

# CONNON BRIDGE LANDFILL SITE

## COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING MINUTES

### **Meetings**

Tuesday 12 January 2016	2
Tuesday 15 March 2016	9
Tuesday 31 May 2016	18
Tuesday 26 July 2016	26
Tuesday 29 November 2016	34

## Meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	12/01/2016
Location	Connon Bridge
Recorder	Janine Sargent

## Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Mike Dobson (Chair)	MD	SUEZ	Communications Manager SW
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Landfill Senior Site Manager
Katherine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Site Manager
William Tedder	WT	SUEZ	Gas Support Manager
Mike Beckett	MB	Cornwall Council	Waste Manager
Carol Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	Chair of St Pinnock PC
Mary Rees	MR	Environment Agency	PPC Officer (Devon & C'wall)
Paul Jordan	PJ	Braddock Parish Meeting	
Janet Haley	JH	Local resident	
Henry Haley	HH	Local resident	
Doug Mills	DM	Local resident	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local resident	
John Emerson	JE	Local resident	
Mick Butfield	MB	Cornwall Council	Planning Department

Ref	Note	Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	
1.1	Apologies were received from Benedicte Bay, Stuart Higgins and Councillor Bernie Ellis. MD said that he had been extremely sad to hear that Suzanne Hardingham-Reeday, a long standing member of the group, had passed away just before Christmas. Thoughts were with her family and friends at this sad time.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Review Previous Minutes</b>	
2.1	Re. 2.2 DM said that he would have described the noise as 'loud' rather than 'abrupt'. With that adjustment the draft minutes from 3 November 2015 were approved.	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>SUEZ Operational Update</b>  This incorporated agenda items of Testing and results of water samples, along with Gas wells and capping works update).	
3.1	IM gave his operational update.  <b>Tipping Operations</b> Tipping operations have previously been concentrating on the higher levels to firstly create an area so that a new haul road and turning circle can be built and secondly to prepare the area ready for capping. The area for the haul road has been finished and the contractor has fully constructed the new road with the last of the stone being added today. The capping area needs some more waste to be tipped there. This is mainly the current haul road and tipping area and has to be done last as we need this for access. Due to the access still being required we have moved operations back to the lower levels. We are also in discussions with the contractor about temporary capping an area to the far north of the site as this will effectively be the last area that we fill before we close.  <b>Capping</b> The capping contractors have not had a lot of luck with the weather which has slowed progress somewhat. After speaking with them they are in agreement that it would be beneficial if they were to divert the resources into the temporary	

	<p>capping as this would require less soils and dumper movements and is therefore less weather dependent.</p> <p>As Stuart mentioned at the last Liaison Group meeting we were at the time investigating why we were picking up Ammonia at Clancy's Culvert which is an outlet at the very bottom of the Site. The contamination was eventually traced back and found to be coming from Phase 4. It was discovered that whilst contractors were on Site towards the end of October last year, they had inadvertently dug a hole through the side wall of the site whilst installing two knockout pots at the end of two horizontal gas wells, which were to be put in to drain any liquid within the wells and aid gas flow. As soon as the hole was discovered the area was isolated and repairs were carried out to the lining system under full CQA supervision. The Environment Agency were kept up to date with all the events and were on site during the repairs. This incident is currently being investigated by another part of our business and I am therefore not in a position to provide much further information at this stage.</p> <p>Unfortunately, approximately three weeks after this event had been resolved, on the 30th of November 2015 ammoniacal nitrogen was detected within the Phase 4B ground water riser.</p> <p>The contamination discovered on 30th November was found to be within the Phase 4 ground water riser but was not detectable at Clancy's Culvert which demonstrated that this was an entirely separate issue to the Southern side wall damage. On the 9th of December a tracer dye test was carried out on the Northern end of Phase 4 which resulted with the Dye being visible within the pump discharge within 2½ hours. On the 10th of December investigations were undertaken under full CQA supervision using a tracked excavator at the junction between the western and Northern sidewalls, it was felt that this was the most likely area for any possible damage. The agency were also in attendance for most of the excavation.</p> <p>An area of damage was located approximately 2m below the waste surface, this was immediately covered with GCL and HDPE and processed fine material to make it safe until a lining crew could be brought to Site. A full repair under full CQA supervision was carried out and completed on 14th December. A CQA report is being prepared for the repair works and this will be sent to the Agency.</p> <p><b>Leachate</b></p> <p>Due to the event that I have just described at the time we had to isolate the contaminated water from Phase 4 groundwater riser. To do this we had to</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>connect it into a line that would pump the water into Phase 3B. This has resulted in higher leachate levels within some of the phases. Given the wet weather, the view is that the levels will take around 2 to 3 weeks to return to within compliance limits. The Leachate Treatment Plant is currently treating around 160m<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p><b>Gas Extraction</b> We still have the five gas engines running flat out and the ground flare is running constantly so that extraction can be maximised at all times.</p> <p>We are constantly reviewing our gas extraction and collection systems and investigating where and if any possible improvements could be made.</p> <p>Since the last Liaison Group meeting, an additional 315mm main has been installed to CB2 compound and there has also been a 180mm gas main installed along the Southern end of Phase 4 with various connections to the existing infrastructure, We have also re-installed horizontal gas well 3 and installed Horizontal gas well 5.</p> <p>We also continue to carry out weekly (surface emissions walkover surveys) to detect any areas of the site where gas may be escaping, any possible defects identified during the surveys are then investigated and repairs carried out as soon as possible.</p> <p><b>Complaints</b> We have received some odour complaints since the last Liaison Group meeting and these have all been fully investigated and the results of our findings have been communicated to the Environment Agency.</p> <p><b>Bird Control</b> NBC continue to be employed as the contractors we use to control the birds on site and their chap is working full time to provide bird control for us. We currently have him working from 8am until 5pm and these hours are constantly under review.</p>	
3.2	<p>PJ asked if IM had said that the leachate was non-compliant. IM said that yes that was correct. KA said that at least 200m<sup>3</sup> was being tankered out per day, as phase 4 leachate was too strong to treat. KA added that there were 3 companies tankering on site, and that when South West Water went into 'storm' (due to rainfall) it had to be sent further afield. PJ asked if all the leachate had been</p>	

	<p>'contained', and MR confirmed that was the case. A discussion about compliance issues and levels of different phases followed.</p>	
3.3	<p>DM asked IM if extra gas extraction equipment had been put in. IM said that it was more of an upgrade. DM asked if more gas was being extracted and IM replied affirmatively.</p> <p>JM said that they'd had really bad problems with gas smells at their house and it was so bad that it had made a friend visiting them physically sick. WT said that additional works had been highlighted and would be starting this week. Three pumps were being installed this week and, these would be followed by a further eight pumps, along with other improvements. A new horizontal well was also installed before Christmas and as soon as this is sealed it will increase extraction.</p> <p>JE said the gas smell had been bad at his house too. CS said that she had spoken to Janice Philp from Trevelmond, and that there had been lots of complaints about smells in the village over the last few weeks. DM asked if SUEZ had the capacity to use all the gas that was being produced. WT said that any excess gas could be flared. WT said that their ability to extract gas had recently been impeded by all the rain. JM said that at times the smell was so strong you could taste it in your mouth. IM said that you have to get areas up to height before any additional horizontal gas wells (to increase extraction) can be installed.</p>	
3.4	<p>PJ asked about the problems with the leachate – he understood that the first problem was caused by damage to the liner caused by the contractors, but what about the second issue? IM said there were some theories but nothing definite and that it was being investigated. PJ explained that he asked the question as was concerned about the future - could it happen again? MD said that the materials used conformed to appropriate standards. IM assured PJ that sampling/monitoring would continue for a long time so problems would always be detected. He added that a new probe would be installed soon, which would be linked directly to the person on call, so any issues will be flagged up and dealt with really quickly. DM asked if these checks will continue after site closure, IM confirmed that they would.</p>	
3.5	<p>DM said that presumably the compactor noise he has heard recently is to do with the building of the haul road. IM agreed that that was probably the case, although a roller had been in use also for the new turning circle, and said that they had been back working in the hole from the beginning of this week</p>	

