

Residents Liaison Meeting



Date/Time: 01 April 2009 – 5.30pm
Venue: Conference Room, Mogden STW
Chair: Richard Aylard, Thames Water

Attendees:

Name	Representing
Richard Aylard	Thames Water
Cathy Gallagher	London Borough of Hounslow
Gerry McCarthy	London Borough of Hounslow
Michael Mehta	London Borough of Hounslow
Tony Bull	London Borough of Hounslow
Shaun Case	London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
Councillor Liz Jaeger	London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
Keith Knight	St Johns Resident Association
Jane Talbot	Queensbridge Residents Co.
Richard Johnson	Queensbridge Residents Co.
Alan McEvelly	Thames Water – Plant Manager
Andy Gingell	Thames Water - Communications
Mark Mathews	Thames Water - Planner
Adrian Jack	Thames Water – Project Manager



No	Item	Actions
	<p>Agenda</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review of previous minutes 2. Operations and correspondence 3. Mosquitoes and the Mosquito Campaign 2009 4. The Odour Improvement Project and its independent review 5. Tidal Thames Quality Improvements Project 6. Communications 7. AOB 	
	<p>Apologies received from:</p> <p>Keith Gardner Nick Fawcett Councillor Barbara Reid Councillor Bradley Fisher Councillor Lilly Bath Hanifa Dobson Simon Eaton-Walker</p>	
1	<p>Review of previous minutes</p> <p>No comments to add.</p>	
2	<p>Operations and correspondence (slides 3- 4)</p> <p>Alan McEilly talked through the operational correspondence graphs adding that the recent 'other' complaints had mainly referred to tree and fly tipping related issues.</p> <p>Michael Mehta asked why there was a spike of complaints in January.</p> <p>Alan McEilly answered, explaining that a proportion of those complaints had related to a backlog sent through early in the year relating to the Christmas period and that we had been experiencing technical problems with one of the odour control units (which was subsequently investigated and re-commissioned).</p> <p>Jane Talbot asked what was the best method of contact for raising issues, as the number that she was using didn't work.</p> <p>Andy Gingell responded, explaining that residents should call the 0845 9200 800 number, or use any of the methods detailed in the communications section of the presentation.</p> <p>Richard Aylard asked Andy to clarify this outside the meeting.</p> <p>Gerry McCarthy asked if Thames Water could explain why the storm tanks have been used extensively over the past weeks as he felt that these may have been the cause of the large number of the</p>	AG



