. MI explained that most of the lights will be projected downwards, the only wall lights will be in pedestrian access areas. MI also showed the group a 'lighting contours plan' which showed the amount of light (and intensity) that is present at different distances from the site boundary. The overall aim is to minimise the amount of light that goes outside the boundary of the site. MI noted that this lighting colour plan doesn't take into account the future planting, so there will be added screening on site from trees/vegetation as they grow. The car park lights will need to be on all the time (for staff safety) but the site's road lights will be switched on and off when needed (for example if maintenance access is needed). MI noted that the aim is for minimal lighting overnight so you will just see a glow of light from the building where the internal process lighting shines through the semi translucent cladding, and light from the car parks (approx. 70 spaces at the CERC and 6 spaces at the IBA building– to give an idea of size). KW asked if LEDs would be used? MI said they would where possible. KW asked about the security of the site and if lighting would not be required for this, MI said there would be CCTV and infra-red cameras for this. CF asked if the intensity of the lights within the building would be the same as now, MI said this would change (and likely become less) as it is currently a combination of both the permanent and temporary lighting.	

	<p>JS asked if SUEZ would work with the community to resolve problems if there were issues with permanent lighting in the future, MI said they would, but would need to take into account both planning and ecological requirements. IL asked if the lighting at the CERC would be the same as at the EfW in Oxford – as that was very subtle. MI said the lighting would be less colour intensive than that facility, with just a hint of colour through the semi translucent cladding. Elizabeth Hawken asked where the lighting plans could be found. MI said they were part of the submitted and approved planning conditions.</p>	
5.3	<p>VP from Cornwall Council introduced the discussion on the traffic management system at the CERC when it was operational. VP is currently working with CORY on routing. She said that the council will be very specific about which vehicles can directly deliver, with most vehicles going through the transfer stations and not direct to site. VP noted that CORY have trackers on their vehicles, and a web based tracking system (so easy to see if a driver is not using the correct route) and VP will have a discussion with SUEZ about the bulk hauliers. VP said that Mike Beckett would be meeting with the barrier company to see if the system could provide more sophisticated information for audit purposes. If this isn't feasible, they will have to carry out a manual audit if required. VP added that everyone accessing the CERC site would need to be trained on the site rules, which would include how drivers access/leave the site. VP said that Cornwall Council directly control the collection teams so it will be easy for them to audit what they are up to. MD said there will be other companies occasionally accessing the CERC site, but that these could be trained accordingly.</p> <p>CF asked if there would be more obvious signage at the entrance to the haul road? VP said that Highways controlled what signage went on the public road itself but it might be feasible to erect a bigger sign on the haul road itself (but still visible from the public road). A discussion about having the sign in multiple languages also took place – to guide foreign HGV drivers. JS was concerned about potential tailbacks on the highway – i.e. the regular vehicles would have tags and the barrier would open automatically, but others would need to speak to someone on the intercom to gain access, which could cause hold ups. MI said that the barrier would be controlled at the CERC, with the aid of cameras on the haul road. JS said that the system would work as long as there was always someone at the end of the intercom. MI said that barriers will be able to be controlled from the CERC's control room and that with the shift teams present there will always be someone present to control the barrier. KW said that there was definitely potential for tailbacks, but maybe it was better to wait and see what happened when the CERC was open and then deal with it. VP said that she would discuss the matter with MB to plan for potential issues. CF suggested that a foreign driver (not travelling to the CERC) could accidentally turn onto the haul road, and then get stuck at the barrier – what would be the contingency for this. VP said she would look into this and also the signage.</p>	<p>VP, MI, MB</p> <p>VP</p>

5.4	<p>MI said that SUEZ's subcontractor was in discussion with a number of different local firms about the recycling of bottom ash but at this stage discussions were commercially confidential. CF asked what happens if SUEZ don't get a contract to get rid of the bottom ash. MI said that we already have an outlet for it; i.e. our subcontractor (Ballast Phoenix). Ideally we want to make use of it locally, which is what the subcontractor is looking into, but they also have national (and beyond) links with businesses which can make use of it.</p>	
5.5	<p>MI said that SUEZ continues to work with Cornwall Council to investigate options for the use of the heat generated by the CERC. They were talking to people from various industries that could make use of the heat, e.g. horticulture companies and data storage companies.</p>	
6.0	CERC Construction Update	
6.1	<p>TC handed around photographs of progress to date, and gave his report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Roof top sheets progressing well since the high winds of the winter months 2. Main EFW building cladding almost complete 3. Tipping hall slabs completed 4. Admin building fit-out with many rooms/areas substantially complete 5. Boiler refractory lining nearing completion 6. Utility pipework almost complete 7. Air Cooled Condenser construction 80% complete 8. Commissioning of function systems has started and progressing 9. Passenger lifts and goods lifts are awaiting final commissioning 10. External concrete roads are progressing with the route to the tipping hall being the first that will be completed 11. Admin car park area has started to be constructed 12. Fuel distribution from the tanks to the generator is complete 13. Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) conveyor has been installed 14. IBA steel work is 60% complete 15. IBA cladding and roofing has started 16. IBA welfare block has started <p>MI added that they now had the permanent power connection on site - being connected to the National Grid.</p> <p>JS asked if the IBA conveyor crossing to the IBA building would be completely covered, MI said yes it would be.</p> <p>KW asked about road noise on the concrete sections of the access road (to the tipping hall). MI said that vehicles should not get up enough speed to cause noise (as only a short section). JS asked if there was a speed limit on site, MI said it would be 10MPH.</p> <p>Following the problems at another EfW plant, FG asked if the tipping hall would be big enough for all sizes of lorries. TC said yes it is big enough.</p> <p>EH asked TC how many of the staff working on the site were from Cornwall. TC said that he would estimate around 50% of the Civil side were local. EH said that she had been told that 90% of the staff were from another country and that many had come in from Europe and were sleeping in their cars. TC said that he wasn't aware of workers sleeping in</p>	

	<p>their cars – but that many were making use of holiday accommodation at caravan parks and so forth (e.g. Gnome World and Atlantic Reach). TC added that using workers from other countries was sometimes necessary as the work was extremely specialised and only a small number of people had the required knowledge/expertise. DCo asked how long the staff stayed at Gnome World. TC said as long as the permission allowed, and then moved onto Atlantic Reach.</p>	
7.0	Environment Agency Update	
7.1	<p>DM gave his report. The Environment Agency (EA) had just finished looking at a couple of the Environmental Permit's pre-operating conditions. The first is to do with acceptance of incoming waste (i.e. certain types of waste) and how SUEZ will deal with this. The second is how SUEZ will be dealing with the bottom ash and fly ash. Both of these conditions have now been discharged. DM noted that it is a quieter period at the moment, until the hot commissioning at the CERC begins. The EA has no issues or concerns with the CERC at present. JS asked DM for an update on staffing at the EA. DM said there were now 7 of them in the team, and that there was no appetite for any more staff losses.</p>	
8.0	Community Fund Update	
8.1	<p>JB gave his report. JB said that it was a good news/bad news report. The last report was very upbeat and most things that were underway, have now come to fruition. The Trust is now recognised by the Charity Commission as a charity. A contract for an administrator has also been finalised – CRCC will be providing the Trust's admin. They are local and already have an office base in St Dennis. The Trust now has a bank account – which was opened in January – and a cheque book. The Trust are now starting to work on a plan for the official launch. The bad news is that the Trust does not have a penny in the bank, as the financing agreement has still not been completed. The financing agreement requires the signatures of 3 entities; the Trust itself, Cornwall Council and SUEZ (actually Cornwall Energy Recovery Limited, not SUEZ). The Trust and Cornwall Council signed in January but they are still waiting on a signature from Cornwall Energy Recovery Limited. Nothing more can be done until the financing agreement is in place. The Trust have been in touch with the Council's legal department about this to find out what is happening. MD said that it was unfortunate that he had not been made aware of the issue earlier, as then he could have looked into it to find out what the problem was. He added that he would now look into the issue this week and try to resolve it. SG said that no issues had been flagged up with the Trust, so they couldn't understand why the agreement hadn't been signed. JB agreed that none of their correspondence with SUEZ/Cornwall Energy Recovery Limited hinted at any sort of problem. FG asked how long the Trust had been waiting for the 3rd signature, JB said it had been 2 months. DC said that Laurie from Cornwall Council had been in touch with SUEZ/ Cornwall Energy Recovery Limited to find out what the holdup was. MI suggested that there might have been an issue with the recent change of</p>	MD, MI