	so things should be quieter.	
3.6	DM said that there had been the odd rock on the B road, which presumably has been transported out of the site in the wheels of the tippers. IM said that the drivers are supposed to perform a physical check of their wheels before they leave the site to make sure there are no stones lodged in their tyres. DM said he was concerned that a stone could fly up and go through someone's windscreen. MD said that SUEZ would remind the drivers again about checking their tyres.	KA/IM
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Environment Agency Update</b>	
4.1	<p>MR gave this update:</p> <p>Since the last Liaison Group Meeting the Environment Agency (EA) has received 15 odour complaints. Five were in November, six in December and there have been four in the current month to date. Staff from the EA have also smelt odours themselves (in December and January). The EA are now receiving odour complaints from quite a distance away.</p> <p>MR said that IM had briefed the group on two separate incidents in his report. She said it was extremely unusual to get one incident, and unheard of to have two in such a short space of time. The EA have received a report on the first incident from SUEZ, and are awaiting a report on the second. MR expressed the opinion that odour problems would get worse for a period of time before they get better, because as the leachate comes out of the waste, more odour is released.</p> <p>MR said that the EA were receiving weekly updates from SUEZ.</p> <p>JM asked if MR was saying that it was going to be smelly for a time and there was nothing to be done about it. MR said that in the short term there would be a gassy smell. JH asked MR how long 'short term' was. IM said that in 2/3 weeks the leachate would be compliant, so that problem should then be resolved. MR said that there was standing leachate in Phase 4, which also carried an odour, but that tipping over this will hopefully make the smell better. WT said that everything that can be done was being done and that SUEZ were working hard on site to balance the system. JH asked if the problems would continue if there was more rain. MR said possibly, but with the amount of leachate being tankered out of the site, SUEZ should be able to get on top of the problem. PJ asked what would happen if the leachate remains non-compliant. IM said that SUEZ will continue tankering leachate away and would undertake more temporary capping to get on top of it. KA explained that contaminated ground water was pumped into the capped phases as SUEZ knew they had capacity to hold it safely there.</p>	

	<p>JM said that this was all very well but the residents had to put up with it. DM said that the landfill had been running for 40 years and that the site managers were still not getting it right. MD said that he can only offer SUEZ's apologies for the current difficulties being experienced and reiterated that everything that can be done is being done to try resolve the problem as quickly as possible.</p> <p>MR continued with her report. MR said that she had received CQA plans and was going through these. She was awaiting the CQA plans for the temporary capping. MR said that once the cap was on there would be better suction, making for more efficient extraction of landfill gas. MR is awaiting the Ambient Air Monitoring report – early signs are that the monitoring is not showing anything concerning.</p>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Questions/Issues to be addressed</b>	
5.1	MD asked how the seagull issues had been. JM said that the seagulls were not bothering them at the moment.	
5.2	DM asked how the CERC build was progressing. MD said that, like Connon Bridge, the construction contractors had been subject to poor weather and were asking for increased working hours in order to help catch up. DM asked if there had been any issues there recently, as he had heard of a resident complaint. MD explained about the issues with the stack lights and how this had been resolved. DM asked about the opening date. MD said that there was no exact date for the opening at the moment but that you could see the buildings taking good shape now.	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
6.1	JE said that a large lorry with a delivery for Connon Bridge had turned up at the wrong place as had several other deliveries. He asked if SUEZ could give better location/address information to suppliers. KA said they would and she would also speak to CLP to make sure they did too.	KA
6.2	Mick Butfield gave apologies for the next liaison group meeting in March, which he is not able to attend.	JS
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
	Tuesday 15 <sup>th</sup> March, 2016 at 5.30 pm (Connon Bridge)	

## Meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	15/03/2016
Location	Connon Bridge
Recorder	Janine Sargent

## Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Mike Dobson (Chair)	MD	SUEZ	Communications Manager SW
Carol Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	Chair
Geoffrey Pearse	GP	St Pinnock Parish Council	Councillor
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	Councillor
Sarah Taylor	ST	Environment Agency	Pollution Prevention and Control Officer
Mary Rees	MR	Environment Agency	Pollution Prevention and Control Officer
Katherine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Manager
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Landfill Senior Site Manager
John Emerson	JE	Local Resident	
Doug Mills	DM	Local Resident	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local Resident	
Janet Haley	JH	Local Resident	

Henry Haley	HH	Local Resident	
Graham Crabb	GC	St Pinnock Parish Council	Parish Councillor
Benedicte Jenkinson	BJ	Cornwall Council	Cornwall Councillor - Lostwithiel
Holly Corcoran	HC	Local Resident	
William Tedder	WT	SUEZ	Gas Support Manager

Ref	Note	Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and Apologies</b>	
1.1	Paul Jordan and Mike Beckett had sent apologies. Mick Butfield gave his apologies in advance at the last meeting.	
1.2	MD said that he was very sorry to hear the sad news that Bernie Ellis had passed away. He would like to record thanks for his input at these liaison group meetings and our thoughts are with his family and friends.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Review Previous Minutes</b>	
2.1	Ref. 3.6 (rocks on road). IM said that they had reminded drivers both verbally and in writing about checking their tyres before leaving the site. There is also a sign after the weighbridge reminding drivers to check. BJ said that there were still a large number of stones finding their way onto the road, which were clearly from the site. A discussion took place about whether it could be lorries entering the site carrying stone that are the problem, but it was agreed not to be the case. IM said that no stone had been delivered recently, only soil. MD asked if there was anything else that could be done. KA said they could carry out some random checks of truck tyres, and make it known to the drivers that there was a likelihood of random checks. DM said the stones were a real danger as they could fly up into the windscreen and could also damage wheels. MR asked if more signs could be placed around the site reminding drivers. KA said that there are already a lot of instruction signs on site and when there are too many people tend to become 'sign blind'. IM said they could possibly put one where the drivers sign their tickets. KA said that it would be no good at the road	KA/IM

	junction itself, as there would be too much information in one place. IM and KA will have a think about additional signage.	
2.2	<p>Ref. 6.1 (delivery drivers going astray). DM said it would help if the site sign was more obvious, e.g. a bigger, clearer sign on the right hand side as you come in the entrance. JH suggested that if the hedge, on the road from the B3359 to the site was cut right back, then the entrance off the road would be more visible. KA said that they would need to speak to Mike Beckett at Cornwall Council to find out what they could do, as it was now bird nesting season and hedges are not usually allowed to be cut back. The point was made that sometimes hedges could be cut back if there was a health and safety issue.</p> <p>The group approved the draft minutes of the 12 January meeting that had been circulated.</p>	KA/IM/MB
<b>3.0</b>	<b>SUEZ Operational Update</b>	
3.1	<p>IM gave his report:</p> <p><b>Tipping Operations</b></p> <p>As I mentioned at the last Liaison group meeting, we were in the process of finishing off a new tipping entrance and turning circle. This was completed the day after the last liaison group meeting and it was handed over, so that the site could start using it.</p> <p>We wanted to delay using this new access for a while so the area was free for a drilling rig to work safely, as there were plans in place to drill two new gas wells in the area, one on each side of the new pad, and practically this would be easier and safer if the rig could stand on the turning circle itself whilst drilling these wells.</p> <p>Unfortunately it didn't go quite to plan as on the 18th of February we suffered with some issues with our site plant. We had two machines break down in the middle of the old tipping area effectively blocking the access, so we had no choice at the time other than to prematurely divert all vehicles to tip from the new circle. We have remained tipping from there ever since and pushing the waste down into Phase 4.</p> <p><b>Temporary Capping</b></p> <p>The temporary capping on the far Northern end of Phase 4 totalling 3,023m<sup>2</sup> was completed last week, all the plastic had been laid and welded and all that</p>	

