

# Residents Liaison Meeting

Date/Time: 23 July 2014 6pm

Venue: Conference Room, Mogden STW

Chair: Chris Shipway, Thames Water



## Attendance

Name		Representing
* Chris Shipway	CS	Thames Water (Chair)
* Cllr Ed Mayne	EM	London Borough of Hounslow
* Cllr Bob Whatley	BW	London Borough of Hounslow
* Gerry McCarthy	GM	London Borough of Hounslow
* Shaun Case	SC	London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
* Keith Knight	KK	St John's Road Residents Association
* Barry Edwards	RJ	Mogden Residents Action Group (MRAG)
* Murray Edwards	ME	Mogden Residents Action Group (MRAG)
* Paul Stocker	PS	Thames Water – Operations Manager
* Andrew Georgiades	AG	Thames Water – Process Manager
* Emily Goren	EG	Thames Water – Team Manager
* Lisa McGhee	LM	Thames Water – Communications (temporary post holder. Where necessary actions will be passed onto LM's successor).

Present – Full Time (\*), Part Time (^)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Review of previous minutes</b>	
1.1	1.1 GM and EG continue to liaise over the joint clean-up of the Duke of Northumberland river with London Borough of Hounslow. A small clean-up was undertaken at the end of March but more needs to be done including fencing. EG/LM to advertise as an opportunity as part of Thames Water's 'Time to Give' employee volunteering scheme. GM to investigate working with the Community PayBack service for additional support.	GM/EG
1.2	1.7 Going forward mosquito graphs are to be presented showing only trend lines from the following years: 2003, 2010 and 2014. Barry Edwards pointed out this will make the graphs less busy and confusing, and show the improvement Thames Water has made on this front.	LM
1.3	1.8 EG invited EM to site to view the storm tank data as compiling it would take too long. PS said he believed a simplified version of this data has been compiled into graphs. EM thinks that this data will suffice. EG to source and send on to EM.	EG
1.4	2.1 The analysis of LBH's complaint analysis has been added to the minutes of this meeting.	LM
1.5	3.4 EG confirmed that Process Controllers are using the new storm tank daily check sheets.	Complete
1.6	3.5 EG has been delayed in getting information on whether or not it is practical to cover the feed channels because Thames Water's internal expert has retired. EG to update in two weeks. Meanwhile, the upcoming results of the Odournet report will be used to inform whether covering the feed channels is necessary or not.	
1,7	3.7 Trialling of use of antifoam on the digesters has proved successful. Since the last meeting an even more effective antifoam has been identified, trialled and instated. AG advised that a new pump will be arriving in three weeks that will improve the process further.	
1.8	There were no other comments and so the previous minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Operations and Communications</b>	
2.1	EG ran through the operations update, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Odournet olfactometry report, May and June visits</li> <li>The next Mogden Update newsletter will be sent by the end of September 2014.</li> <li>The Mogden mosquito campaign is due to go out imminently. This has been delayed this year due to staffing changes and shortages.</li> <li>Staffing changes: Zak Espi-Castillo has moved into a new role within Thames Water after eight years at Mogden. Andrew Georgiades is taking up the post of Process manager. Emily Goren has moved into the Team Manager post. These appointments retain core experience at Mogden, and further recruitment to backfill these vacancies will be completed as soon as possible. In the short term the Customer and Stakeholder role is being fulfilled by Lisa McGhee.</li> </ul>	
2.2	BE raised the point that residents would like more detailed information about site performance, sources of problems and Thames Water's efforts and successes in odour control. LM advised that a balance needs to be drawn between providing information that will be appealing to residents who have taken great interest and are very knowledgeable about the sites, and residents who are perhaps newer to the area, or have performed less research. LM to look into, particularly when producing content for the next Mogden newsletter.	LM
2.3	EG went through the operational correspondence graph showing the complaints received: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thames Water received one odour complaint in February 2014, one about operative conduct and a further one about grounds maintenance.</li> </ul>	