	<p>legal entity, from 'SITA Cornwall' to 'Cornwall Energy Recovery Limited' or possibly the availability of directors to sign the agreement. JB said that the Community Trust's concern was that it did not reflect well on them (i.e. all the delays), and that they were losing the support of the local community. FG said that he was very disappointed that neither he nor DCo had been made aware of the problem, as they could have tried to intervene. JB said that the Trust hadn't approached the councillors as they had been assured that it was just a matter of Cornwall Energy Recovery Limited signing the agreement (i.e. no other issues). MD asked the group to give him a chance to look into the matter, and find out what the problem was and then he will update the forum. JB said that the Trust no longer meet as frequently as everything is now in place. The website is on hold, there are only a few tweaks to make but until the finance agreement is signed they can't sign it off as can't pay the bill. JB added that the Trust were really hopeful that the beginning of 2016 would mark the start of their activities – so were very disappointed with the latest delay. CF asked if the query about how much funding would be available to the Trust had been answered. A discussion about what counted as the 'construction' period ensued. MI noted that he remembered that one funding trigger was the first export of electricity to the grid. JB said that they had just wanted a ballpark figure really, and had based their calculations on a 3 year construction period. MI said that he would check the financing agreement and update at the next meeting. DS said he was confused as to why the Trust hadn't received any money yet, as it had already been under construction for nearly 3 years. MD said it was because the Trust had to be set up properly first (i.e. in order to be able to receive the money). FG said that the money was in a Cornwall Council account waiting to be released, and would be as soon as the financing agreement had been signed by all concerned. JS said he was concerned that the website had been shut down because the Trust couldn't pay for it. JB said that it wasn't yet operational (so hadn't been shut down), everything was in place, and it would not take much work for it to be fully operational. JB said that his main concern was the financing agreement – i.e. what the delay was and when it would be resolved. FG suggested that he and DCo, as County Councillors, could write a letter to Cornwall Energy Recovery Limited to hurry things along. JB said he thought MD should be given the chance to look into it. MD said he would do this and come back to JB within the week*.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Post meeting note (16/3/16), the delay about the signing of the funding agreement mentioned above was caused because the signed documents had not been sent to Cornwall Energy Recovery Limited for their signature. This is now being rectified. 	
9.0	AOB	
9.1	JS mentioned the contract for the dust monitoring. The wording needed to be rejigged, but then it can be signed and the equipment can be purchased (funding is all in place for its purchase). The next meeting will	

	be about where the monitors will be sited. FG said that the details would be on the website for everyone to see.	
10.0	Date of next meeting: Monday 16 th May 2016, 7pm at the Brannel Rooms, St Stephen.	

Meeting minutes

Subject	CERC Community Forum
Date	16/05/16
Location	Brannel Rooms, St Stephen
Recorder	Janine Sargent (JSa)

Present:

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Julia Clarke	JC	St Dennis Parish Council	Chair (and Chair of this forum)
Chris Fry	CF	Community representative	
Dave Hatton	DH	St Stephen in Brannel Parish Council	Councillor
Dave Simpson	DS	St Stephen in Brannel PC	Councillor
Ian Lobb	IL	St Dennis Parish Council	Councillor
Keith Wonnacott	KW	St Stephen in Brannel Parish Council	Councillor

Supporting Officers:

Michael Dobson	MD	SUEZ	Communications Manager
Matt Ives	MI	SUEZ	Project Development Manager
Mike Beckett	MB	Cornwall Council	Waste Manager
David Mudge	DM	Environment Agency	Industry Regulation

Members of Public Present: None

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	Welcome and Apologies	
1.1	Apologies were received for John Sibley, Fred Greenslade, David Chadwick, Lindsey Craik and Tim Caddy.	
2.0	Review and agree minutes of meeting held on 14 March 2016	
2.1	Minutes were approved by KW, seconded by IL and all in favour.	
3.0	Matters arising from previous minutes	
2.2	Re. 5.3 - will be covered under agenda item 5	
2.3	Re. 8.1 - MD said that this was resolved pretty quickly and was added as a post meeting note on the minutes of meeting dated 14/03/16. Agenda item 8 will also cover the Community Fund in more detail.	
4.0	Opportunity for members of the public to speak	
4.1	CF asked for an update on Evans Haulage (the owner of a vehicle that went down the haul road and then doubled back to use an unauthorised route). MD said that VINCI had written to the company concerned.	
4.2	CF expressed concern about vehicles entering the CERC construction site that had not been signed in at the gate. CF had viewed them going in one after another and it did not appear that they were being recorded. MD said that only the regular drivers of selected companies who had been inducted to site previously and planned to visit site several times a day could enter the site without stopping. In these cases the gateman will note them as they enter the site, and then they were ticketed by staff on the site itself. MI added that all drivers park up on their first visit of the day and talk to the gateman before entering the site, but with the drivers that will be visiting the site multiple times that day to make deliveries, rather than clog up the access road, for their subsequent deliveries they are allowed to enter the site without stopping at the gate (noted by the gateman as they go in) and then deal with the paperwork when on site (i.e. vehicles registered by foreman). CF said it was against health and safety law to not know who's on site. He said that he didn't think the gateman would be able to record the registration numbers as they entered the site and that there was therefore a 10-15 minute window when we did not know who was on site. MD said that the gateman was able to radio through when vehicles were entering the site, so we did know who was on site. MD said that he would speak to the gateman and to VINCI to clarify the process and explain further at the next meeting.	MD
4.3	CF said that the litter issues were much better now – SUEZ/VINCI seemed to be on top of this now.	

4.4	<p>CF asked about the overrun on the project and the penalties for this. He asked for the deadline dates for various things to be completed, and asked if SUEZ were already being fined for the delays. MI said that this information would be in the contract documents and that he couldn't really comment as he was unsure what information is within the public domain. CF asked if there was an official completion date, beyond which penalties were imposed. MI said that completion was originally Summer 2016, now likely to be in the last quarter. MD said that the remit of this group did not include discussing potentially commercially confidential information. JC suggested that this question is best addressed to their Cornwall Councillors and that she would organise this. MB said that once the opening date was known, the forum would be made aware and as the note MD had previously circulated to forum members commissioning is running late. IL said a lot of people were asking when the commissioning (i.e. when waste deliveries) was going to start. KW said that presumably as soon as SUEZ know the answer to this, they would let the forum know. MI confirmed that the forum would be informed once the date for waste deliveries was confirmed.</p>	JC
4.5	<p>CF raised the issue of Sunday working. MD said he would be following up with VINCI about CF's email of yesterday but didn't have the answer now. CF said there have definitely been people on site working on Sundays. MD said that he was aware that CF has raised some incidents, but he needed further clarification from VINCI before he could respond.</p> <p>IL asked about construction phase shift patterns, MI said that different trades worked different shifts so there wasn't a single set of shift patterns.</p> <p>MI said that there is currently a NMA in for a proposed 3 weekends of working. They have asked for three Sundays, as the WPD substation on site needs to be powered down, but in actual fact only need one (the other two being contingencies), and that should this be approved, the plan is that the works would occur this coming weekend which includes Sunday 22nd May. JC said the Parish Council had yet to comment on this NMA. MI said he understands that the Parish Council meeting is tomorrow and hence this will feed back to the planning authority prior to the decision date (due Thursday 19th May) and hence VINCI are all geared up to go ahead this weekend if permission is granted.</p>	MD
4.6	<p>CF raised the issue of the empty houses at the entrance to the access road being broken into again. He asked why Cornwall Council had moved the tenants out. CF said that if the tenants had remained in situ, the damage wouldn't have happened and the properties would have been fit for sale when the time came, saving a lot of money. MB said that this was the decision that was taken at the time and that the houses had been boarded up very robustly to protect them. He added that Cornwall Council were currently surveying the properties so they could come up with a cost estimate for putting them back to a liveable standard. CF said that one tenant was happy to go, but the other would have liked to have stayed put. MB said that the tenants were rehoused. He reiterated that Cornwall Council's aim was to get the work done and people moved in. MB said</p>	MB

	that the matter was now in the hands of his colleagues in property maintenance. CF asked about the cost of refurbishment, MB said that once the survey was done this information would be available and if it was in the public domain, he would let CF know.	
5.0	Traffic – vehicle routing to/from the CERC site, Footpath update	
5.1	<p>As previously advised, where hauliers had used the wrong route to get to the CERC, VINCI had written out to remind them of the correct routing that must be followed. There is now a ‘three strikes and you’re out’ policy for taking the wrong route – i.e. drivers can potentially be banned from the CERC site. MI said that the policy would also apply to people travelling at excessive speed along the access road.</p> <p>IL said that many locals had mentioned to him that people were travelling through the village very fast at around 7.45am, and that they suspected they were CERC staff. MD suggested that the best solution to this was to get in touch with the local PCSO and ask if they could come out with a speed gun. CF said that with regards to the access road he had reported details of speeding to MD who then followed up. JC said naming and shaming can help with changing behaviours.</p>	
5.2	JC said that she had been asked about a verge that may be causing visibility issues for vehicles travelling from St Dennis towards Gaverigan roundabout. Visibility is allegedly restricted partly by vegetation growing on the verge and the hedge of the farm. Details provided to MB who will follow up.	MB
5.3	MB said he was currently working with CORY on the routing for direct deliveries (i.e. local waste collections) and once confirmed would come back to the group with details.	
5.4	Following on from 5.3 above, DH asked if the new St Austell road had been taken into account with regards to routing. There are two proposed routes and one option will skim Whitemoor meaning the road through the village could become a rat run for vehicles travelling to the CERC. MD said that vehicles will only be allowed to use approved routes, and that he thought Whitemoor was one of the villages identified in the Section 106 Agreement. MB said that whatever route is approved, Cornwall Council can instruct CORY vehicles to use a specific route and take action if they don’t. DH asked if ‘3 strikes and you’re out’ would apply to them too. MD said this was just for construction traffic at the moment. MI said all operational drivers would have an induction into procedures, and authorised routes would be included in this. DH said that now the routes were out, all the locals could see the potential short cuts. He added that map of the new routes was available to view and IL agreed to send details through. MD and MB would look into this and come back at the next meeting. MB said that CORY vehicles have trackers, so if they are seen using the wrong route and are reported, Cornwall Council can look into it.	MD/MB
5.5	MD gave an update on the footpath, which was originally closed until 16 th May 2016 and so the temporary closure has been extended until the end	