	<p>was left was for the contractors to return to site this week just to finish placing the tyres that are being used to anchor and weigh down the plastic. Gas collection pipework was placed under the plastic cap and some gas take off points were added on top of the cap. These have been connected into the extraction system.</p> <p><b>Leachate</b></p> <p>Leachate levels are compliant within all the phases with the exception of phase 4, where they are at just above 3 meters. We are continuing to tanker this leachate away off site as it is not possible to treat in our Leachate treatment facility due to its high Chemical Oxygen Demand content.</p> <p><b>Gas Extraction</b></p> <p>We are constantly reviewing our gas extraction and collection systems and investigating where and if any possible improvements could be made.</p> <p>Since the last liaison group meeting apart from the capping and the additional extraction connected with that, we have also installed Horizontal gas wells 6 and 7 within the waste mass and these are connected to the extraction system. Horizontal gas well 8 is planned for installation later on this week. As I mentioned earlier we had a drilling rig on site which began work on the 29th February. A total of 4 new gas extraction wells were installed that week, one each side of the new turning circle and two nearer to this end of phase 4. We managed to work around the rig whilst the two wells were being installed next to the turning circle.</p> <p>We are continuing to carry out our weekly surface emissions walkover surveys and this helps to identify any potential detects or any areas of the site where gas may be escaping, and if any are identified the repairs are carried out as soon as possible.</p> <p><b>Complaints</b></p> <p>I don't think there has been many complaints since the last liaison group meeting, but I am sure Mary can confirm the numbers during the Environment Agency update.</p> <p><b>Bird Control</b></p> <p>NBC continue to be employed as the contractors to control the birds on site and their chap is working full time to provide bird control. We currently have bird</p>	
--	---	--

	control working from 8am until 7pm and these hours remain under constant review.	
3.2	DM said he had heard that one of the capping contractors had gone bust. IM said that this was CJ Pryor. SUEZ had found a way of getting the works done - they had managed to retain the CJ Prior Manager to oversee works on site, but they have had to pay for the works themselves. DM asked if high level works had come to an end for a while. IM said that they had plans to cap permanently this year but needed to find another contractor. IM said that the old turning circle would be finished off with waste pretty soon and then be capped later in the year. MR asked about timescales for closure. KA said that they currently had a SUEZ engineer working on a plan for the void. The engineer was doing void calculations and coming up with a tipping/capping plan. This meant that subject to the start date of the Cornwall Energy Recovery Centre (CERC) there would still be space available for waste. KA said that they should have a tipping/capping plan to bring to share with the group at the next meeting.	KA/IM
3.3	MD updated the group on the CERC construction progress and handed around a recent aerial photograph of the CERC site. He said that a definite date for completion can't be given until the hot commissioning has been done, but at the next meeting in May more details will be available. BJ asked if the swaying chimneys issue had been resolved. MD said yes, this was a very short term issue when the stack was being erected and had been fully resolved some time ago. MD said that as part of the CERC construction there was also a special haul road built, so lorries (other than the local refuse collection vehicles) would not need to go through the surrounding villages. JE asked if the ash was a saleable product. MD said that our ash subcontractor, was working on finding local companies for the material. JH asked if it would be coming to Connon to be landfilled. MD said no, as the ash had a use (e.g. road building material), so had a value. CS asked what happened if batteries ended up in rubbish taken to the CERC. MD said there were visual checks to see the inputs were acceptable and a continuous emissions monitoring system in place to make sure the outputs were compliant. MD explained that fly ash was different – this will likely go to a special landfill out of county, or emerging technology may make it possible to be used safely somehow. MR said (with regards to treating fly ash) that there were lots of technologies coming on line all the time, but it was not quite there yet.	
4.0	<b>Environment Agency Update</b>	

<p>4.1</p>	<p>MR gave her report:</p> <p>Since the last meeting there have been 4 odour complaints – from the end of January through to today, and from different people. There has also been a litter complaint and a complaint about black liquid on site (which EA staff were not able to track down). Overall it has been a relatively quiet period for odours. JM said that they had not had the smell at home but it was reeking near the top as you drive in. JH said there had been a bad odour where they live as well. KA said that SUEZ had received a complaint when they had been digging a horizontal well into the waste – but the well will ultimately reduce odour. BJ said that she had smelt odour while at the bottom of Deerpark Woods. MR asked JM if it was a waste smell or a gas smell. JM said it was a gas smell and mentioned that Lean Quarry near the A38 is good for comparison, as that is a definite waste smell.</p> <p>MR continued with her report: At the last meeting IM described two incidents, MR had now received reports from SUEZ on both of these and works to prevent a reoccurrence are ongoing. One of the outcomes is that the EA now receive daily reports on leachate head on site, and also on what is being done to manage odour, so the EA know that there is progress. Leachate head had been under compliant, but is now back in compliance (Phase 3 was back in compliance today).</p> <p>The EA are also look at the engineering reports coming through from SUEZ.</p> <p>CS said that an increase in litter had been noted by the neighbouring parish, Lanreath. CS said that the verges were in a disgusting state in some areas. It was OK through East Taphouse as Alan Yeo picks up all the rubbish, to keep things looking tidy. CS said that she had followed a lorry coming to the tip and even though it was netted, small pieces of litter were still flying out of the top. She added that some of the litter was probably down to the public too. Cornwall Council is supposed to clear litter along the verges. JM said that there was litter all along the Looe road too and from East Taphouse to Dobwalls.</p> <p>MD mentioned that Clean Cornwall were running a campaign to find local people (like Alan Yeo) who do things in their community to keep things looking tidy. MD suggested that the Parish Council could put his name forward, to gain recognition for his work and passed on details to CS of Clean Cornwall after the meeting. MR highlighted that litter on verges was not in the Environment Agency's remit. JM said he thought that some of the litter was coming off the site as well (i.e. being blown). IM said that they did have nets on site to prevent this, but it was particularly bad during the high winds last week. KA confirmed</p>	<p>KA</p>
------------	---	-----------

<p>4.2</p>	<p>that the litter pickers had a list of where they needed to go and that they would be sent out to collect any litter along the road to Connon Bridge.</p> <p>DM raised an EA report on air quality. MR said that the EA had carried out air monitoring in the area. This consisted of putting out ambient air diffusion tubes, and carrying out hydrogen sulphide monitoring at West Trevillis. The air diffusion tubes (at various sites between January and March 2015) passively collect data over the whole period, and then the results are averaged out. For the chemicals analysed, none were of concern. One tube near the school showed high readings (but not concerning readings) but there was nothing on any of the other diffusion tubes so the EA are not sure why that came about. It could have been something happening at the school when that particular tube was out, causing the high readings (e.g. works of some kind). All previous tubes at the school have been fine. CS asked if the school were aware of the high readings. MR said that they hadn't been informed - but the information had been passed to Public Health England and they didn't raise any concerns, i.e. the readings were high but not high enough to cause any concern. The tube with the high reading was out between 26<sup>th</sup> February and 11<sup>th</sup> March. ST suggested that the readings could be high due to the proximity of the road to the tube. JH asked if there would be any effect on the children at the school due to the high readings on the air diffusion tubes. ST reiterated that whilst the readings were high, they were within acceptable levels and Public Health England were not concerned. The high readings were for 3 specific chemicals, Toluene, Tetrachloroethylene and Xylene which MR read out from the report. MR went on to talk about the hydrogen sulphide testing. The detector was not in a temperature controlled environment, which has led to results that the EA can't rely on. There might have also been a very high background level. In short, the data collected is not accurate enough to rely on the figures themselves. However, the EA were able to use the data to look at the 'spikes' of hydrogen sulphide, 10 in all. The 10 spikes were then plotted based on wind direction. From this information it doesn't appear that the hydrogen sulphide is attributable to any one source in the time period that the detector was out, i.e. the data collected does not point to the landfill as the source of the hydrogen sulphide. DM summarised the conclusion of the EA report by saying that levels were within WHO guidelines, so they weren't going to kill you, but they would annoy you. DM said that he thought the hydrogen sulphide was coming from the leachate management plant. MR said that was not what the data indicated and that there were likely to be other sources of hydrogen sulphide locally. JM said that it was them that had to live there, breathing it in and asked if SUEZ could provide hydrogen sulphide personal monitors, like the ones the EA staff use when they are on the landfill site itself. MD reiterated that the results in the</p>	
------------	--	--

	EA report do not point to a problem, so he did not see why personal monitors would be necessary. JM said that Mrs Bunney's children were often sick. MD said that as Public Health England had seen the EA report and were not concerned, nothing pointed to there being a problem. BJ said that if having personal monitors would reassure people, would it be worth looking into. DM said it would reassure them. JM said it felt that their concerns were being dismissed. MD reiterated that the EA report did not point to any one source of hydrogen sulphide, but that in view of DM and JM's concerns, he would speak to SUEZ's health and safety people about the personal monitors and report back at the next meeting.	MD
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Questions/Issues to be addressed</b>	
5.1	JM said that a Bale tanker had pulled out right in front of them about 4 weeks ago. KA said she would look into it as they shouldn't have been in that location. If there are planned works that mean tankers will be in different locations, KA will always let them know. KA will also speak to Bale about the routes they should be using into site. It could possibly have been an agency driver who didn't know where s/he was going.	KA
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
6.1	JP said that he had been carrying out his own informal traffic count and there seems to be quite heavy traffic coming to and leaving the Connon site. He asked what the traffic would be like when the tip closes and it becomes a transfer station – will the traffic be significant? MD said that it will be only one of several transfer stations so it will not be that significant.	
6.2	KA asked the group if they thought R&R were sticking to the speed limit through local villages. HK said they were getting better. GC said (as an aside) that in all the speed counts that have been carried out, speed of vehicles increased at school times.	
6.3	KA said that she thought it would be worth issuing a flyer to the drivers at Connon for several problems that had been raised - including sticking to speed limits and checking tyres for stones before leaving site (discussed earlier in agenda).	KA/IM
6.4	On a lighter note, KA explained that Connon staff had recently been occupied with some runaway sheep and a runaway pony/horse. She had photographs	KA

