

Residents Liaison Meeting



Date/Time: 27 January 2010
Venue: Conference Room, Mogden STW
Chair: Richard Aylard, Thames Water

Attendees:

Name	Representing
Richard Aylard	Thames Water (Chair)
Cathy Gallagher	London Borough of Hounslow
Gerry McCarthy	London Borough of Hounslow
Tony Bull	London Borough of Hounslow
Shaun Case	London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
Councillor Hardy	LB Hounslow
Richard Johnston	Queensbridge Residents Co.
Simon Eaton-Walker	MRAG
Barry Edwards	MRAG
Siân Thomas	Thames Water – Area Network Manager
Andrew Georgiades	Thames Water – Process Manager
Adrian Jack	Thames Water – Project Manager
James Clarke	Thames Water – Project Manager's Representative
Andy Gingell	Thames Water – Communications
Sonia Rana	Thames Water – Communications



No	Item	Actions
	<p>Agenda</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review of previous minutes 2. Operations and correspondence 3. Mosquitoes 4. Tidal Thames Quality Improvements Project - Update 5. Communications 6. AOB 7. Date of next meeting 	
	<p>Apologies received from:</p> <p>Councillor Jabbal Councillor Bath Michael Mehta Phil Hayman Hanifa Dobson Rachel Addis</p>	
1	<p>Review of previous minutes</p> <p>Barry Edwards felt that the UK water quality bathing standards applied all the way up to Teddington as this is the tidal range of the River Thames.</p> <p>Richard Aylard responded, explaining that the bathing standards do not apply to the tidal part of the Thames and committed to comment further outside of the meeting.</p> <p>[Extract from the Defra bathing waters and Bathing Water Directive</p> <p>"During 2009 there were 414 identified and monitored bathing waters in England, 81 in Wales, 80 in Scotland and 24 in Northern Ireland, making a total of 599 bathing waters across the UK. Of these sites, 587 are coastal waters and 12 are inland freshwater sites."</p> <p>More information can be found on the link below: http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/quality/water/waterquality/bathing/index.htm#number]</p> <p>Gerry McCarthy asked if there was a formal response from Guaranteed Leaflet Distribution about them failing to distribute the mosquito leaflet to a number of properties around the works.</p> <p>Richard responded stating that the company had refused to respond to our requests for a proper explanation and Thames Water have blacklisted them from our supply chain, meaning we will not be using them again. He apologised once again to all those residents who didn't receive the publication.</p>	



2	<p>Operations and correspondence (slides 3 – 5)</p> <p>Siân Thomas ran through the operational correspondence slides, explaining that since the last meeting, the volume of contacts had been very low.</p> <p>Siân explained that a number of notifications had been sent out relating to work on the pasteurisation plant odour control unit.</p> <p>Richard Johnston asked about the servicing of the odour control units, enquiring as to why Thames Water chooses to service the odour control equipment in the summertime.</p> <p>Andrew Georgiades explained that the odour control units are serviced annually and as-and-when necessary beyond that. He added that the pasteurisation plant odour control unit has a number of processing streams, meaning that servicing activities can be carried out without compromising the unit's performance. The notifications related to this kind of work are often sent out as precautionary measures.</p> <p>Richard Aylard asked the operational teams to look at their maintenance programme and check that where possible, maintenance activities on odorous plant is carried out outside of the summer months.</p> <p>Barry Edwards asked if he could see a year on year breakdown of plant servicing activities.</p> <p>Barry added that one of the reasons why complaints are so low is because many residents have given up complaining. And it's not that the works are improving and people aren't complaining.</p> <p>Barry asked if we could do some analysis of complaint numbers, compared to the maintenance regimes at Mogden.</p> <p>Simon Eaton-Walker stated that he thought such information was detailed in the OdourNet report.</p> <p>Richard Aylard stated that if such analysis could add any value, then Thames Water would consider carrying out some further complaints analysis.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy stated that cumulatively, complaint numbers had increased.</p> <p>Andy Gingell responded, explaining that since the planning committee, we had not received any complaints relating to either odour or mosquitoes.</p> <p>Siân Thomas proceeded to talk through the remaining notifications, explaining that there had been a few issues with the west side</p>
----------	--



primary tanks, namely their scraper systems, which had resulted in a number of maintenance activities. There had also been a minor sludge spill.

Richard Johnston asked how big a minor sludge spill was, and how Thames Water differentiate between a minor and major spill.

Andrew Georgiades explained that the difference between a minor and major spill is classified by the response time that operatives can respond to a spill. Typically a minor spill is when sludge overflows the digester seal over the lip wall and operatives can swiftly make the necessary adjustments and clean up any mess within a short time period.

Barry Edwards asked if Thames are going to be carrying out analysis on customer complaints, please can we include the number of storm tanks that are used each day?

Siân Thomas questioned whether such analysis would be relevant for discussion within this forum.

Simon Eaton-Walker stated that such analysis would be very relevant as the planning application was approved on the basis on reducing the number of storm tank uses.