	<p>of the year. CF asked why new signage had appeared. MI said when they renewed the closure they realised that additional signage was preferable to cover both the old footpath route and the relocated route. CF said the wording 'Footway closed' was confusing and people were still walking there. MI said this was the official Highways signage. CF asked what would happen if people were seen walking there. MI said they would be reminded that it was closed. MD said that if they do walk there, it is at their own risk.</p>	
6.0	CERC Construction Update	
	<p>MI advised the group that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighbridges installed • External roads under construction – working on the concrete roads in and out of the tipping hall • Louvres installation continuing on the EfW building • Roof installation continuing – tipping hall and bunker now complete, moved onto the boiler and flue gas treatment now • Building soffit and fascia being installed using the long reaching cranes – tipping hall and bunker almost complete • Roller shutter doors installed for the tipping hall (including the fast acting inner door) • IBA building progressing – roof and wall cladding almost complete • Pre-commissioning progressing through the various functional systems 	
7.0	Environment Agency Update	
7.1	<p>DM gave the EA report. DM said that they were currently working with SUEZ on the reporting requirements for when the CERC is up and running. When the hot commissioning begins the EA will be on site much more frequently. At the moment there are no problems at all, and everything is progressing as the EA would hope/expect. CF asked if the EA can monitor what's coming out of the chimney during commissioning. DM said that they could interrogate the system at any time. DM said that everything is mapped out now, i.e. what will happen and when. They will be busier when it comes to the steam blowing and first waste acceptance. He reiterated that there were no issues to report.</p>	
7.2	<p>DS spoke about the dust monitoring St Stephen in Brannel Parish Council would be carrying out. They are currently waiting on Cornwall Council to finalise the contract, but as soon as this is done, the Parish Council can go ahead and purchase the dust monitoring equipment. MB said that he had supplied some information so knew that the finalisation of the contract was</p>	

	<p>imminent. DS said that hopefully the dust monitors will be in place in the next few weeks. He added that they still needed to confirm locations, but that they were hoping to put one in St Dennis. JC said that this would need the approval of St Dennis Parish Council. DS said that other locations discussed were Treviscoe, and possibly Whitemoor and Nanpean, depending on funding. He said that once the contract/funding was in place, the Parish Council would make a decision on the specific locations and then seek the necessary approvals. DS said that once the machines were ordered they would only take 2 weeks to arrive. DH added that the machines were not specifically for dust from the incinerator, but all dust (i.e. from vehicles and other sources).</p> <p>JC said that she had met someone from Cornwall Waste Forum who had questioned her about the dust monitors. She had explained that it was St Stephen in Brannel Parish Council who were dealing with this. DS said that until the contract is finalised and everything agreed, he can't release specifics. The information will be released when everything is in place – so everyone has the same information at the same time.</p> <p>CF asked if the EA would be informed about the results of dust monitoring. DM said that the EA would only be involved with monitoring the stack. DH said that the results would go on the Parish Council website for anyone who has an interest to view. JC asked if the monitoring company would be sending the information to St Dennis PC as well as St Stephen in Brannel PC, DH said that it would just go on St Stephen in Brannel's website. He added that dust monitoring information from the existing monitor had been on the PC website for the last 12 years, so this was just an extension of that. JC asked if members of the PC will be able to understand the information sent. DH said they could pick out 'spikes' in dust (i.e. discrepancies).</p> <p>DM asked if the monitors just covered the quantity of dust, or whether they showed content as well (i.e. was it capturing dust to test later). DS said that if there's a 'spike' there's an option to look at the information in more detail, so yes, it captures dust as well as measuring amount of dust. DH said there's an option to do air sampling with mobile monitors too, and to look at specific types of dust but everything has a cost.</p>	
<p>8.0</p>	<p>Community Fund Update</p>	
<p>8.1</p>	<p>JC gave the report. The launch of the community fund was held on Saturday in the St Dennis Working Men's Club, facilitated by the Cornwall Rural Community Council. Application forms and information are available, so now it's a case of waiting for the applications to come in. The funding agreement has now been signed by all parties so there is currently ~£400k in the account, with another ~£230k to come. There are two types of applications – 'up to £1,000' and 'over £1,000'. It will be down to the panel to decide which projects go ahead. If the project involves a building, payments will be staged (i.e. for different phases of the build) so that if there is a problem with the project being completed, all the money will not be lost. The panel will meet monthly to look at applications and decide how funding will be awarded. A list of dates for the panel meetings will be made</p>	

8.2	<p>available. CRCC will look at all the applications before the panel view them, to make sure that all the sections of the form have been completed correctly and all necessary information included.</p> <p>JC said that there had recently been some changes in the Community Fund team - the Vice Chair had resigned due to health reasons and the Chair, John Betts, had also resigned (but has remained as a Trustee). KW said that of late, he had been able to glean more information on what was happening with the community fund from the minutes of this meeting than the Community Fund minutes, which had concerned him. JC said that it had been recommended that they change the constitution of the Community Fund so a councillor can chair the meeting. She added that procedures needed to be pulled back in and tightened up. KW or JS could possibly become Chair, or they could have a Cornwall Councillor Trustee/Chair – possibly Fred Greenslade. MD asked if the panel can choose to partly fund or fully fund a project. JC said each case would be looked at on its merits. She had met some groups at the launch who did not want anywhere near £1,000 and she had advised them to put in for whatever amount they needed. JC felt they had a great responsibility to ensure that the money was used wisely, to benefit the greatest number of people. IL said it had been a very successful launch, with a very positive response to the fund. There were in the region of 100 people attended and there was also a wide mix of ages and people from different areas. He said there were some very ambitious projects discussed and some people are concerned that all the money will go in the first month. JC said that with regards to big projects they may require applicants to give a presentation, and some projects would be instant rejections (i.e. if they should be funded out of the public purse, e.g. school maintenance). JC advised that the address for applications is the CRCC in Truro. DH asked if funding was available for the life of the incinerator, JC said that yes it was adding that the amount of funding available (beyond the construction period) will be dependent on electricity generated. JC agreed to send an application form to MD so he could have a look. MD asked if JC could let him know when a new Chair was appointed. JC said she would. She added that the website would be live very soon, now that the money was in the bank. IL said that the Facebook site was already up and running.</p>	JC
9.0	AOB	
9.1	<p>MD said that SUEZ were progressing with the plans for the visitor centre. We intend to print off a large copy of the plans and then hold an interim meeting in about a months' time so the CERC Community Forum could have a look and provide a sense check and feedback. MI said that lots of the group's comments from the previous meetings had already been taken on board. MI hoped that the designers would be able to attend the interim meeting, so they could talk the group through the plans.</p>	

	DH said it would be good if local families had a chance to visit the CERC before anyone else. JSa said she thought local schools would be given some sort of priority.	
10.0	Date of next meeting: 25 th July 2016, 7pm at the Brannel Rooms, St Stephen.	

Meeting minutes

Subject	CERC Community Forum
Date	25/07/16
Location	Brannel Rooms, St Stephen
Recorder	Janine Sargent (JSa)

Present:

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Julia Clarke	JC	St Dennis Parish Council	Chair (and Chair of this forum)
Fred Greenslade	FG	Cornwall Council	Councillor St Dennis and Nanpean
Dick Cole	DC	Cornwall Council	Councillor St Ender
Dave Simpson	DS	St Stephen in Brannel PC	Councillor
Ian Lobb	IL	St Dennis Parish Council	Councillor
Keith Wonnacott	KW	St Stephen in Brannel Parish Council	Councillor
John Sibley	JS	Treviscoe Institute and Community Centre	Chairman
Chris Fry	CF	Community representative	

Supporting Officers:

Michael Dobson	MD	SUEZ	Communications Manager
Matt Ives	MI	SUEZ	Project Development Manager
Mike Beckett	MB	Cornwall Council	Waste Manager
Dale Unsworth	DU	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract – Team Leader
David Mudge	DM	Environment Agency	Industry Regulation
Tim Caddy	TC	VINCI	Engineering Manager
David Chadwick	DCh	Cornwall Council	Community Link Officer