---

	and asked the group if anyone knew who they might belong to. BJ suggested that they might belong to the Bunneys and KA said she would follow up on this.	
6.5	BJ mentioned that the roads around Cannon had been very muddy when it was wet. KA said there was no way they could stop it completely but they did have a road sweeper in everyday cleaning up.	
6.6	HC said that her and her husband had experienced a problem with lorries entering the site – the lorries had turned right across their path meaning they had to brake sharply.	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting:</b> Tuesday 31 May, 2016 at 5.30pm	

## meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	31/05/16
Location	Connon Bridge
Recorder	Janine Sargent

### Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Mike Dobson (Chair)	MD	SUEZ	Communications Manager SW
Carol Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	Chair
Phil Seeva	PS	Cornwall Council	Cornwall Councillor - Menheniot
William Tedder	WT	SUEZ	Gas Support Manager
Paul Jordan	PJ	Braddock Parish Meeting	Chair
Jenny Mills	JM	Local resident	
Doug Mills	DM	St Pinnock Parish Council	Councillor
John Emerson	JE	Local resident	
Janet Haley	JH	Local resident	
Henry Haley	HH	Local resident	
Geoffrey Pearse	GP	St Pinnock Parish Council	Councillor
Chris Male	CM	SUEZ	Regional Manager South - Landfill Energy

Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Landfill Senior Site Manager
Katherine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Manager
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	Councillor
Sarah Taylor	ST	Environment Agency	Pollution Prevention and Control Officer
Mary Rees	MR	Environment Agency	Pollution Prevention and Control Officer
Mick Butfield	MB	Cornwall Council	Planning Department

Ref	Note	Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and Apologies</b>	
1.1	Apologies were received from Benedicte Jenkinson.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Review Previous Minutes</b>	
2.1	Re. 2.1 (rocks on road) this will be dealt with further on in the agenda.	
2.2	Re. 2.2. KA said that with regards to the hedge, this still needs to be dealt with and that she would speak to Mike Beckett. DM asked about the issue with delivery drivers getting lost, IM said that he had spoken to the CLP (gas) people to ask them to add 'Connon Bridge Landfill' to their address for deliveries. DM said he felt that a bigger sign at the entrance would help.	KA, MB
2.3	Re. 3.3 IM ran through the capping plan and handed out plans/photographs to the group. Two hectares of capping would be completed by September.  A query was raised about the delay to the Cornwall Energy Recovery Centre and what impact this would have at Connon. IM explained that changes had been made to the tipping plan because of the delay to the CERC and that SUEZ were currently looking at whether they needed to extend phase 4. DM asked if they would be tipping at a higher level than originally planned, and suggested that this	CM, MB

	<p>would create more noise for local residents. IM said that currently they had tipped to levels lower than the planning approval allowed, but they now needed to tip to higher levels – but this was still within the planning approval. DM disputed this. CM reiterated that SUEZ was tipping in line with the planning approval. MB said that he was happy to look into the planning situation if there was an issue. CM said that SUEZ had just had a full planning audit and all was compliant. MB asked CM if he could have sight of this and CM agreed to send MB the information. DM said that whilst SUEZ said they wanted to be good neighbours, he and JM were experiencing noise from the compactor every day, including bank holiday Monday. CM said that noise levels had been investigated by an independent surveyor and they were below the level permitted. DM said that his noise meter put it over the limit. A discussion ensued.</p> <p>In view of the time, it was agreed that IM should continue with his explanation of the capping plan.</p>	
2.4	Re. 4.1 KA said the litter picking mentioned at the last meeting had been carried out as planned.	
2.5	Re. 4.2 MD said that he had asked the company's health and safety team about supplying personal monitors for hydrogen sulphide for local residents. As the levels recorded do not cause any concern to Public Health England (as per the report discussed at the last meeting), they would not be provided.	
2.6	Re. 6.3 KA said that all drivers had been issued with a poster to remind them about checking their vehicle's tyres for stones before leaving the site. DM said that they were still coming across large rocks on the road. MD said that SUEZ would continue to remind drivers about the action they needed to take.	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>SUEZ Operational Update</b>	
3.1	<p>IM gave his report:</p> <p><b>Tipping Operations</b></p> <p>Tipping operations have concentrated in filling the Southern/Western end of Phase 4 and building it back in benches that step up towards the Eastern end or towards phase 3D. We have filled as far as we can go for the time being in this area and tipping operations have moved up onto the top of the Site to an area known as the cap strip area.</p> <p>The old turning circle known on Site as Area 2 - which is at the back of the Site adjacent to the haul road - is up to final waste height and has been heavily covered with soils. SEW walkovers of this area have shown the heavy covering is very affective at controlling the gas.</p> <p>We will be progressively filling with waste from area 2 working our way down through the valley towards the sump area close to the office. We will be heavy</p>	

	<p>covering behind us as we reach final approved waste levels in preparation for final capping.</p> <p>Permanent capping is scheduled to commence in mid-July when we anticipate permanently capping around 20,000M<sup>2</sup> of Landfill which will be at final approved levels. Tender documents are being prepared and these will be sent out next week to contractors, for pricing.</p> <p>It is anticipated that Landfill volumes into the Site will start to reduce from mid-July when waste starts to be diverted to the CERC which is scheduled to be fully operational by November this year. Waste that will come into Landfill for disposal will be from HWRC Sites and of course soils for restoration.</p> <p>Approximately 1,000 tons per day of sub-soil has been imported to site to assist with long term restoration. This is being stockpiled for future use. We have increased the road sweeper during the soil imports.</p> <p><b>Leachate</b></p> <p>Leachate levels are compliant within all the phases with the exception of one point in phase 4, where levels remain over compliant within a monitoring point at this end of phase 4, as the liquid seems to be held up and is not freely draining and reaching the pumping sump. The Site team has installed a separate pump into the riser so the liquid can be pumped out and we are monitoring the re-charge rate.</p> <p><b>Gas Extraction</b></p> <p>We are constantly reviewing our gas extraction and collection systems and investigating where and if any possible improvements could be made.</p> <p>Since the last liaison meeting we have installed additional pumps in three gas wells and two new manifolds to increase gas extraction,</p> <p>We have also installed additional flow lines to the temporary cap, de-silted all Phase 4 gas wells &amp; completed additional sealing works on points which have been identified during SEW surveys.</p> <p>Dragon drilling are working on Site at the moment and are installing 15 gas wells. CLP are connecting each one into the extraction system as each well is completed.</p> <p>Drilling is taking longer than was initially anticipated due the drillers having to drill through the haul road to install the first wells, this proved to be very difficult and slow going.</p> <p>A company called EPS have also been working on site over the past couple of weeks, they have been moving a gas main and some of the gas extraction system to enable waste placement as well as additional works to increase gas extraction across the operational area.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>We have discussed and agreed with CLP, provision of an additional flare that will give the Site a flare capacity of 3,600m<sup>3</sup> per hour this will ensure we have capacity to flare gas following the increased gas extraction.</p> <p><b>Complaints</b></p> <p>We have received a number of odour complaints since the last Liaison group meeting and the EA will talk about these during their update.</p> <p><b>Bird Control</b></p> <p>NBC continue to be employed as the contractors we use to control the birds on site and their chap is working full time to provide bird control. We currently have him working from 8am until 8pm and these hours remain under constant review.</p>	
3.2	<p>DM raised the issue of mud on the road. He said that SUEZ didn't deal with the issue until he had reported it to Cornwall Council as the road was in a terrible state. IM said they had organised the sweeper to come in but the company concerned had staffing issues, which delayed its arrival. DM asked how long SUEZ had been hiring the sweeper in for, IM said 6 weeks. DM asked when sweeper was organised, IM replied that it was organised on the first day of soil imports, when they realised there was a problem. CM said that SUEZ now have a road sweeper in full time, and apologised for the initial oversight.</p>	
3.3	<p>DM said that there had been a terrible screaming noise from a drilling rig - he had been told that this was caused by SUEZ drilling through the haul road. DM said that he had received an apology but that it wasn't good enough as SUEZ were always getting it wrong with regards to noise. CM said that an independent report had shown that SUEZ were compliant with noise regulations. He added that this was independent data and that SUEZ had no idea when the surveyors were visiting the site. DM said that it was strange that every time SUEZ had a survey done they were compliant for noise. JE said that there had been noise at times. MD said that with regards to the drilling rig, SUEZ had acknowledged that this was noisy and had apologised. MD added that the only noise complaint SUEZ had received was from the Mills'.</p>	
3.4	<p>CS said that ten days ago there was a massive queue of traffic going into the site and that two members of SUEZ staff were doing a great job managing the traffic. CS asked if this was due to extra lorries coming into the site. IM acknowledged that there had been an issue, which had been caused by extra lorries being diverted to Connon from other refuse transfer stations in Cornwall. IM said that as soon as they were aware there was a problem, they had reduced the number of lorries coming in with sub-soil. CS said that the staff had been doing a brilliant job that day to manage the issue. JM said that the queuing lorries had delayed her journey and asked why she should have to wait to get home. GP asked if SUEZ were better prepared now with the soil imports and road sweeper. IM said that there would be more soils coming in but they can</p>	PS (North Road query)