Richard clarified that although the main driver for the project was to reduce sewage from going into the Thames, significant additional benefits would arise, including reducing the frequency of storm tank use.

Richard added that Thames Water have agreed to a binding section 106 commitment relating to storm tank usage. Should we use the uncovered tanks 6 or more times and generating unacceptable odour, within a rolling year, then we will seek funding from Ofwat to cover the remaining tanks.

Barry Edwards stated that storm tank use information would also be useful in connection with the new abatement notice, explaining that it would be useful to check that Thames Water is complying with the terms.

We have appealed each of the abatement notices served but are complying with a number of the conditions within them.

Councillor Hardy asked if Thames Water would publish the storm tank logs on the web.

Richard responded, explaining that it would not be appropriate to publish the day to day activities of running a sewage treatment works.

Councillor Hardy replied, stating that if Thames Water won't be using the storm tanks as often, then there won't be as many updates to



publish.

Richard Aylard stated that he is not prepared to commit further resource to such an activity.

Simon Eaton-Walker asked if Gerry McCarthy had access to this information.

Cathy Gallagher answered yes, explaining that as part of the S106, the London Borough of Hounslow will be reporting on any storm tank breach of terms.

Barry Edwards stressed that the storm tanks should only be used as a result of heavy rainfall, not for the normal day to day running of the site.

Richard Aylard responded stating that storm tanks are a normal part of the sewage treatment process and they can be used for any number of reasons.

Barry Edwards contested Richard's statement explaining that he understood that they were only for use in times of heavy rain when the process can't cope.

Richard responded explaining that the storm tanks can be used for a variety of reasons, but all essentially as a buffer. If we need to use the tanks to help us meet our regulatory requirements or prevent sewage from going into the River Thames, then we will.

Barry Edwards stated that there are more and more households connecting into the sewer pipe network and surely this must be putting a strain on Mogden by increasing flows into the works.

Richard explained that new housing developments all have separate arrangements for storm water, so the additional flows coming into the works are relatively small as they do not include any additional rainwater and groundwater that has infiltrated into the sewer system. Barry responded explaining that although he understands why we need to use the storm tanks, he explained that the tanks are a very contentious issue for local residents which Thames Water needs to address.

Richard Aylard agreed and explained that we are making significant improvements to the site which will not only reduce sewage from going into the River Thames, but will also reduce the need to use the storm tanks. He added that Thames Water have committed to very clear S106 planning conditions relating to storm tank use which are legally binding.

Richard Johnston asked what the time definition is before a use of a storm tank becomes a S106 condition breach.

Cathy Gallagher responded explaining that if Thames Water have



committed to 6 uses of storm tanks within a rolling 12 month period, with each use not exceeding 72 hours.

Richard Johnston asked how the London Borough of Hounslow will know when Thames Water is using the tanks.

Cathy Gallagher stated that detailed records kept by Thames Water are inspected on a weekly basis.

Gerry McCarthy asked why the converted circular primary tank work had not been completed, as to date he had not received a satisfactory answer.

Adrian Jack explained that we plan to deliver the 100ML project by the end of April. Unfortunately, engineering buildability problems that we weren't aware of had created challenges and delays.

Simon Eaton-Walker asked why Thames Water were holding back information from the London Borough of Hounslow.

Adrian Jack apologised if communications hadn't been clear enough, adding that these delays have not been helpful to Thames Water, as we want those tanks in service faster than anyone else does.

Councillor Hardy stated that communications with Council Officers is bad, let alone communications with members of the public.

Barry Edwards added that storm tank usage and site investigations need to be shared to give the public the credibility they deserve.

Richard Aylard stated that it would be hard to commit to anything more binding than a Section 106.

Simon Eaton-Walker asked for clarity as he understood the storm tanks were only used in rain storms.

Richard Aylard clarified that the tanks are used during and following periods of heavy rain, however if they are needed on other occasions to make sure we meet our regulatory outputs and keep sewage out of the River Thames, then we will.

Simon Eaton-Walker asked if Thames Water are going to fill the tanks and leave them.

Cathy Gallagher responded stating that it doesn't matter what the tanks are used for, if Thames Water use them, they will be caught by the S106.