Members of Public Present: Elizabeth Hawken

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	Welcome and Apologies	
1.1	Apologies were received for Dave Hatton.	
2.0	Review and agree minutes of meeting held on 16 May 2016	
2.1	Re. 7.2 KW asked for 'dust monitoring' to be replaced with 'environmental monitoring'.	
2.2	IL proposed to accept the minutes and KW seconded this.	
3.0	Matters arising from previous minutes	
3.1	Re. 4.2 MD said that SUEZ had taken CF's concerns on board and had looked into it. There is a second person who helps to marshal vehicles at the front of the site (as well as the security guard). He radios the details through to the security guard as necessary, to ensure that VINCI is always aware which vehicles are on site.	
3.2	CF asked if any penalties would be paid by Cornwall Council (CC) due to the CERC delays. JC said she was unable to answer this. KW said he had heard Adam Paynter say on the news that no charges will be paid by CC. FG said that the risk was held by SUEZ not CC, which was also said on the radio. EH asked for confirmation on dates. JC reminded EH that as she is not a member of the forum, she can only ask questions during agenda item 4 'Opportunity for any members of the public in attendance to speak'.	
3.3	Re. 4.5 MD said that he had looked into this and had emailed CF with the details, namely that the Sunday working referred to in the minutes was for safety related works.	
3.4	Re. 4.6 MB said that the condition surveys in respect of the empty houses at the entrance to the access road have now come back and that he was in dialogue with his colleagues in the property team and would keep the forum updated.	
3.5	Re. 5.2. The verge has now been cut back.	
3.6	Re. 5.4. IL has sent the details of the St Austell road re-routing to MD for his information. MB has passed the details through to a team member,	MB

	who is currently looking at all of the routes. MB will ask the team member to come along to the next meeting to explain the various options.	
3.7	Re. 8.2 (Community Fund, appointment of new Chair) this would be covered later in the agenda.	
4.0	Opportunity for members of the public to speak	
4.1	EH said that in the contract documents there is a clause that states that work has to be completed by a certain date and if not done by that date, Cornwall Council is liable. She added that the details are in Schedule 11 (which EH does not have access to). EH said that she felt Schedule 11 needed to be looked into and she wondered if there was a glitch with the contract. JC said that it would be looked into.	JC/MB
4.2	EH raised a query about the food industry – she asked if anyone had contacted the CLA or the food industry about the CERC. MD said that conversations would have taken place in the past with relevant bodies. EH said that they wanted to know who to sue when the time was right. MD said that a recent study had been carried out into EfW facilities and no related problems with the land around them had been identified - <i>post meeting note</i> – here is a link to an article about this: http://www.letsrecycle.com/news/latest-news/waste-incinerators-do-not-affect-nearby-agriculture/	
4.3	Re. 4.4 on the last meeting's minutes, CF asked about overruns and fining. He said that he was always told that June was the deadline and that SUEZ could be fined every day for any overrun. He asked who this would be paid to and what it would be used for as it looks like completion will be six months behind (i.e. operational in November). MB said that any issues with delays/fines will be between the two contractors SUEZ and VINCI. MB said that the delays caused no additional cost to the Council. He added that it was a difficult and complex matter and he had sent an email to JC to clarify this. JC said that the best thing would be for MB to re-send the email to the whole group, so they could all have sight of it. CF said that one of the reasons he was asking about completion dates was to protect the Community Fund, as the funding varies depending on the length of the construction phase. KW said that he was liaising with MB to make sure the Community Fund was drawing down the correct amount. MB said the criteria was set out in the S106 agreement. JC said it was her understanding that when the CERC starts receiving the full amount of waste and exporting electricity, that is when the construction phase ends. MD said that SUEZ will inform the relevant parties when construction is complete. JC said that as far as CF was concerned, the longer the CERC took to construct, the more money the Community Fund would receive. CF said that the S106 agreement also sets out how much money will be received when the CERC is operational and that this was dependent on the amount of electricity exported. He asked who will be monitoring how much electricity is being exported? MB said that CC will monitor this with SUEZ. JC said that the estimated figure of income from this was £100k a	

	<p>year, but that this was dependent on how much electricity was produced by the CERC. KW said that as Community Fund Treasurer he will liaise closely with MB over this. CF said he was asking on behalf of the Trust, so they could judge how much money they might have available for projects. KW said the Trust were sending invoices to Cornwall Council (to draw down the money) every 3 months.</p>	
4.4	<p>CF asked about local refuse collection vehicles travelling through Treviscoe to access the CERC. At the moment different villages had different collection days and he asked if they could all be scheduled to fall on the same day, so the disruption in Treviscoe was limited to one day. MB said he would look into this and asked if an agenda item about 'routing' could be included at the next meeting. The group agreed this should be added to the next liaison group meeting agenda.</p>	MB / MD
4.5	<p>CF asked about the delivery of waste in uncovered vehicles. Some vehicles appeared to be completely sealed whereas others are just netted and CF asked if all vehicles travelling to the site could be completely covered to reduce odour. MB said that the requirement is that vehicles do not allow waste to escape from vehicles (hence sheeting/netted) but the escape of odours is not covered. CF said he was concerned about queues of waste vehicles waiting to access the CERC, releasing odours in Treviscoe. A discussion took place about the number of vehicle movements per day. CF noted that there would be 150 vehicle per day. MI clarified that there would be on average 70 waste vehicles per day visiting the site (hence CF was likely referencing vehicle movements rather than vehicles). JC added that not all of these would be going through Treviscoe, only the local rubbish collection vehicles. CF reiterated that properly covered vehicles were much better for controlling odour. He gave an example of a netted vehicle passing him on the road and the unpleasant odour it left behind. IL said that you would never get every haulier to use sealed vehicles due to the cost. CF said that odour and vermin were the two main concerns that people were raising hence his query. There were lots of measures to reduce odours at the building itself, he was asking for measures to be put in place while the waste was in transit. FG said that the AD plant in Fraddon was having horrendous problems with traffic and smell, which were 10 times worse than the vehicles likely delivering to the CERC (because of the haul road). EH said the stench from the AD unit was terrible and that a lot of the vehicles were not covered/sealed. MB said that he couldn't give a guarantee that every vehicle visiting the CERC would be sealed. It is a nationally accepted practice that waste is covered or netted. He added that the aim is to have an efficient site with a fast turnaround of vehicles, so there shouldn't be queuing vehicles releasing odour. JS said he had heard a lot of concerns about potential traffic problems at Trerice Bridge but not one complaint about odour. CF suggested that there would be complaints when the waste bunker was filled. MI said there was around 1,000 tonnes of waste in the bunker at the moment and it was good to hear that there had been no complaints about odour.</p>	

4.6	<p>EH said that Highgate roundabout gets snarled up very quickly and that extra vehicle movements could cause a traffic problem. She asked if there was a system whereby waste vehicle visits to the CERC were staggered, so they didn't all turn up at once. MD said that he did not feel that the number of extra vehicles involved would cause a problem for that roundabout, but that it would be monitored and if there was a problem SUEZ would take action to manage the timing of the waste deliveries. MI said that this would have been looked at as part of the planning process. EH said that the volume of traffic on that roundabout was her concern. JC reiterated that SUEZ will look into it should there be a problem. MD said that if there were traffic issues around Connon Bridge landfill, then vehicles have been held back to alleviate the problem. FG said that a lot of construction traffic has been travelling in and out of the CERC in recent times, and this hasn't caused any jams.</p>	
4.7	<p>JC had a query from the residents of Whitegate Meadows in St Dennis. They had found orange spots on their washing and on their cars and wondered if this was anything to do with the CERC. FG said he had also noticed little brown specks on his car. MI said that nothing was happening at the CERC that could have caused this. JS said that he had asked several of the residents of Little Egypt and nobody had experienced the problem.</p>	
4.8	<p>With no more queries to be raised, JC closed the meeting to members of the public to speak, but any in attendance could remain to listen.</p>	
5.0	CERC Construction Update	
5.1	<p>TC handed around some up to date photographs of the CERC site, and gave the construction update:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- First waste trucks received at CERC 2- Wall cladding to EFW almost complete 3- Louvres to EFW complete 4- Roller shutter doors installation continuing 5- Roof to the EFW almost complete 6- Commissioning to many systems continuing in readiness for first incineration 7- Road network around the EFW building almost complete and the road around the IBA progressing well 8- IBA wall cladding completed 9- IBA roof almost complete 10- Drainage network almost complete and the pond is being finished off 11- Admin building is almost complete and SUEZ have installed some of their furniture 	
5.2	<p>FG asked if the bunker chutes were metal clad. MI said yes, they had a metal plate on them so they can resist the abrasive nature of the waste as it slides down into the bunker.</p>	
5.3	<p>IL asked if the waste at the bottom of the bunker would stay there for ages. MI explained that the waste in the bunker was regularly mixed (as well as being fed into the treatment process) so this wouldn't happen. MI noted</p>	