	<p>limit the lorries down to manageable levels. He added that SUEZ can bring the road sweeper in as often as they need, to keep the road clean. DM said that the extra tipper lorries on North Road were causing problems for locals and could they be banned from using this route? IM said that they could ask drivers not to go that way but it is a public highway. CS said that the Parish Council had reported it to the Highways people and were awaiting a response. The Parish had asked about the possibility of putting a weight limit on the road as huge articulated lorries were using it and the banks were giving way. She added that it was not just the tipper lorries that were causing a problem but all of the heavy vehicles using it. JH asked if the CC councillor could request that a traffic survey of North Road be done. PS said it could certainly be added to the list. JH said that the road was totally unsuitable for the size of the vehicles using it.</p>	
3.5	<p>DM asked where the additional flare would be going. CM said that it would be in the SUEZ compound at the top of the site.</p>	
4.0	<p><b>Environment Agency Update</b></p>	
4.1	<p>MR gave her report:</p> <p>There had been 27 complaints since the last meeting. 6 in March, 10 in April and 11 in May. All complaints related to odour, except one in April for noise. The EA has substantiated a number of these reports when they have been on/around the site.</p> <p>The EA has just received SUEZ's operational plans, so will be commenting on these very soon.</p> <p>At the last meeting two breach incidents were discussed. Initially daily updates were provided to the EA, and now weekly updates (on management of leachate levels/gas management). There are currently elevated leachate levels in phase 4 so the EA are keeping a close eye on this at the moment. The rest of the site is compliant and has been since the last meeting.</p> <p>With regards to landfill engineering, the EA has now received all the information about the new landfill gas wells. Hopefully this work will resolve some of the issues with offsite odours. Information on the new cell has also been received and the EA has responded to say that it will need a permit variation. The EA has had various discussions with SUEZ about this. DM asked if by 'new cell' MR meant the extension of phase 4. MR said that it was counted as a new cell. An audit of landfill gas infrastructure is currently being carried out. The EA is in regular discussion with WT about work that is ongoing.</p> <p>With regards to alternative daily cover, the EA has asked SUEZ for more information. CM explained that SUEZ were looking at a different type of covering.</p>	

	<p>JM asked why they were getting so much gas odour in the morning/evening. MR said this was probably a question for SUEZ. CM asked JM if they were waste smells or gas smells. A discussion ensued. CM said that within 3 months 200,000 square metres of the landfill will have been capped, various wells will be connected up and there will be an additional flare, which should improve the situation. JM said that they were still going to have the smell all through the summer. CM asked if there were any other places that might generate odours in the area. DM said that there used to be no odour but as more waste has come to Connon and the fill rate increased, gas smells have increased. MR said that increased volume would mean more waste smells and that landfill gas is produced in greater quantity at landfill sites nowadays.</p> <p>With phase 2 it took a lot longer for gas to be produced - this is to do with the waste mix in modern landfills. MR added that getting the capping/gas management in place will be a great help. IM said that they did get pockets of gas smells on site. JM said that the mothers at the local school had complained about the smell. CM said that you will always get some gas smells with landfill and reiterated that there may be other places locally that generate it, explaining that some farming activities also generate hydrogen sulphide. DM said that it was all around the boundary of the landfill.</p> <p>JH said that there had been 27 complaints since the last meeting, 26 for odour, whereas at the previous meeting there were only four complaints - she asked why it had escalated? JP asked if the staff working at the site had any problems with landfill gas odour? IM answered that they didn't and that site staff carried personal gas alarms due to the close nature of their work. He added that more of the site was now capped/covered, the active area was very small and itself had a temporary cap. MR said it was more a covering of soil, rather than a temporary cap.</p> <p>JM asked IM if he could smell the gas odour. IM said they carried out gas monitoring regularly and did sometimes smell it. MD asked if the odour complaints related to the same area, MR said they were from a wide area. She added that the EA had been around the site themselves and there is an odour – she had smelt it today both on and off site. IM said that SUEZ currently had the drilling rig on site (as work was ongoing), and drilling can cause gas release, in addition pipes sometimes have to be disconnected to enable work to go ahead and this can release gas as well. CM said that the answer was to plastic cap the site, and that 67% of the area will be done very soon. PS said that he was always on the side of local residents but felt that there was a plan in place to get the problem sorted, and it would be clear very soon if the measures being put in place were effective.</p>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Questions/Issues to be discussed</b>	

5.1	CS asked PS what happens if the landfill is full up before the CERC is operational. PS said he didn't know the answer to this. MB said he didn't know the answer either. DM said that SUEZ got it wrong with their landfill engineering. CM said that their original engineering was based on when the CERC was due to open.	
5.2	DM and JM said that the verges near the entrance of the site needed to be cut back. Could SUEZ speak to Cornwall Council? PS said this was something Cornwall Council could look into.	PS
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
6.1	GP asked if recycling will needed to be sorted differently when the CERC is operational. MD said that it will be black bag waste going to the CERC, so no different from now. There may potentially be additional recycling in the future (there has been a pilot scheme for the recycling of additional plastics) but Cornwall Council will let residents know what to do. MD added that Mike Beckett would probably have more detailed knowledge of this, i.e. whether additional plastics recycling will be rolled out to the whole of Cornwall. JP asked if the CERC was delayed but getting there. MD said he should have more to report on this at the next meeting in July, but yes, it will not be too long before it starts to process waste.	
6.2	CM said that a landfill site tour could be arranged for the group, to take place immediately before the July meeting. He suggested 3 site vehicles and meeting at 4.30pm. Group members agreed that a tour of the site would be very useful.	
6.3	KA asked if Mr Yeo had been put forward for a Clean Cornwall award. The deadline for the awards had been missed but a special thank you card had been sent which he was really delighted with.	
6.4	MD said that as part of 'Compost Awareness Week' some compost had been bagged up by SUEZ for members of the Connon Landfill Liaison Group. He offered members the chance to pick up some as they were leaving the meeting.	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
7.1	Tuesday 26 <sup>th</sup> July (4.30pm for tour, 5.30pm for meeting)	
7.2	DM said he was disappointed that the May meeting had been cancelled at the last minute. MD apologised for this.	

## meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	26/07/16
Location	Connon Bridge
Recorder	Janine Sargent

### Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Phil Seeva	PS	Cornwall Council	Councillor - Menheniot
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	Councillor
Janet Haley	JH	Local resident	
Henry Haley	HH	Local resident	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local resident	
Doug Mills	DM	Local resident	
John Emerson	JE	Local resident	
Paul Jordan	PJ	Braddock Parish Meeting	Chair
Geoffrey Pearce	GP	St Pinnock Parish Council	Councillor
Mary Rees	MR	Environment Agency	Pollution Prevention and Control Officer
Mike Dobson (Chair)	MD	SUEZ	Communications Manager SW
William Tedder	WT	SUEZ	Gas Support Manager
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Landfill Senior Site Manager

Katherine Alexandre	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Manager
Mike Beckett	MB	Cornwall Council	Waste Manager
Dale Unsworth	DU	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract – Team Leader
Mick Butfield	MBu	Cornwall Council	Planning Department

Ref	Note	Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	
1.1	Apologies were received for Benedicte Jenkinson, Chris Male, Carole Spear and Graham Crabbe	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Review previous minutes</b>	
2.1	The minutes were approved.	
2.1	Re. 2.2. (hedge that needed cutting back) IM arranged for the hedge to be cut back by a contractor, and it is all sorted now.	
2.2	Re. 2.3 MBu said he had looked at the relevant information and SUEZ's tipping plan was in line with the profile in the planning approval.	
2.3	Re. 3.4 (traffic survey North Road) PS said he did follow this up, but will chase it up again this week.	PS
2.4	Re. 5.2 (verges at entrance to site) The verge has now been cut. PS said he followed up on this after the last meeting. MB said he had asked the Highways team to include the verge on the main road inspection regime.	