No	Item	Actions
	<p>complaints.</p> <p>Alan McEvilly explained that we use the storm tanks to hold incoming flows when the site is running at full treatment capacity.</p> <p>Unfortunately storm water flows do not stop entering the sewage treatment works as soon as rainfall ceases. This is due to the lag period caused by the large catchment area that Mogden serves.</p> <p>There is also no specific timeframe relating to how long it takes for the wastewater flows to travel through the network and into Mogden.</p> <p>Shaun Case asked how we use the two covered tanks.</p> <p>Alan McEvilly explained to keep odour to a minimum, the two covered tanks are the first to fill, taking the most odorous flush and last to empty.</p> <p>Councillor Jaeger asked what percentage of time are the storm tanks used?</p> <p>Alan McEvilly explained that there is no clear percentage as use is dependant upon the weather and incoming flows into the works.</p> <p>Richard Aylard added that every sewage treatment works has a finite capacity at any time. As a result, they need a safety system as we cannot just 'shut the gates'. At Mogden the storm tanks are our safety system.</p> <p>Once we reached our treatment capacity and our safety systems are full, we are then left with no choice but to discharge into the River Thames.</p> <p>The proposed improvements will mean that the works has a greater capacity to fully treat more of the existing incoming flows, meaning that we will not be so reliant on our 'safety systems' and therefore significantly reduce any discharges into the River Thames.</p> <p>Richard then invited the EHOs to comment on their recent storm tank observations.</p> <p>Michael Mehta stated that on his visits for the past 2 – 3 weeks, the storm tanks had been in use.</p> <p>Richard added although they had been in use, the storm tanks have been required so that we can meet our required regulatory consents to make sure that our final effluent was compliant before discharging it into the River Thames.</p> <p>Richard also went on to explain that if we are able to build the proposed improvements, once complete if we exceed 6 uses of the</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>uncovered storm tanks within a year, we will approach Thames Water's regulator Ofwat to seek funding to cover the remaining uncovered tanks.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher added that Thames Water will be implementing a storm tank management plan amongst other controls as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher asked if there were any operational changes to the way Mogden was run on match days.</p> <p>Alan McEvelly responded that no changes of any sort were made on match days.</p>	
3	<p>Mosquitoes and the Mosquito Campaign 2009 (slides 5 - 13)</p> <p>Alan McEvelly ran through the mosquito slides, explaining that Thames Water had recently gone through a mosquito audit with LB Hounslow and Richmond Pest Control Officers.</p> <p>Alan also explained that the survey patterns vary throughout the year to tie in with weather and mosquito breeding patterns. He explained that Thames Water have now moved to the summer survey, meaning that we are monitoring more sites across the works on a weekly basis.</p> <p>Shaun Case asked if there is a reason for the increase of sites inspected compared to previous years.</p> <p>Alan explained the reason for the increase is as a result of the engineering works and managing our contractors' parts of the works.</p> <p>Andy Gingell then went on to explain that this year Thames Water will be sending out a mosquito awareness leaflet named 'Beating Biting Bugs' and this will arrive at residents doors just after the May Bank Holiday weekend.</p> <p>Tony Bull asked why there was a decrease in the percentage of sites showing mosquito activity within the first two weeks of the summer survey.</p> <p>Andy Gingell explained that during this time, mosquito activity is low. If there had not been much change in mosquito activity, and we increase the number of sites that are surveyed, the percentage of sites showing activity would therefore decrease. This is the most likely explanation.</p>	



4	<p>The Odour Improvement Project and its independent review (slides 14 - 17)</p> <p>Richard Aylard gave a brief overview relating to the odour improvement project and invited Adrian Jack to comment on the outcomes.</p> <p>Adrian Jack explained that the results were positive showing that some of the dataset comparisons showed an odour reduction of up to 90%.</p> <p>Andy Gingell clarified that Thames Water would be quoting the 66 % odour reduction statistic. This is because although some data sets had shown significantly higher reductions, Thames Water have chosen to use the 'worst case scenario' reduction of odour using the most critical data sets.</p> <p>Richard Aylard talked through some of the example photos in the presentation showing some of the technology used to achieve the reduction. He also added that a full copy of the report is available for download of the Thames Water website. (www.thameswater.co.uk/mogden).</p> <p>Richard went on to summarise the project outputs as detailed in the presentation and invited participants for questions.</p> <p>Shaun Case stated there have been a number of complaints in the past and that it must have been hard to identify the sources of odour to answer them.</p> <p>Alan McEvilly agreed, stating that it can be difficult to identify point sources and that this is why we use Odournet [independent odour company] to identify the most problematic parts of the works relating to odour.</p> <p>Michael Mehta asked if Odournet has identified areas of the site that are still problematic?</p> <p>Alan McEvilly answered explaining that Odournet have surveyed the whole of the site and all of the odour levels from different areas of the site have been detailed in their report on the Thames Water website.</p> <p>Gerry McCarthy explained that LB Hounslow still have concerns with the action trigger levels set on the odour control units and asked Alan to comment.</p> <p>Alan McEvilly explained that the action levels are set at the trigger levels they were designed to. Without re-engineering the plant to higher sensitivities at a large cost, it would be difficult to measure to tighter/lower levels.</p>	
----------	--	--