	that this mixing was key to ensuring a consistent steam production and hence consistent electricity export.	
5.4	TC said that the tipping hall was all finished and the control room and CCTV was in. A few queries were raised and answered as TC worked his way through the photographs.	
5.5	CF expressed concern that the bottom ash building was not airtight (i.e. open on two sides) and wondered if this would mean that ash/dust could be blown around and escape from the building. MI explained that the ash leaving the EFW process passes through a water quench before being transferred to the IBA building and hence is wet. MI also noted that the IBA building had a spraying system throughout so if there was potential for dust (i.e. during dry periods) it could be damped down. CF asked about the potential for hazardous dust escaping. MD explained that the hazardous dust (fly ash/air pollution control residues) was contained in a sealed silo in another part of the site. It would also be collected in a very controlled way to ensure no particles escaped. IL said he was interested to hear from the media that these residues would be going to Northamptonshire for disposal and not South Gloucestershire as he thought. MD said that it was originally South Glos and that the new recipient had only recently been confirmed. CF asked again what would stop the dust in the IBA building blowing around. MI said that the water spray systems would be used. CF asked why the building was not air tight. MD said that it was better for the people working there if the building was well ventilated, and had some natural light as it provided a better working environment. TC said that only a small section of the building was open and that this was alongside the EfW building, so not open to the elements.	
5.6	JS asked what would happen if something big went down the chute into the bunker? MI explained that it would be pulled out of the bunker using the waste cranes where it can then be managed accordingly. MD added that SUEZ was also doing a lot of work educating people in the whole chain, so certain things would be removed before they even get to the CERC.	
5.7	FG said that at the AD plant the trees that formed part of the landscaping just weren't growing. He asked what SUEZ will be doing at St Dennis to make things better than this. MI said that they were already taking advice from a landscaping expert at Cornwall Council on their landscaping plan. Originally there were some non-native species in the planting plan so these had been replaced with native ones. The planting plan for clay country also favoured using young trees rather than mature trees as they could establish more easily (i.e. mature trees grown in a nursery sometimes struggle in clay country) so they would be looking to follow this advice. MI said there wouldn't be full screening from day one, but due to the use of young trees, more could be planted. FG said he felt it was the ongoing maintenance that was sometimes the problem. MI said there would be an ongoing landscaping maintenance plan for the site, which	

	would include replacing trees that died, using/maintaining tree guards to protect the trees from damage and so forth.	
5.8	DS asked if it was correct that SUEZ had applied for a cesspit at the CERC. FG said this had been blown all out of proportion. MI explained that this was purely for domestic sewage from the offices (toilets, showers, sinks etc.) and not any process or trade effluent. Basically there will be underground tanks which treat the sewage. The cleaned effluent is discharged and the solids would be tankered off site for treatment.	
5.9	CF asked how the fan to take odour from the tipping hall/bunkers works. MI explained how the system worked.	
5.10	MD said that a communication had recently gone out to every resident and business within 1 mile of the CERC about steam blowing. The steam blowing is expected to start this week.	
5.11	CF asked MB for an update on an issue with the barriers on the haul road. MB explained that a couple of times the barriers had not been closed, which was to do with a changeover of personnel on site and hence human error. MB added that Cornwall Council would also be doing an audit of signs in this area to see if any additional signage was needed (e.g. 'no trespassing').	
6.0	Environment Agency Update	
6.1	<p>DM gave his update:</p> <p>He has been working closely with SUEZ on the commissioning plan. At the moment the key point is the incinerator bottom ash – i.e. Ensuring it is classified as non-hazardous before processing it. The labs are already set up to test it; they will be testing 12 samples over 6 weeks. Judging from other sites, there is no reason to expect the ash to be anything other than non-hazardous. He has also been looking at the Continuous Emissions Monitoring System and carried out an in depth inspection today. He is happy with the way this has been set up. SUEZ has also had one of their sampling contractors look at the CEMS, and they are also happy with it.</p> <p>IL had raised a query with DM about problems with odour at MVV (which had been in the news recently) so DM clarified this issue for the group. MVV is a single line operation so when that's shut down, they can't run a second line. The fan was shut down and they relied on the carbon filters to reduce odours from standing waste. The shutdown lasted for 3 weeks but unfortunately the carbon filters did not work as planned (they discovered that the life of the filters is very short). The EA is currently considering enforcement action. The system at the CERC is totally different so the same issue wouldn't occur.</p> <p>FG asked what the lapse between the stack monitoring and the information going live was. DM said it would be about a month as the information needs to be verified by the EA before it is posted on the website.</p>	

	IL asked how Brexit will affect monitoring rules and regulations. DM said that most of the standards the EA operate under (i.e. enforce) are both British and European standards so it shouldn't have a big impact.	
6.2	DS gave an update on the environmental monitoring St Stephen in Brannel PC will be carrying out. At the last meeting the PC were awaiting the finalisation of the contract and the funds, both of these have now been concluded. Two dust monitors have already arrived and the PC are currently awaiting the arrival of the soil monitors. The PC now need to organise a meeting to finalise the siting of the monitors (having already written to various people about potential sites). They plan to site monitors in St Dennis, Treviscoe and Whitemoor or Nanpean. One of the potential sites in St Dennis is at the cemetery. JC said this would be a good site as monitoring has been done there before (for comparative purposes) and there is a power supply.	
7.0	Community Fund Update	
7.1	<p>JC gave an update. KW has been appointed as the Treasurer of the group. There is also a new Chairman of the group. CF asked if the new Chair had been invited to the liaison group. MD said she would be welcome to attend future meetings and he would invite her. JC said that at their last funding panel meeting they had awarded £1,000 to the St Dennis Carnival. They had turned one application down as it did not meet the funding criteria and had asked for more information on another application. The applications so far have varied from requests for £500, to requests for £94,000.</p> <p>A discussion took place as to whether the Community Trust should still be on the agenda at the liaison group meetings, now it is up and running. DC suggested that information on who money has been awarded to is tabled, so it is recorded on the liaison group minutes. This was agreed by the group.</p> <p>A general discussion about the workings of the Community Trust followed.</p>	MD
8.0	AOB	
8.1	IL said that he had received a report of a lorry from the CERC and an IMERYYS lorry having an issue (where neither would reverse) causing delays for local residents (one resident reported being held up for 15 minutes). MD asked for a description or any further details. IL said it was a white lorry (a foreign one) and it had been witnessed coming out of the CERC access road. The incident took place at 8am that morning (25/07/16). TC said he would check the records and see if anything had come into the CERC. IL said he had spoken to the resident and had suggested collecting as much detail as possible if something similar happens in the future, including photos if possible.	TC, MD
8.2	IL asked if there was any possibility of another tour of the CERC site now that things had moved on. MD said there was so much happening on site that he wouldn't like to make a commitment for the time being. He added	MI, MD

	that perhaps the next meeting could be held in the meeting room. MI had concerns about this due to welfare facilities possibly not being available. MD and MI will discuss this and let the group know if a visit is feasible.	
9.0	Date of next meeting: Monday 26 th September at 7pm, St Dennis Working Men's Club.	

Meeting minutes

Subject	CERC Community Forum
Date	26/09/2016
Location	St Dennis Working Men's Club St Dennis
Recorder	Angela White

Present:

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Julia Clarke	JC	St Dennis Parish Council	Chair (and Chair of this forum)
Fred Greenslade	FG	Cornwall Council	Councillor St Dennis and Nanpean
Ian Lobb	IL	St Dennis Parish Council	Councillor
Ken Wonnacott	KW	St Stephen in Brannel Parish Council	Councillor
John Sibley	JS	Treviscoe Institute and Community Centre	Chairman
Chris Fry	CF	Community Representative	
Sharon Kelsey	SK	St Dennis and Nanpean Community Trust	

Supporting Officers:

Michael Dobson	MD	SUEZ	Communications Manager SW
Matt Ives	MI	SUEZ	Project Development Manager
Verity Palk	VP	Cornwall Council	Waste & Environmental Contracts – Team Leader
Paul Masters	PM	Cornwall Council	Corporate Director
David Mudge	DM	Environment Agency	Industry Regulation
Chris James	CJ	Environment Agency	Industry Regulation
Tim Caddy	TC	VINCI	Senior Project Engineer
David Chadwick	DCH	Cornwall Council	Community Link Officer

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	Welcome and Apologies	
1.1	Apologies received for Mike Beckett, Lindsey Craik, Dale Unsworth & Cllr Dick Cole	
2.0	Review and agree minutes of last meeting	
2.1	IL proposed to accept the minutes and JC seconded this	
3.0	Matters arising from previous minutes	
3.1	RE 3.6 – to be discussed on agenda	
3.2	RE 4.1 – Nothing untoward found.	
3.3	RE 4.4 – to be discussed on agenda	
3.4	RE 7.1 Sharon Kelsey has been invited to attend this meeting by MD	
3.5	RE 8.1 Following on with investigation the lorry identified was believed to be of foreign origin.	
3.6	RE 8.2 - MD cannot commit at this time. As soon as the visitors centre is up and running at the CERC a tour could be arranged.	
4.0	Opportunity for members of the public to speak	
4.1	JC read out email from Mike Beckett who has confirmed that Cornwall Council will not be liable for costs associated with the delay of the CERC.	
4.2	Member of public asked how the “light up” (testing) was going? MD advised that information on progress will be given in construction progress update section of the agenda.	
4.3	Member of public asked what the noise was that has been heard occasionally during the evening/night? MI advised that this was one of the safety systems (pressure relief valves) releasing steam. This occurred when one of the plant’s systems trips and hence to protect the plant and operatives it releases the steam to atmosphere. It’s good that these systems have been working as they should be, however it has been unfortunate if these have occurred late in the evening /overnight. MI advised that due to the commissioning of a complex process this can occur, however this is anticipated to be very infrequent once the plant is in normal operation and all systems have been optimised.	
4.4	CF has asked if the CERC is accepting waste from outside Cornwall. MD said some of the waste treated during commissioning has come from outside Cornwall however this is commercial waste (not household black	