3.0	<b>SUEZ Operational Update</b>	
3.1	<p>IM gave his report:</p> <p><b>Tipping Operations</b></p> <p>As described at the last liaison group meeting tipping operations have concentrated in filling the valley within the cap strip area working down towards the sump at this end of Phase 4 which is close to the office, we have been covering behind us as we reach final approved waste levels in preparation for final capping.</p> <p>Permanent capping of around 20,000m2 is scheduled to commence mid August; delayed to allow us to maximise the amount of waste to final levels.</p> <p>Landfill volumes into the Site have started to reduce with waste being diverted to the CERC with the first burn being scheduled to take place this week. The CERC is programmed to be fully operational by November this year. The only waste that will continue to be brought into the Landfill for disposal will be from HWRC Sites and we will continue to receive soils for restoration.</p> <p><b>Leachate</b></p> <p>Leachate levels are compliant within all the phases, however we are still seeing higher levels at 1 point within phase 4, levels remain over compliant within a monitoring point at this end of phase 4 as the liquid seems to be held up and is not freely draining and reaching the pumping sump. Site have installed a separate pump into the riser so the liquid can be pumped out and we are continuing monitoring the re-charge rate.</p> <p><b>Gas Extraction</b></p> <p>During the period since the last liaison meeting we have completed the drilling and installation of 15 gas wells within the Phase 4 area.</p> <p>Two new gas mains have been installed around Phase 4 with additional knock out pots to ensure the maximum amount of gas is extracted from the new wells.</p> <p>Flow lines and connections on all the gas wells across the site have been reviewed and moved or adjusted to ensure the flow lines remain dewatered.</p> <p>An additional 8 pumps have been installed into gas wells to remove perched leachate and ensure the maximum amount of gas is collected.</p> <p><b>Bird Control</b></p> <p>Bird control has proven to be challenging especially during this difficult breeding period. Bird control between April and August is time the birds have their young and then of course we have the difficulty of the young birds themselves who seem to have no fear and are more difficult to keep out.</p>	

	<p>NBC continue to be employed as the contractors we use to control the birds and we continue to review the bird control measures that are used. Their chap is working full time to provide bird control and on occasions it has been necessary to have two bird control operatives on Site. We continue to have bird control on Site right through until 8pm although the hours remain under constant review.</p> <p><b>General</b></p> <p>An unknown intruder came on to site during the evening of Sunday 19 June. This was discovered during routine monitoring of the LTP remotely when a question was raised over a level in one of the tanks that seemed to have dropped.</p> <p>Site Management attended site and found that someone had entered site and then the Leachate Treatment Plant, and had opened a valve on one of the tanks.</p> <p>Following further checks around site it was found that a bitumen-like material had been poured into the surface water system at an area we call the 'garage sump'. Luckily due to the discharge from the surface water lagoon running, the material was being held in the end chamber and so was being stopped from leaving site. A swift clear up of the material ensured there was no impact on the river.</p> <p>This matter is currently under Criminal Investigation by the Police, who attended site to collect evidence on Monday 20 June.</p>	
3.2	<p>PJ said he was disappointed that there had been no progress on the phase 4 leachate levels – the report given at today's meeting on this issue was exactly the same as at the last meeting. He was disappointed that there seemed to be no short term or long term plan for resolving the issue. MR said that the EA had been advised that SUEZ were running a trial to see what was happening. A discussion ensued on what the issue was and what was being done to tackle it. KA said that this corner of the site had been difficult from the word go. PJ said it would be good to see some progress on this.</p>	IM, KA
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Environment Agency Update</b>	
4.1	<p>MR gave her report:</p> <p>The EA has received 2 complaints since the last meeting. Both were in July and related to odour. One complaint needs more investigation as it was not close to the site. MR had been around the site on several occasions and hadn't found odour offsite. The situation with odour has been much improved since the last meeting, this is due to the landfill gas wells which had now been installed.</p> <p>The EA are now waiting for the capping to go ahead, which has been delayed until the end of August.</p>	

	<p>The EA has been working closely with WT (SUEZ Gas Support Manager). WT has been carrying out an audit of the whole site's landfill gas infrastructure, (e.g. he has been looking at how the pipes are flowing), and has identified a number of problems. MR is really pleased with the work that is being carried and the very positive communication between WT and the EA.</p> <p>Engineering-wise the EA have received the CQA capping plan and this was all ready to go ahead now. The EA has also received parts of the stability risk assessment, and engineering details for the mini cell located at the end of phase 4. The EA have not heard if the new cell will be going ahead, this depends on the amount of waste coming to site. The design details of the new cell still need to be looked at by the EA. Linked with the new cell, the EA has also received the leachate management plan – this will need to be reviewed substantially if the new mini cell goes ahead.</p> <p>With regards to bird control in the middle of the month MR noted a lot of noise. MR has asked IM to review the situation, to make things better for local residents.</p> <p>With regards to the break in at Connon (referred to above in SUEZ Operational Update), IM had called the EA helpdesk immediately and an officer went out that night to check the stream. MR was on site the following day. It was very good that SUEZ staff were checking monitoring information on their phones that night, as this meant the problem was caught early.</p>	
<p><b>5.0</b></p>	<p><b>Questions Issues to be addressed</b></p>	
<p>5.1</p>	<p>JM said it was all very well that the birds were driven off the landfill site but they all settled over by her house and the surrounding fields, messing on her house and car. MD said that it is part of the permit to control birds at the landfill. JM asked why was it not appropriate to have them at the landfill site but OK for them to be all around her property. HK asked if there were the same number of birds every year. IM said that yes, there were roughly the same number. JE said it seemed like the bird control was a waste of money if it only moved them on briefly and then they were back again. MR said that they needed to be kept off the waste so they can't pick up the rubbish and drop it elsewhere. MD said that once the permanent capping was in place the issue will be resolved. DM said that better temporary capping is the answer as if any part of the site is available to them, the birds will come. JM claimed that anyone who visited after closing time would see rubbish lying on the surface of the site. DM said cover down had been a problem at the site for the 20 years he and JM had lived in the area. MD asked the site staff if there was anything more that could be done. IM said he was confident that there wasn't any rubbish that the birds could get to at the end of the day. JM and DM disagreed. MD suggested that JM and DM took a photograph of the site after closing, to illustrate the problem of exposed rubbish. MR asked about bird control over the weekend. IM said it was only until 1pm on</p>	

	<p>the Saturday. DM asked when the bird contractor was on duty generally, IM said from 7.30am until 8pm. DM asked if that meant that at other times the birds were left to their own devices. He added that why couldn't they be left to their own devices all the time – it needed to be all or nothing with bird control. MD said doing nothing was not an option due to the permit. PJ said that looking on the bright side, this would be the last summer that residents would suffer. IM said that it was the food waste that attracted them and this would be stopping very soon (i.e. it would be going to the CERC). PJ asked if the transfer station would cause similar problems. MD explained that this would be under cover so wouldn't be a problem. GP asked for clarification on the regime during the course of a day – i.e. is the waste uncovered all day. IM said that it was uncovered during the day, but this was when bird control was in operation. At the end of the working day the waste is covered adequately and then this layer is tipped on again the following day. DM said that it all came down to what was considered adequate, and what DM considers adequate, IM will say causes perching. IM said he did not feel this was an argument they were going to resolve.</p> <p>PS said that at the last meeting he had made the point that SUEZ seemed to have a plan in place to resolve the various issues (the imminent permanent capping) and that they should be given time to implement them. The permanent capping was due to have been started by today's meeting, and he was very disappointed that it hadn't. PS asked if this is what happened at every meeting. DM said that it was. PS said that if the same old stuff was discussed at every meeting, and no progress was made, he was not sure what the meetings were for. DM said there was a difference between capping and cover down and it was the latter that was the problem with the birds. PS said he had moved the meeting onto capping as felt that the birds issue was not going to be resolved. MD said progress had been made as the odour complaints were down to only 2. IM explained that the capping had been delayed because it's a massive/complex contract and a difficult job because they were maximising the void. PS said he understood why the work had been delayed, but that he hoped they would not be having the same conversation in September. DM said he felt that the only reason SUEZ did anything is because of the EA. MD disputed this. JM said that in all fairness to SUEZ things had improved immensely. The birds were a big problem though, and the noise from the cannon annoying (bird scarer).</p>	
5.2	<p>MD said that the first waste had now been delivered to the CERC so things would be coming to an end at Connon before long. JM expressed the view that St Dennis would now have the same problems they had experienced. MD said that all the waste would be inside the EfW building so a totally different scenario. DM said that all the feeder stations (transfer stations) had been shown on the news as well. A discussion ensued about the transfer station proposed for Connon. DM asked if SUEZ could ensure that the machinery at the Connon transfer station had the correct reversing beepers (to reduce noise for</p>	