<p>3</p>	<p>Mosquitoes (slides 6 – 13)</p> <p>Andy Gingell ran through the mosquito slides showing the results of surveys carried out by independent mosquito experts and explained the different control methods used on site.</p> <p>Tony Bull asked about the use of fungicide sprays in the covered primary tanks following the small fly infestation last year. He specifically asked whether Thames Water had found any health and safety or operational reasons why a certain product couldn't be used.</p> <p><u>Siân Thomas did not have the information available and agreed to find out for the next meeting and share the results of the entomologists' survey.</u></p> <p>Siân explained that she understood the problem with dealing with the fly infestation was that certain chemicals couldn't be used within confined spaces. The chemicals also required ultraviolet light to break them down, meaning that they couldn't be used in the covered tanks as they would affect the sensitive biological processes and risk compromising the quality of the final treated effluent.</p> <p>Siân added that we were looking for alternatives which can be used.</p> <p>Richard Johnston asked for clarity on the cause of the infestation as he understood that it was caused by a failure of the tank mechanisms, and if that hadn't happened it wouldn't be a problem.</p> <p>Andrew Georgiades responded explaining that the scraper mechanisms hadn't been working properly, creating a build-up of sludge on the tank surface, which created a breeding ground for the flies. He added that we have since reviewed our procedures and these have been documented in the site odour management plan, cascaded down through teams working on site.</p> <p>Barry Edwards stated that he was still finding mosquitoes at his house.</p> <p>Tony Bull asked him to let him know the specific details and to send him samples to analyse.</p> <p>Barry responded stating he couldn't remember the specific details of when the mosquitoes were in his house. He added that Thames Water need to correlate the survey information with what customers are experiencing.</p> <p>Andy Gingell showed the graphs demonstrating reduced levels of mosquito activity and compared them to complaint data showing the number of contacts.</p>	<p>ST</p>
-----------------	---	-----------



4	<p>Tidal Thames Quality Improvements Project – Update (slides 14 – 19)</p> <p>Richard started the Tideway Improvements section of the meeting by explaining all five tideway sewage treatment works had received funding approval for works to improve the quality of the River Thames. Four of those works have planning approval and preparatory work had begun on many of the sites.</p> <p>Adrian Jack gave an overview of the project, explaining the drivers for the scheme. He explained that we have recently started some of the preparatory work which needs to happen ahead of commencing construction in Spring.</p> <p>He explained that Black and Veatch had been awarded the contract and representatives from their team would attend the next meeting.</p> <p>Richard Aylard asked Adrian what the planned working hours are, and what measures have been put in place to make sure that these working hours are adhered to.</p> <p>Adrian responded explaining that Black and Veatch had requested working hours between 7am and 7pm.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher stated that Thames Water had agreed that working hours will be 8am to 6:30pm.</p> <p>Adrian reassured Cathy that the core construction working hours would be between those times.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy stated that Thames Water will need to be strict with their contractors, asking if there will be a man on site with authority over them.</p> <p>Adrian responded explained that James Clarke (TW) has been appointed as his onsite representative with those powers of authority.</p> <p>Barry Edwards asked if we had accounted for dust.</p> <p>Adrian answered, stating that the teams will take the necessary precautions to keep any dust to minimum and this has been built in to the engineering protocols. He also added that we plan to replant the embankment as soon as we can, which will help.</p> <p>Sonia Rana explained that we would be letting residents know of any disruptive activities through targeted communications.</p> <p>Sean Case asked if there will be a gradual reduction in the use of storm tanks.</p> <p>Adrian Jack answered no, explaining that there won't be any reduction in usage until the end of the project, once the project has been completed.</p>	
---	---	--



	<p>Tony Bull asked about what was being done to prevent new breeding sites for mosquitoes in the new plant and equipment.</p> <p>Adrian responded explaining that we had been working with our entomologists to engineer out potential breeding sites, for example making sure that floors are either sloping or free draining. He added that Black and Veatch are also obliged to identify and report sites so we can carry out any necessary control measures.</p> <p>Richard Johnston commended the fact that mosquitoes had been written into the contract, but wanted to know how Thames Water / Black and Veatch would be penalised if those conditions are breached.</p> <p>Gerry McCarthy responded stating that there were strict controls in the form of a S106 mosquito management plan.</p>	
5	<p>Communications (slides 20 – 22)</p> <p>Andy Gingell ran through the communications slides, explaining that we will be sending out a newsletter to update residents on what's happening on site and he handed around a copy of the final proof.</p> <p>Andy also explained that we have a new telephone number for Mogden residents to call should they wish to get in touch</p> <p>Councillor Hardy asked if we were planning on contacting the local schools about disruptive activities, especially as it's likely that such activities may happen during the run up to exam time.</p> <p>Sonia Rana explained that this has already been considered and communicating with local schools will form part of the communications plan for the project.</p>	
6	<p>AOB</p> <p>Andy Gingell announced that Thames Water are planning to have a site open day on 10 April.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy explained that he would not be able to make that weekend, as that is over the Easter holiday, and could we consider 17 April instead as this would be more accessible for many.</p> <p>Richard Aylard agreed to amend the date.</p> <p>Barry Edwards asked when the next expansion would be.</p> <p>Richard Aylard responded stating that it is possible that one day in the future the site may need to expand again, but tried to reassure Barry that all of our improvements have been designed to best meet the requirements that we have modelled, using the best available</p>	



	<p>data.</p> <p>Simon Eaton-Walker stated that there were issues with grounds maintenance, and was not happy.</p> <p>Siân Thomas explained that there had been problems with the grounds maintenance, and things are improving. She also added that she was aware of Simon's concerns.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>Thursday 10 June, 5.30pm Conference room, Mogden STW</p>	