	<p>bag waste). MD then read a statement from Cornwall Council's 'Question and Answer' web page:-</p> <p><i>Will SITA bring in commercial waste from outside the county?</i></p> <p><i>Due to haulage costs it is likely that the majority of the waste to be treated within the incinerator will be sourced within the County. Profit made from the treatment of commercial waste in the incinerator is subject to a profit sharing mechanism between the Council and SITA under SITA's contract. As such the Council would financially benefit from the treatment of such waste too.</i></p>	
4.5	<p>CF asked why has waste from outside of the county come to the CERC? MD said during the testing process it is important that waste with different compositions and calorific values is treated so as to test the plant. MI noted that some high calorific value wastes are needed as well as low calorific value wastes and hence the use of some commercial waste streams to provide this range.</p>	
4.6	<p>Member of public questioned if the CERC is running at full capacity? MI advised that the CERC is currently running at ~85% capacity currently whilst it is optimised at this point, but the CERC has attained 100% capacity during parts of the testing. It is anticipated that the CERC will increase to 100% capacity very soon.</p>	
4.7	<p>JC asked why steam was visible from the stack during the evening? Is this normal? MD advised that due to cooler air outside in the evening / overnight, the steam leaving the stack condenses and therefore would be more visible.</p>	
4.8	<p>FG stated the two stacks directly behind the CERC always have steam coming out and that's nothing to do with the CERC.</p>	
4.9	<p>Member of public asked if the data on the plume plotter is correct? JC said that the St Dennis Parish Council ceased their contract to monitor air quality locally, but noted that St Stephen Parish Council will be conducting some air quality monitoring of their own. DM noted that the "plume plotter" is not clear on the data that it uses and the assumptions made in producing the output. DM noted that his best estimate is that the "plume plotter" uses the data from the Environmental Permit application (which is assuming that all chemicals are emitted at their relevant limit, whereas in practice emissions would be below this) as there has been no actual emissions data published from the CERC currently; as it is still in commissioning. DM noted that the "plume plotter" also used current weather data alongside the emissions data. A discussion about the 'plume plotter' followed and nobody could provide clear information about who ran the website or how this was modelled or what data it was based upon.</p>	
5.0	<p>CF noticed odour in Treviscoe recently and asked if this was resolved? MD acknowledged that there had been some localised odour on the day in question and to resolve the issue an additional mobile deodoriser was</p>	

	<p>activated. MI added that line 1 had been shut down and therefore negative pressure in the tipping hall was reduced for a period of time.</p> <p>CF asked if both lines go down would odour escape again? MI said that SUEZ would manage the tipping hall to minimise odour escape; this could be through the use of deodorisers. MI reminded forum members that when the plant first started receiving waste neither line was operating and no odour issues occurred (as was noted at the last Forum meeting).</p> <p>CF asked if fans were running all the time. MI advised that the induced draft fans run 24/7, when the facility is processing waste.</p>	
5.0	CERC Construction Update	
5.1	<p>TC gave photo presentation to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attenuation pond and surface water management completed other than the area next to the office complex. • Construction site offices removed to allow ponds to be constructed. • Landscaping has begun. • Admin car parking has been completed. • Steam blowing to clean the boiler tubes has been completed. • Commissioning works are well advanced and hoping to start the formal testing process at the end of October. • Turbine commissioning commenced and anticipating exporting electricity to the grid in the next few days/week. • Landscaping and external works will be completed early November. 	
5.2	<p>Member of public questioned what the steam is being used for?</p> <p>MI the steam is part of a closed loop system; the steam is generated from water in the boilers using the heat from the combustion of the waste. The steam drives a turbine which generates electricity. The exhaust steam is then condensed using the air cooled condenser back into water and recirculated back into the boiler. The electricity generated to the National Grid at Indian Queens will be at 132,000 Volts.</p>	
5.3	<p>MI went on to explain the testing and commissioning progress. The steam produced by the plant is now of the high quality required for use in the turbine. This was achieved in one week of steam blowing from 2nd – 7th September 2016. The CERC has been running at 85% capacity whilst this is optimised. It will soon move to 100% capacity and then 60% capacity and be optimised at each of these points. Turbine is ready to start commissioning this week to start generating electricity.</p>	
5.4	<p>CF asked what is happening with the community trust fund?</p> <p>JC advised that the Community Trust is still claiming payments for construction phase. JC advised that once plant has been commissioned</p>	SK to clarify

	<p>the Fund will fall into another payment category and the amount of money claimed will differ according to the electricity exported.</p> <p>JS questioned if the CERC is still in the construction phase but is generating electricity, does that mean the Fund gets both payments?</p>	
5.5	<p>JS asked why a lot of soil had appeared in the car park at the top of the road behind the La Mount properties?</p> <p>MI advised that it is soil from the site being temporarily stored while VINCI progress with the landscaping after removal of portable cabins from site. The topsoil will then be returned to site once the landscaping is almost complete. VINCI just needed some additional space to store the topsoil whilst they were working on completing the landscaping.</p>	
5.6	<p>SK asked what date the CERC would be fully operational.</p> <p>MI said approximately at end of year (2016).</p>	
5.7	<p>Member of public asked if the Environment Agency's Permit is in place?</p> <p>MI confirmed that the CERC's Environmental Permit has been in place for some time now.</p>	
6.0	Environment Agency Update	
6.1	<p>DM advised that the steam blowing has been completed in one week and the Environment Agency is happy with this. The emissions monitoring data from the commissioning is being issued to the EA on a weekly basis and being reviewed. DM noted that the Environment Agency is encouraged and pleased with the plant.</p> <p>DM gave out the Environment Agency's telephone number 0800 80 70 60 which is a 24hrs hotline should anyone wish to report anything of concern.</p> <p>Member of public questioned if the plant is going so well, why does plume plotter show negative data?</p> <p>DM noted that this may be because the data is possibly incorrect (see item 4.9).</p> <p>Member of public sought clarification that the plume plotter is NOT connected to stack?</p> <p>CJ confirmed that it is not. Actual emissions data obtained from the CERC does not exceed EA guidelines.</p>	
6.2	<p>JS questioned whose air quality monitor is located behind the La Mount cottages by the car park? It's an ACON monitor.</p> <p>DM confirmed that it is not the EA's.</p> <p>MI confirmed that it is not SUEZ's/VINCI's.</p> <p>VP advised that she will ask within the Council to see if this was a historic monitor or something new.</p>	VP

7.0	Routing of local refuse collections	
7.1	<p>VP advised that as Cory has been taken over by Biffa, the Council is working with Biffa through the transition. This is particularly the case for the transition to the start of operation of the CERC when some waste deliveries will be directly to the CERC. VP advised that she was currently working with Biffa on identifying the rounds and routings for those direct deliveries as well as routing to other existing transfer stations.</p> <p>VP noted that she plans on getting Biffa to attend the next Forum meeting to show the vehicle routings for those local collections.</p> <p>VP confirmed that Biffa has been given clear instruction as to what vehicles are allowed on site and the correct use of the haul road. VP noted that all of the Biffa vehicles have trackers and hence their routings can be checked.</p> <p>VP advised that Cornwall Council cannot implement changes to the collection days to have all collections occurring on the same day(s) as this just isn't feasible given the number of different collections.</p>	VP (invite Biffa to next meeting)
7.2	<p>IL questioned if the proposed A391 link road via Whitemoor has been considered in the routings?</p> <p>VP advised that the routes will be as per the contract routes. If a new road is constructed then the routings will be reviewed.</p>	
7.3	<p>JS questioned if local collection lorries could have signs on them to show origin so it was clearer which vehicles should be going through the village and which shouldn't?</p> <p>VP again noted that all Biffa vehicles have a tracker so routings can be checked. VP noted that the Forum will be informed of what lorries should be collecting in their area when Biffa present the vehicles routings.</p>	
7.4	<p>FG questioned how many lorries are delivering to the CERC every day and was this close to the normal operation, as he had not identified any traffic problems?</p> <p>MI advised that as the plant was operating at ~85% capacity then it was close to being the normal operation. MI noted that the CERC has however been operating at 100% capacity for some periods during the commissioning.</p> <p>IL/JS agreed that no traffic problems at Stamps Bridge had occurred, despite some predictions to the contrary.</p>	
7.5	<p>Member of public questioned if the CERC was burning selective waste?</p> <p>MI advised that the CERC was receiving the standard, normal Cornwall household (black bag) waste. MI noted that the CERC has requested some waste with different calorific values while in commissioning phase. However all waste deliveries has come via transfer stations.</p>	