Item	Description	Action
2.4	<p>Meanwhile LBH received 14 odour complaints. Thames Water received seven odour complaints in March 2014, two about mosquitoes and one about grounds maintenance. LBH received six complaints during this period. In April Thames Water received five odour complaints, one about communications, one regarding a squeaking noise coming from site, and one about ground maintenance. LBH received 32 complaints. In May Thames Water received two odour complaints. LBH received 29 complaints. In June Thames Water received five odour complaints, two mosquito complaints and one about communications. LBH received 20 complaints.</p> <p>GM handed out his own analysis of the complaints that LBH have received. GM encouraged attendees to ring LBH if they experience odour from Mogden.</p>	
2.5	It was identified that there has been an increase in complaints between May and June. EG and PS to investigate.	EG/PS
2.6	EM mentioned that odour from Mogden had been a major point of contention during the recent elections. He added that the majority of comments were made by people living further away from the site rather than close to it.	
2.7	EG was asked if there is a central team of Thames Water employees who survey for odour. There is an odour team, but currently results of their surveys are not shared externally. EG to investigate and find out if we can share with LBH.	EG
2.8	GM was asked if data reflecting whether or not investigations of odour complaints result in finding offensive levels of odour. GM said he can do this and will provide at the next meeting.	GM
3.0	<b>Odournet report</b>	
3.1	<p>EG presented a summary of Odournet's May report, and spoke about Thames Water's continued action on the Odournet report, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Replace the carbon in the East Side, West Side and Sludge Thickening Odour Control Units (OCUs): This has been completed. The new media has an expected lifetime of five years. We will be monitoring its condition. The OCUs are still operating within the Odour Management Plan's trigger levels.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Confirm that the current odour abatement performance of the Inlet PS OCU has improved to levels indicated by recent hydrogen sulphide monitoring data: According to Odournet, the residual odour concentration has reduced from the 2013 survey and is in the region expected. As mentioned on the previous slide, the OCUs are operating within the Odour Management Plan's trigger levels agreed with the London Borough of Hounslow.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Install a scum suppression system in the anoxic zone of Bank E to eliminate scum formation: This is in full operation and is being inspected by the London Borough of Hounslow on a weekly basis. We are very pleased with its operation to date.</i></li> <li>4. <i>Review the operational procedures around the storm channels to reduce retention of storm water in between storm events: The storm tank feed channels are inspected twice daily as part of the storm tank checks. If the feed channels need flushing, this is recorded on the storm tank check sheets and carried out by the on-duty Process Control Engineer (PCE). The check sheets are then sent to the London Borough of Hounslow daily.</i></li> </ol>	
3.2	Stagnant water resting in storm tank hoppers was raised as a continuing source of odour. PS explained that as the storm tanks drain down, solids clog the hoppers leaving a small amount of water unable to pump through to feed channels. This water requires manual over-pumping to the feed channels, which is a time and labour intensive job. PS assured attendees that we will look into the issue. PS to speak to Thames Water engineers before next meeting. BE advised that a potential solution for the problem could be increasing turbulence as effluent drains down by creating more friction on the walls of the tank as the water drains down, reducing the likelihood of clogging.	PS

<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Action</b>
3.3	Thames Water was asked to include results of the Odournet surveys in the next Mogden newsletter. LM to include.	LM
3.4	OCU's are much improved. PS said Thames Water is committed to continue improving them.	
3.5	Odournet is preparing to analyse some sealed air samples to analyse odour components. Thames Water intends to use the output of this analysis to inform any necessary changes in chemical and PH levels during the treatment process with the goal of reducing odour.	AG
3.6	PS acknowledged that odour is not purely made up from H <sub>2</sub> S components, and committed to a review of Odournet's remit for checks.	
3.7	The June Odournet report was unavailable at the time of the meeting, and is not expected to be returned until around 13 August 2014. However, EG was able to provide Odournet's projected findings following preliminary analysis: <i>"Changes in site emissions that are a result of the extension should result in a broadly odour neutral situation."</i>	
3.8	LM requested to put notice of issue with data monitors on the Mogden customer website.	LM Complete
3.9	Thames Water is currently reviewing its odour monitor technology it operates (JEROME monitors) and has commissioned quotes for replacements.	
3.10	BE said the JEROME monitors are not an adequate indicator of odour.	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Mosquito survey results</b>	
4.1	EG ran through the mosquito update, including: Updated graphs showing mosquito activity year-to-date.	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
5.1	BE asked when Thames Water is going to put tougher measures on itself in terms of Code of Conduct. PS said we review it annually and raise the bar when required.	
5.2	ME asked who will now be responsible onsite for site inspections and housekeeping issues. EG and AG confirmed that they would be. ME said that housekeeping issues are contributing to a perception issue. For example, dried rag has been spotted during LBH inspections and though this may not be a source of odour, it reflects badly on the maintenance onsite.	
5.3	EG was asked to provide a date when the sealed air sample analysis will be available from Odournet.	EG
5.4	EM commented on wider network issues. There are manholes in town which are significant sources of odour. EG to communicate with EM regarding this matter separately.	EG
5.5	BE said he feels that Thames Water has misunderstood the core purpose of the S106 agreement. EG and GM to meet with BE to discuss further.	EG/GM
5.6	BE and ME offered Thames Water support in terms of stirring residents to support a Defra application for increased funding to resolve odour issues.	
5.7	BE said a bearing has gone somewhere onsite, resulting in a high-pitched noise as air is released. It is heard in the early hours of them morning when noise pollution is at its lowest. AG to investigate.	<b>AG</b>

<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Action</b>

<b>Dates of future meetings</b>	Wednesday 8 October 2014 Wednesday 4 February 2015 Wednesday 10 June 2015	<b>Time</b>	6pm
<b>Location</b>	Conference Room, Mogden STW		