	<p>Councillor Jaeger asked if this was for reducing odour at Mogden?</p> <p>Richard Aylard answered that the driver for the new capital works was to clean up the River Thames, but the plans include new equipment and controls to make sure the scheme is odour neutral.</p>	
5	<p>Tidal Thames Quality Improvements Project (slides 18 - 20)</p> <p>Richard Aylard ran through the presentation slides explaining the background behind the proposals and the latest update [as per the presentation].</p> <p>Mark Mathews gave a brief overview of the section 106 legal obligations that Thames Water is currently working with LB Hounslow on.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher added to Mark's comments explaining that LB Hounslow are looking for Thames Water to take a phased approach in their construction programme to deliver any odour reduction benefits to local residents as soon as possible.</p> <p>Adrian Jack [Project Manager] explained that subject to finalising the section 106 agreement, which will include a ring of odour monitors around the digesters. The earliest Thames Water could consider starting construction would be Autumn 2009.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher explained that there are still some issues to be resolved, and even after that the application will be subject to approval from the Mayor and referred to the Government Office for London. Cathy asked Thames Water to update the presentation slides to reflect this.</p> <p>Jane Talbot asked if the planning application was approved as is.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher answered yes, but with tight section 106 obligations and planning conditions to reduce odour occurrences including; storm tank management plan, a jerome monitor for LB Hounslow, gully cleansing, funding for environmental health monitoring, a mosquito management plan and a sludge-monitoring plan.</p> <p>Mark Mathews also added that Thames Water would be improving the public footpath through the centre of the STW, including providing new information boards. Significant additional renewable energy generation would be created from the CHP engines (Combined Heat and Power), and tight construction controls too through an agreed construction management plan.</p> <p>Richard Aylard stated that these would be conditions and legal obligations that Thames Water would be bound to.</p> <p>Jane Talbot asked if all of these obligations and conditions are on the web.</p>	



	<p>Cathy Gallagher answered stating that once the section 106 obligations have been agreed they will be published in a report on their website.</p> <p>Councillor Jaeger asked if all the areas will be covered to 0.02ppm.</p> <p>Gerry McCarthy stated that covered areas will have emissions treated to the appropriate levels.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher added to the discussion stating that there is a non-technical report available online.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p>Communications (slides 21 - 23)</p> <p>Andy Gingell ran through the communications slides explaining the different ways of contacting Thames Water and the different Mogden Communications.</p> <p>Gerry McCarthy stated that LB Hounslow were concerned about the joint report turn-around times.</p> <p>Richard Aylard said Thames Water would work to improve on this and aim to turn them around in 7 working days.</p> <p>Richard also added that we plan to write a newsletter once the planning application process has been completed.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher asked why there was a delay in posting odour monitor readings on the website.</p> <p>Andy Gingell responded explaining that the delay had been caused by a fibre optic cable break. As a result, we had lost the connection to the computer where the odour monitor readings are downloaded.</p> <p>Andy went on to explain that the cable had been replaced and all the missing odour monitor readings had been updated.</p> <p>Andy also clarified that during this time, all odour monitor readings remained available for viewing at the powerhouse by the operational teams and EHOs.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>Michael Mehta asked if there were going to be additional updates on the website during any future construction work.</p> <p>Andy Gingell answered explaining that its very likely that website updates are likely to form part of the communications plan.</p> <p>Cathy asked why there has been a delay in posting Hounslow site inspections on web, and why the Odournet surveys were not on the web?</p>	



	<p>Andy explained that there had been some delays caused by the internal signoff procedure and that he is currently working on ways to speed things up.</p> <p>As for the Odournet survey, a copy has been available for download from The Thames Water website, and a link to this was included in the original invite for the resident meeting.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher asked Richard Aylard to look at streamlining the company's internal approval procedures, which caused significant delays. This is because concerns associated with such delays were being taken up with LBH rather than Thames and that these delays were causing residents serious concerns.</p> <p>Richard apologised and agreed this would be done.</p>	
	<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>Planned for 6 months time, date to be confirmed.</p>	