7.6	<p>KW questioned if the SUEZ deliveries are being monitored for the correct vehicle routing? Do they have the same trackers as Biffa?</p> <p>MI advised that all of SUEZ's hauliers are trained on the correct routes to and from site. They must use the haul road and also be on the site's authorised vehicle list.</p>	
7.7	<p>There was some further discussion about vehicle routing, particularly vehicles coming from St Austell. To help this KW questioned if the approved vehicle routes could be provided to the Forum?</p> <p>MI confirmed that the routes from the Section 106 agreement could be presented at the next meeting when Biffa present their vehicle routing.</p> <p>FG questioned if these vehicle routes could be emailed out in advance.</p> <p>MI confirmed. MD to issue.</p>	MD
8.0	Fund Update	
8.1	<p>SK advised that the Fund had received 3 years of construction funding so far. Recent funding approvals have gone to the Nanpean playing fields and St Dennis football team.</p> <p>SK noted that one group has put forward a particularly large bid for funding, whereas others are smaller. SK confirmed that the Fund is receiving a good variety of requests for funding.</p>	
9.0	AOB	
9.1	<p>IL questioned if SUEZ had a date for when the footpath will reopen?</p> <p>MI advised that the current closure order is due to end at the end of construction or the end of the year, whichever is sooner. MI noted that the footpath has to remain closed whilst the construction works are still ongoing.</p>	
10.0	<p>Date of next meeting:</p> <p>Provisionally 21 November, however subsequently amended to Monday 28 November 2016 due to availability of room at St Dennis Working Men's Club.</p>	

Meeting minutes

Subject	CERC Community Forum
Date	28/11/16
Location	Working Men's Club, St Dennis
Recorder	Janine Sargent (JSa)
Chair	Julia Clarke

Present:

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Julia Clarke	JC	St Dennis Parish Council	Chair
Chris Fry	CF	Community representative	
Fred Greenslade	FG	Cornwall Council	Councillor St Dennis and Nanpean
Dick Cole	DC	Cornwall Council	Councillor St Enoder
Dave Simpson	DS	St Stephen in Brannel PC	Councillor
Ian Lobb	IL	St Dennis Parish Council	Councillor
Sharron Kelsey	SK	St Dennis and Nanpean Community Trust	
John Sibley	JS	Treviscoe Institute and Community Centre	Chairman
Dave Hatton	DH	St Stephen in Brannel PC	Councillor

Supporting Officers:

Phil Rudin	PR	SUEZ	Regional Manager
Matt Ives	MI	SUEZ	Project Development Manager
Verity Palk	VP	Cornwall Council	Waste and Environmental Contracts – Team Leader
Dale Unsworth	DU	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract – Team Leader
Peter Marsh	PM	Cornwall Council	Head of Service (Waste and Environmental Services)
David Mudge	DM	Environment Agency	Industry Regulation
Tony Burge	TB	SUEZ	Plant Manager (CERC)

David Chadwick	DCh	Cornwall Council	Community Link Officer
Paula Pope	PP	BIFFA	Operations Manager (St Austell)
Dave Anderson	DA	BIFFA	Operations Manager (Bodmin)

Members of Public Present: Elizabeth Hawken, Mr A Trethewey

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	Welcome and Apologies	
1.1	Apologies were received for Keith Wonnacott, Tim Caddy, Mike Dobson and Mike Beckett.	
2.0	Review and agree minutes of meeting held on 26 September 2016	
2.1	DS pointed out that on the attendees list it should be 'Keith' Wonnacott, not 'Ken'. JSa will amend this.	
2.2	DS proposed to accept the minutes and IL seconded this.	
3.0	Routing of local refuse collections	
3.1	Paula Pope and Dave Anderson from BIFFA gave the forum a presentation on the routing of local refuse collections. VP will forward a copy of the PowerPoint presentation to JSa, who will send it out with the minutes.	VP/JSa
3.2	DS asked how many vehicles would be coming into the CERC in total. PM said that he didn't have the answer to that at the moment. DS said that 180 vehicles/day was mentioned previously, and asked if this had changed. DA explained that the presentation was to show how many local collection vehicles would be operating in the area and hence inform Forum members that there will still be some vehicles going to the CERC through the villages as part of their usual collection round, and that he couldn't really comment on the total number going to the CERC. DS said he was just trying to get an idea of the total number of vehicles expected. PM said that the plant capacity hadn't changed so it would be roughly the same as detailed in the planning application's transport assessment.	
3.3	DH asked how SUEZ would police vehicles coming from the transfer stations to the CERC. MI said that all vehicles from the transfer stations, and for any other deliveries, will have had a driver induction and hence will have had the correct access routing explained and reinforced through this process. All drivers are also allocated with a unique PIN which is then recorded at the gatehouse each time they deliver to site. The vehicles wouldn't have the 'snail trails' (tracking) that BIFFA vehicles have, but anyone who sees a vehicle in a location it shouldn't be can report it (with a full or partial registration and details of the vehicle) and it could be	

	<p>investigated with the haulage company responsible. SUEZ has a 'three strikes and you're out' policy for drivers flouting the rules and hence will be banning repeat offenders from delivering to the CERC. VP said that SUEZ would also be monitored by Cornwall Council. MI added that the induction for every driver that came to site would be the same. FG asked who was in control of vehicles from over the Tamar. MI said that any commercial waste was under SUEZ's remit and that such drivers would also need to have the site induction and be allocated a driver PIN to get on/off site.</p>	
3.4	<p>JS asked what time the deliveries would start/end. MI said it would be 7am – 6pm, Monday to Friday. On Saturday deliveries would stop at 1pm.</p>	
3.5	<p>DS said he was very happy with what has been planned, i.e. that local waste collection vehicles go directly to the CERC, and that this would involve only a small number of vehicles overall. DS added that he had been concerned by the stories in the media about imports of waste, and the large number of vehicles that would be coming into the local area. MI said that the plant has been operating during this commissioning phase in line with its normal operation and so the number of vehicles people will have seen recently, will be approximately the number of vehicles delivering going forward. The only additional vehicles will be from the bottom ash plant exporting the aggregates and metals, these vehicles haven't commenced yet as the plant is not currently fully operational (but will be starting soon).</p>	
3.6	<p>PM said that there may be the odd occasion that something isn't right, but that we have the help of technology (i.e. tracking/other devices) and can deal with any issues accordingly. MI said that the key message was if local people saw anything untoward, they should take the vehicle registration and report it. VP said that there may be fluctuations in what BIFFA have presented, e.g. if there were new properties etc. She added that it was not in BIFFA's interests for drivers to be doing things they weren't supposed to. CF sought clarification on how the public would know if vehicles were not where they should be (i.e. which ones to report) – he asked if on a Thursday/Saturday locals shouldn't see any trucks. PP said they may see the mechanical broom.</p> <p>FG asked if he received a report that a vehicle had turned up at the CERC at 4.30am, would the PIN system show this. MI said that vehicles would not be able to enter the CERC until 7am – but they may stop en route (for rest breaks). However, drivers were not permitted to park up at any location in the villages and have been reminded that if drivers are taking rest breaks they should do so at a service station or a layby on the main roads. FG asked if the ultimate check was login/logout at the weighbridge, and asked if print outs could be provided. PM said yes, they should be able to, as everything is logged. JS asked about drivers sleeping on the haul road. MI said that the barriers would be down outside of waste delivery hours and so there should be no access to this road. JS asked about the potential for drivers to sleep in laybys en route. MI said there was no way of policing drivers travelling to any and every site, but SUEZ</p>	

	have been making their expectations very clear to all drivers delivering to the CERC as part of the induction process.	
3.7	<p>JC asked if any of the members of public present had any queries about the BIFFA presentation.</p> <p>Elizabeth Hawken (EH) asked BIFFA, with 5000 new houses being built in Newquay, what would happen when the transfer station in Newquay closed. PP said that once Trevenson closed, the waste collection vehicles would go direct to the CERC. EH asked if the vehicles would go through Indian Queens. PP said they would go through Quintrell and then join the A30. EH asked what would happen if the road was blocked (i.e. delays) at Halloon roundabout, as it frequently is. PP said that this was something BIFFA would have to deal with operationally, and that there were various routes to the CERC they could use if there were issues with traffic. EH asked what would be happening with waste from Wadebridge/Rock area. DA said that this would also go direct to the CERC. EH said these vehicles would also end up at Halloon roundabout and face the same traffic delays. VP said that CC and BIFFA would look into this, as it wasn't in BIFFA's interests to have drivers sat in traffic, and thanked EH for raising the point. FG said there was a 15-20 year build time for the 5000 new houses EH had mentioned. PM said that Duchy was the principal builder and they were working to a 20 year plan of incremental development, so yes, there would be growth, but over a long period of time.</p> <p>Mr Trethewey asked where all of the bottom ash is going, as he thought it was going to be used as a construction material. MI said that SUEZ have a subcontractor who deal with this side of the operation, and that he wasn't able to give a definitive answer at this point in time as commercial discussions are ongoing between our subcontractor and their end users. He added that it was a high grade product so hopefully there would be a good market for it. Mr Trethewey asked what would be happening with the fly ash. MI said this would be going to a landfill in Northamptonshire, as it was classed as hazardous waste.</p>	
3.8	PP and DA left the meeting following their presentation and questions/answers.	
4.0	Matters arising from previous minutes	
4.1	Re. 5.4 (query re. Community Fund), this will be covered later on agenda	
4.2	Re. 6.2 (ownership of emissions monitor at La Mount cottages). VP has asked around and nobody seems to know anything about it, certainly nothing has been installed by Cornwall Council. JC asked if it could be an IMERYS one. JS said that IMERYS didn't know anything about it either. JS added that the monitor has recently disappeared, so problem solved to an extent.	
4.3	Re. 7.1 (Biffa to be invited to next meeting). Thanks to VP for organising this and to BIFFA for attending.	