	residents), IM said he would. JM asked when the liaison group could visit the CERC, MD said this could certainly be arranged when the visitor centre was open.	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
6.1	MBu said he had spoken to IM regarding the issue with lorry movements. The lorry movements were associated with the HWRC, which is approved for use over the weekend (i.e. in accordance with the planning permission). JM and DM said they were 100% certain that the lorries came from the landfill site, and that the gates were often left open. IM said that he had reviewed the CCTV footage for the day in question, the gate was closed and the lorry driver reversed up to the landfill gate and then stopped to put the lorry's net on. IM added that from the road it could have looked like the lorry came from the landfill but it didn't. DM said the gate was often left open over the weekend so anyone could go in there. IM said it should be shut, so he would look into this. He added that the main gate was also shut every evening. DM/JM said they had also seen the main gate open one evening. IM said that this was probably when the night security staff were driving around to check all is secure.	IM
6.2	JH asked why they were considering putting in a new mini cell at Connon. KA said this was to do with the delays at the CERC and needing plans in place should there be unexpected further delays. MD said that the CERC was well on its way but they needed to do more testing before the waste could be sent there for treatment. JH asked how much waste the cell would take. IM said that there was a good chance the new cell would not be needed, i.e. it was just a contingency measure. KA said a lot of work crunching numbers was being done to make sure they had adequate void for the anticipated waste. DM asked if they were increasing the footprint of the site due to the delays at the CERC. IM answered 'no', and said that the works they were doing were in line with the planning permission. DM asked what the profile would be like for the new cell, KA said it will be on the same level as phase 4. DM asked if it had been lined. KA said no, because nothing had been agreed with the EA yet.	
6.3	JH asked what had happened about the proposed tour at this meeting. MD apologised and said it was cancelled because there was a lot of work happening on site at the moment. He added that he was looking to arrange something for the next meeting (same arrangement as before – 4.30pm for tour) which he will confirm the details for as soon as possible.	MD
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting:</b> Tuesday 20 <sup>th</sup> September, (4.30pm for tour of site, 5.30pm for meeting).	



## meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	29 <sup>th</sup> November 2016
Location	Connon Bridge
Recorder	Janine Sargent
Chair	Chris Male

### Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Chris Male	CM	SUEZ	Regional Manager
William Tedder	WT	SUEZ	Gas Support Manager
Doug Mills	DM	St Pinnock Parish Council	Councillor
John Emerson	JE	Local resident	
Mick Butfield	MB	Cornwall Council	Planning Department
Mary Rees	MR	Environment Agency	PPC Officer
Carole Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	Chair of St Pinnock PC
Benedicte Jenkinson	BJ	Cornwall Council	Cornwall Councillor Lostwithiel
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Landfill Senior Site Manager
Katharine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Site Manager
Graham Crabbe	GC	Local resident	
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	Councillor

Geoffrey Pearse	GP	St Pinnock Parish Council	Councillor
Dale Unsworth	DU	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract – Team Leader
Edwyn Walsh	EW	SUEZ	Leachate Plant Manager
Gerry Cavanagh	GC	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Regional Manager

Ref	Note	Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	
1.1	CM welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were given for Mike Dobson and Mike Beckett. CM also apologised for changing the date of the meeting at short notice. CM introduced GC and EW and explained their roles at SUEZ.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Review previous minutes/ Matters arising</b>	
2.1	Benedicte Jenkinson asked for her apologies to be added to the minutes, as she had given them. No other amendments to the minutes.	
2.2	Re. 3.3 (transfer station). CM confirmed that a transfer station would be opening at Connon. Discussions about the possible shredding of waste (to make more suitable waste streams for the CERC) have not been concluded, and are ongoing. DM asked if it would be difficult to carry out both activities in the same area. CM said he wouldn't have thought so, as the shredding would not involve a large tonnage of material and the operation could be carried out on quite a small footprint. CM added that the shredding operation wasn't a given, but it was being discussed. DU said that with regards to the timescale for the transfer station opening, this was linked with when the CERC was fully operational. CM said that once the transfer station was open the only waste going into the landfill would be bulky waste and waste from street cleaning. CM estimated this would be about 20-30,000 tonnes per annum.	

2.3	<p>DM raised an issue he had seen in the media about the incinerator receiving waste from other parts of the country. DU explained that waste from other parts of the country was being used as part of the testing process for the CERC. Some of the waste being brought in was high calorific waste that had been treated already. The aim is to make sure that the CERC can process these types of waste effectively. CM said that basically we needed to be able to ensure that the CERC can do what it's designed to do. DU said that an incinerator cannot take such a wide range of waste as a landfill can, and some of the commercial waste being produced in Cornwall may not be suitable.</p>	
2.4	<p>Re. 6.1 (rocks on the road). KA said they were continuing to do walkovers. They were planning to put stone in the tipping area within the next couple of months. DM said they were still seeing rocks on the road, particularly at the junction at the top. CM said they would ask Danny Pearce to speak to the hauliers again. DM asked of the soil they were using on site had stones in it. KA said it didn't. The soil lorries are running on unmade roads but it's basically mud, not stone.</p>	KA
2.4	<p>Re. 6.2 (fly tipping near SUEZ's second gate). KA said she had been out and picked this up. A discussion ensued about fly tipping in the area. DE mentioned various materials at different locations. KA said that any fly tipping should be reported to Cornwall Council, who will send their contractors to pick it up. MR said that if a vehicle was actually seen fly tipping, take the registration number and report it to Cornwall Council. DM said that one of the concerns when the HWRC stopped taking trade waste was that fly tipping would escalate, although it isn't as bad as everyone thought it would be.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>SUEZ Operational Update</b>	
3.1	<p>CM updated the group on an incident that had taken place at the landfill site. It concerned the gas drilling rig and a problem that had occurred in the last month or so. He explained that gas wells tend to settle, bend, and get silted up, which makes them less effective at pulling gas, so they have to be re-drilled. Unfortunately the survey company that SUEZ used provided incorrect data on levels, which meant that the wells were drilled too deep. GC explained that, because the data was incorrect, the well hit the bottom of the site causing damage (i.e. well passed through plastic lining and into the clay). CM said that the problem had been remediated fully, there was no groundwater pollution and the matter was fully reported to the Environment Agency as soon as it occurred. The remedial work, which involved putting casing into the hole to plug/seal it, plus bentonite material, has been fully CQA'd. GC said that in terms of the integrity of the site, the problem is now fixed. CM said there had been 4 incidents (i.e. 4 wells affected) but that monitoring had shown that no contamination had been caused. DE asked if the other company was at fault, rather than SUEZ. CM said that there was a significant error in the survey data –</p>	CM