4.4	Re. 7.7 (provision of vehicle routing information). MD sent this information out in an email prior to the meeting.	
5.0	Opportunity for members of the public to speak	
5.1	CF asked about waste coming into the CERC from other parts of the country. MI said that as MD had explained previously (and had forwarded questions/answers from CC website), there is potential for it to come in, particularly during the commissioning phase as different types of waste need to be put through the CERC as part of the equipment testing.	
5.2	CF said that the haul road barriers were being left open all the time, including evenings/weekends, and that there was therefore the potential for antisocial behaviour on the haul road. MI said that there had been a misunderstanding between VINCI and SUEZ when certain responsibilities were handed over to the Operations team, which has caused this issue, but it was now resolved as SUEZ is now taking over the operation of the barriers.	
5.3	CF said he had noticed that the roof vent had been left open on the tipping hall. MI said that an access hatch had been left open the weekend before last by mistake following a routine inspection, but that it can be closed when it was identified.	
5.4	CF asked if he could have an update on when the footpath would be reopened. MI said that the operational site's security fence was almost completed, the footpath stopping up order is in place until the end of the year (31 st December) but the sooner SUEZ can get it open the better.	
5.5	IL said that last Wednesday local residents noticed that the stack lights had gone off. IL had sent MD photographs of this. MD had responded with an email to let IL know that VINCI had been doing some maintenance works, which had regrettably caused the stack lights to lose power. IL had some concerns about what had occurred, and SUEZ's response, and had followed up with Newquay Airport. IL read out an email response from Newquay Airport to the members of the forum. IL was particularly concerned that Cornwall Air Ambulance wasn't given any notice or informed of any light failure at the CERC and felt that the CERC needed to update their reporting procedures. IL added that if there was pre-planned maintenance the forum should have been informed, so that they have the information available for responding to queries from local people. IL also asked why there was no backup generator to keep the lights working. MI explained what had happened to the forum: The pre-planned maintenance was not on the stack lights themselves, but on a number of systems within the plant as a whole, and unfortunately these works had an unexpected side effect where power was lost for a period to some specific systems one of which was the lights on the stack. The site's power is backed up, but in this instance the works also affected the switch which allows movement between normal power and various backup power sources. MI noted that given this occurrence, the system is under review to ensure that	MI

	<p>backup power can still be provided if the switch is being maintained. IL said that if there is a problem with the stack lights it should be properly reported, and any pre-planned maintenance should also be reported. MI explained that the maintenance that was being carried out wasn't expected to cause a problem with the stack lights and hence this could not be advised in advance. IL reiterated that the Air Ambulance had said they were not informed, and that he had serious concerns about this, particularly if a similar failure should happen in the future, as this could have consequences. PM said that Cornwall Council own the airport and have obligations as part of their Civil Aviation Authority licence, so they will make sure that the correct processes are in place. MI agreed to take this away with him and put in place a procedure to notify the relevant people should there be a loss of power to the stack lights again sometime in the future.</p>	
5.6	<p>Elizabeth Hawken (EH) said that there was waste coming into the CERC from all over the UK and various waste companies in Cornwall would like to know why the CERC can't take any waste from them. JC asked if this was to do with the letter in the Cornish Guardian, about waste coming in from Wilshire/Bristol etc. EH said she received this information direct from the waste companies. MI said that the CERC had accepted waste from other areas of the country; this is because as part of the testing process certain types of waste, particularly waste with a high calorific value, is needed and that this is not produced within Cornwall. SUEZ's commercial waste team have been in charge of sourcing the waste needed for the commissioning process. MI added that certain types of waste may be outside of the CERC's Environmental Permit, and hence cannot be accepted at the CERC. PR said that waste would be sourced from local customers in the first instance. He added that haulage costs meant that most waste was likely to be fairly local. EH said that PR was telling her one thing but the MD of a waste company was telling her another. VP said that in order to answer specific questions it would be necessary to know exactly what type of waste is involved; but in short, if the waste is suitable the CERC will take it, if it's unsuitable (i.e. outside permit) it can't. JC suggested to EH that she finds out what type of waste the company are trying to dispose of, so the question can be answered. DC said that local people were assured that waste would not be coming from outside Cornwall, and that people now needed some sort of clarity on the proportion that would be brought in from outside the county. MI said that in the commissioning phase a variety of waste is needed to thoroughly test the plant. When the CERC is operational SUEZ will be in a better position to answer this question. The figures would be skewed at the moment due to the specific types of waste being brought in as part of the testing phase. DC asked if any assurances can be given that the waste treated in the CERC will be from within Cornwall. MI said that commercially it made sense for it to come from within Cornwall due to haulage costs. DS said that over 12 months ago the amount of waste needed to run the CERC at capacity was discussed, and it was disclosed at this time that Cornwall could not supply all the waste needed as the size of the CERC allowed for future waste growth (given that it is a long term solution). DC said he was</p>	

	<p>not sure if that was accurate. PM said that the extra capacity was to reflect the future growth of Cornwall. He added that there had always been a commercial waste aspect, until such time as Cornwall Council's need for the capacity may increase (i.e. when CC need extra capacity for municipal waste, due to a growing population). So the CERC does have a greater capacity than is currently needed, and in the meantime this will be filled by commercial waste. DS clarified the points made – Cornwall's municipal waste will be dealt with first, any surplus will be filled by commercial waste, and as PM said, it was necessary for the CERC to have extra capacity to allow for Cornwall's future growth. DC said he would have a discussion with PM outside the meeting to clarify some issues. PR said that commercial waste was not restricted by county boundaries and that currently some of Cornwall's waste goes out of the county. DC said that surely there was enough commercial waste in Cornwall to fill the CERC's remaining capacity, and bringing in waste from outside the county was more to do with commercial negotiations. VP reiterated that the waste has to be suitable for the CERC. PR said that there was competition in the market, i.e. other places competing for the waste.</p>	
6.0	CERC Construction and Testing Update	
6.1	<p>Matt Ives updated the group on the latest works on site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site landscaping has been progressing with grassed areas being seeded and trees/shrubs planted. 2. Site boundary fencing is being installed 3. The footpath has been constructed 4. The turbine has now been commissioned and the first electricity generated and exported. 5. The testing phase has been continuing with various systems being optimised. 6. The plant has been shut down for the last week to conduct some modifications/improvements in anticipation of conducting the final phase of the testing before the plant becomes fully operational. 	
6.2	<p>DS asked if there was an end date for construction yet. MI said that this is currently anticipated to be around mid-January. MI noted that there is a prescribed timetable for the final testing phase; specific durations for the final tests. DS asked if by mid-January things would be fully up and running then. MI said yes, that is the anticipation, excluding any unforeseen circumstances during these final tests.</p>	
7.0	Environment Agency Update	
7.1	<p>David Mudge gave the Environment Agency update: The Environment Agency have been monitoring what has been done to date. They are very happy with progress so far and are now waiting for the 30 day operation trial to commence – where ash, emissions and so forth will be monitored.</p>	

8.0	Community Fund Update	
8.1	<p>Sharron Kelsey gave the St Dennis and Nanpean Community Trust report: 19 applications have been received to date, 11 of which were small grant applications (under £1,000), the other 8 were general grant applications (over £1,000). Of the general grants; 2 were approved, 3 were withdrawn (2 of these are expected to be revised/resubmitted) and 3 were declined. Of the small grants 6 were approved and 5 were declined. The biggest grant has been awarded to St Dennis Football Club, approximately half of the money has been paid to fund the works carried out so far, e.g. drainage done, seating installed, pitch side improvements for spectators. The other half of the money will be awarded when all the works are completed. SK gave other examples of the types of projects funded. The grants have been focussed on St Dennis at the moment, so the Trust would like to encourage applications from other areas too. 3 new resident trustees have been taken on, so there are 7 resident trustees in total now (and 6 councillor trustees). The Trust's bank balance is big! JC said that the Trust wanted to use the money wisely, to leave a legacy for the area. She added that the Trust was working very well now, with some good local causes supported already, and the staged payments with the football club have worked well too. DH asked if it would be possible to see figures at the next meeting (i.e. money available for grants). SK said she could pass this information to JSa. FG said it would be useful to see the Fund's balance available to be spent. IL said the running balance was about £700,000, but he couldn't give an exact figure. FG asked if it would be possible to know who has applied and who has been turned down. JC said that may be a problem as sometimes applicants are not rejected permanently, i.e. they may reapply when they have put a better application together. FG posed a query about a specific application, JC said this would be better dealt with outside the forum meeting and that she would organise this. JC said that at the next meeting they can show some general accounts. DH said yes, that was what he was interested in and asked if this information was in the public domain. SK said yes this was. FG said his main concern was that the Community Trust funds, which were hard fought for, are well spent. JC reiterated that for the next meeting the figures will be available.</p>	SK and JC
9.0	AOB (none raised)	
10.0	<p>Date of next meeting: Monday 23rd January 2017, 7pm at the St Dennis Working Men's Club.</p>	