	<p>which does sometimes happen in the industry – and that SUEZ were in discussions with the survey company about the problem they had caused. MB asked if the surface level statistics provided were wrong. CM said yes, and added that there were proper procedures the survey company should have followed but didn't. MB asked if he could have a copy of the up to date survey data. CM said this could be arranged.</p>	
<p>3.2</p>	<p>Ian Mitchell gave the operational update:</p> <p><b>Tipping Operations</b></p> <p>Waste tipping operations continue in the western flank. Waste Inputs continue to remain at a lower rate due to the waste being diverted to the CERC, with the exception of the odd few days when they have closed to waste and the lorries have been diverted to Connon.</p> <p>We continue to receive soils from various locations which is being stockpiled for future restoration.</p> <p><b>Capping</b></p> <p>We have invested around £350,000 on capping which was completed at the end of September. Mouldings completed 17100m<sup>2</sup> of permanent capping but we were able extended the contractor's area of works to include further 2,600m<sup>2</sup> of temporary capping on the western flank below the permanent cap.</p> <p>The recently capped area has been seeded for erosion control over winter.</p> <p>Unfortunately due to the delays with the drilling rig, the grass has been run over by the drillers, however we did ask the seeding contractors to leave us seed so that we can re-seed disturbed areas once the drillers have finished.</p> <p><b>Leachate</b></p> <p>Leachate levels within the phases are compliant with the exception of P4A2 which is undergoing the pumping trial. This was within 10cm of compliance the week before last, however the pump in Phase 4 sump began to lose flow last week causing a backlog seen in the P4A2 well. The sump pump was removed, checked, cleaned and reinstalled however we were still seeing low flows from the pump. On investigation it was found that the discharge pipe to the Phase 4 storage tank was suffering from a build-up of material, this was jetted and cleared by tanker and the pump recovered to full flow again.</p> <p>During the last few months we have made numerous improvements to the LTP and Leachate collection system. These are in both the technical process and security of the site.</p> <p>We have installed dedicated desludge points within the bunded area of the LTP and are currently treating 30m<sup>3</sup> of phase 4 leachate on a daily basis.</p>	

	<p>There has been a recent code modification to allow us to remotely transfer the volume of phase 4 leachate we require and a modification to automatically monitor tank levels, and alarm if a 50m<sup>3</sup> drop is registered within any ½ hour period within the tank.</p> <p>We have carried out a security audit and have implemented a number of changes. These include all valves within the LTP have an updated locking procedure to stop uncontrolled use. We are currently installing a CCTV system within the LTP to monitor the un-banded area within the LTP footprint.</p> <p>There is a program to install foam suppression systems in our nitrification tanks, AE1 AE3 and PAT to improve and ensure continued effluent quality.</p> <p>We have carried out modifications and updates to the existing caps on the side slope risers to further ensure there is no risk of air ingress.</p> <p><b>Gas Extraction</b></p> <p>When we last met we advised the group that we had a drilling rig on site that would be drilling 7 new gas wells in the recently capped area of Phase 4 and 13 wells across the rest of the site to replace those already installed that had become ineffective for various reasons.</p> <p>In terms of the drilling we have now completed 13 new wells in total 5 of which are on the newly capped area and 8 on the older parts of the site.</p> <p>Drilling continues and the drillers are hoping to complete by the end of next week. This will also include the decommissioning of the replaced gas wells.</p> <p>We are constantly reviewing our gas extraction systems and as part of this we undertake weekly FID monitoring surveys, this helps us to identify any potential points of concern which we will then investigate and remediate as appropriate. These could include additional sealing works, movement of manifolds or gas flow lines and can also affect how we tip and fill certain areas.</p>	
3.3	<p>DM asked why, if there was a reduced volume of waste coming in, the incidents of gas odour were not reducing. CM said that the new wells would not be fully functional for 2-3 weeks but hopefully when they were, gas odour would be reduced. GC said that once the central wells were installed they would start drawing the gas in. He added that, soon, the coverage of the site by gas wells will be considerable. DM said he would still have expected incidents of gas odour to decrease. GC said it was an ongoing process, but that it should start making a difference very soon. MR said that although the drilling rigs have been on site a long time, for a lot of that period they have been remediating the issues with the 4 problem wells (described above). CM said they were investing £200,000 to reduce gas smells. There was currently an exposed flank which needs to be capped, and overall they want to accelerate capping to better manage gas on the site. CM added that in the third week of December they will be using bottom ash blocks from the CERC to seal the flank. DM said that he</p>	

	<p>was told this was a valuable product so why were they putting it in landfill. CM said it was an engineering material, which is what they were using it for, with the aim of controlling odour. DM said it sounded like SUEZ were 'firefighting'. CM said this was not the case. DM said they were still getting gas smells and leachate problems and the situation had not improved in 20 years. HK said that odour from the site was much better now, and that it was nothing like it used to be. DM agreed that it was not like it used to be, but said that nothing had changed in terms of gas. HK said that a lot of money had been thrown at this problem over the years.</p>	
<p><b>4.0</b></p>	<p><b>Environment Agency update</b></p>	
<p>4.1</p>	<p>MR gave the Environment Agency update:</p> <p>Since the last meeting (20/09/16) the EA have received the following complaints;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 complaint of waste odour was received at the end of September</li> <li>• At the end of October they received 3 complaints about landfill gas odour</li> <li>• In November, to date, they have received 6 landfill gas odour complaints</li> </ul> <p>The EA have also carried out their own odour surveys and have smelt landfill gas odour, which has been reported to site. It is difficult to know if this is linked to the drilling operations or the exposed flanks. Once the drillers are off site we will be able to see if the problem is resolved. With regards to the landfill gas well installation issue, the EA were kept fully in the loop about the break in the liner, and CQA engineers have been on site overseeing the remedial work. The drillers were very professional. Problems of this nature are not a regular occurrence thankfully. The capping has been completed. Waste deliveries to Connon are up and down as when the CERC needs the waste it goes there, but if they don't it comes to the landfill. This will continue until the CERC is fully commissioned. The EA would like to see the flank capped with plastic as soon as possible, this will mean less leachate is generated, and landfill gas can be more effectively collected, so better all round. With regards to the incident that occurred on 16<sup>th</sup> June (break in/release of leachate from tank), MR and Sarah Taylor (EA) have carried out an audit of the Leachate Treatment Plant with Edwyn and Colin (SUEZ LTP staff) and lots of measures have now been put in place. The work at the LTP is ongoing and constantly being reviewed and MR is pleased that this work is being carried out – so a positive out of a negative. There have been many site inspections since the last meeting, due to the drilling incident. There were birds on site the last time MR/ST visited. The situation with birds should improve once the CERC is open. The EA has initiated bringing the permit conditions up to date.</p>	

	DM said that the number of complaints the EA had received bore out what he had said about gas odours increasing. CM said that SUEZ were aware they needed to keep working at this.	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Questions/Issues to be addressed</b>	
5.1	DM raised an email that MD had circulated regarding out of hours working. MR interrupted to say that she had asked SUEZ to send this out. It was on the evening that it was discovered that the drillers had gone through the liner. A new drill bit needed to be brought down from upcountry, and it was due to arrive at 5pm. MR felt working outside normal hours was worthwhile, as getting the issue addressed quickly (i.e. installing casing) would have minimised the potential for leachate escaping. DM said that a request to work out of hours should have gone to MB. MB said it would have been counterproductive to disallow it. DM said that the condition said working hours were Monday to Friday, 7am – 5pm. DM said that there had been no consideration for local residents, and that out of hours working was outside of the planning consent, and not what he would expect from a professional company. CM said it was a difficult situation at the time, i.e. there was concern about leachate escaping, so they did what they felt was right.	
5.2	DM said he was disappointed that the date of the meeting was changed at short notice, and that the local people who attend have busy diaries too. Phil Seeva, and Janet and Henry Haley were not able to attend because of the change. CM apologised for the change of date.	
5.3	DM asked what waste the CERC could take besides black bag waste. He asked if the CERC would take the low grade clinical waste, as surely more hygienic to incinerate it. DU said the CERC was not allowed to take clinical waste. DM said it was unfair that the people local to Connon should have to put up with it. HK asked if Connon accepted dog waste. KA said that specific dog waste lorries didn't come in.	
5.4	DM said the noise from the compactor was causing him annoyance. It was working on the flank, which is directing the noise towards his house. DM added that Gareth Philips had said that when waste volumes are reduced, the work could be done with a bulldozer rather than the compactor. CM said that they were still using the compactor for the time being and that a noise survey had been done and they were compliant by planning standards. He added that they would look into what DM had said though. IM said they did try whenever possible to have the exhaust pointing away from DM's direction. DM said it was definitely the compactor and not the drilling rigs, it is currently working on a steep gradient and it sounds like the machine is struggling. IM said the compactor was designed for working in those sort of conditions. DM said they were still getting noise, not all the time, but when they did, it was very loud.	CM

5.5	GP asked if the transfer site was operational yet, or was this to come. He said he had noticed a small reduction in traffic, but there were still a lot of local lorries coming through. CM said that the transfer station operation had not started yet, and suggested that some of the lorries that GP had seen may have been soil wagons. GP said he was keeping an eye on the number of lorries. CM said it was likely that the transfer station would come into operation early in the new year.	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Any other business</b> (none raised)	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
7.1	24 <sup>th</sup> January 2017, 5.30pm at Connon Bridge	
7.2	MR would not be able to make this meeting and gave her apologies in advance. MR would ask ST to attend in her place.	