

Residents' Liaison Meeting



Minutes of Meeting

26 November 2015, Conference Room, Mogden STW at 6pm

Attendees	
Organisation	Name
Thames Water	Richard Aylard
	Nigel Watts
	Tony Stanbridge
	Richard Dennett
	Mark Mathews
	Ian Cranshaw (Odour Expert)
	Rebecca Crawford
	Waleed Janjua
	Cecilia Larkin
Eight2O	Stefanie Hedgman
	Matt King
Odournet	Andrew Meacham
Public Representatives	Cllr Bob Whatley
	Joe Heal (Ruth Cadbury MPs office)
London Borough of Hounslow	Gerry McCarthy
	Tony Bull
Richmond Council	Shaun Case
MRAG	Barry Edwards
	Murray Edwards
Residents	Bruce Sparrow
	Michael Walsh
	Adriane Mead

Residents' Liaison Meeting



No.	Content	Action	Due date of Action
1.0	<p>At the request of the chairman all attendees introduced themselves.</p> <p>The chairman outlined the agenda for the evening's meeting.</p>		
2.0	<p>Review of previous minutes</p>		
2.1	<p>There were no outstanding actions from the previous meeting. It was agreed to proceed with the meeting.</p>		
3.0	<p>Operations & Communications</p>		
3.1	<p><u>Odournet Survey</u> R.Dennett (TW) gave a presentation and overview of the findings from the independently conducted Odournet Survey. He informed the meeting that the report enables TW to determine what, where and why smells/odour may be occurring in relation to Modgen STW operations. The report compares the 2008 results to the results collected in 2015, measuring the odour value per second.</p> <p>R.Dennett (TW) gave an outline of both performing and underperforming operational activities. He confirmed that: * OCU 12 is underperforming, as the carbon filter is not functioning at optimal level. However, it was confirmed that the carbon will be replaced with a newer form within two weeks. TW are currently awaiting the lab results in order to assess the exact findings of underperformance. * The East side odour units were tested under lower testing conditions than normal, which may have produced more favourable results. A retest will take place in 2016.</p> <p>G.McCarthy (LBH) wanted further clarification over OCU12's underperformance as the carbon filter in current use had only recently been replaced. R.Dennett reassured the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R.Dennett (TW) to provide update on the issues with OCU12 investigation. As requested by G.McCarthy (LBH). 	<p>Next R Meeting</p>

Residents' Liaison Meeting



	<p>meeting that carbon is still functioning, but not to the optimum level required. I.Cranshaw (TW) added, that the change of carbon will not be like for like. He stated that the existing carbon is copper impregnated whilst the updated version is essentially a virgin carbon which is untreated carbon allowing for a higher absorption level. B.Edwards (MRAG) requested a range of figures of odour release, both at national level and specific to Mogden.</p> <p>G.McCarthy (LBH) enquired if TW had monitored the level of sludge stocks in the East side PST's and compared these to the Odournet results.</p> <p><u>Detection of deterioration:</u> N.Watts (TW) requested further clarification regarding pre-emptive testing, enquiring into detection before deterioration. A.Meacham (Odournet) informed the meeting that the newer technology does rely on actual target levels, whilst the older models rely on predicted targets. I.Cranshaw (TW) stated that the current carbon deterioration in OCU 12 was due to a process upset, TW are currently working with the manufacturers to determine the root cause.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I.Cranshaw (TW) to provide a comparison on national STW odour levels. R.Dennett (TW) to confirm sludge stock levels on East Side PST's when Odournet survey was carried out. 	<p>Next R Meeting</p> <p>Next R Meeting</p>
4.0	Update on current major investment work		
4.1	<p>Overview: R.Dennett (TW) explained that TW have recently invested £4.5 million in Mogden in order to strive for optimum performance, the majority of this investment has been focused on odour control. He stressed the importance of maintaining this current level of high standards. He introduced eight2O and explained that the alliance partners work alongside TW.</p>		
4.2	<p>Storm Tanks: R. Dennett (TW) provided an update on the storm tanks at Mogden STW: * amajets are fully refurbished, * number of boxed spare amajets has increased to 8, * the storm return pumps will go through a rolling programme & the priming pumps have been replaced</p>		

Residents' Liaison Meeting



	<p>B.Edwards (MRAG) asked if the flushing of storm tanks had been implemented. R.Dennett (TW) clarified that the storm tanks were under maintenance and that TW were in the process of training staff in order to use the new pumps.</p>		
4.3	<p>OCUs: R.Dennett (TW) provided an overview of the investment and development of the Odour Control Units: * there has been a big financial investment, * the valves & pumps are under maintenance, * OCU work is estimated to reach completion by the end of 2015. * the Odour Management Plan is under review.</p>		
4.4	<p>Digesters: R.Dennett (TW) stated that the digesters are under constant observation and are performing well, he added that the wheels and sensor have been refurbished.</p>		
4.5	<p>Tanks: R. Dennett (TW) provided an update on the sludge storage, explaining that TW are undertaking a complete refurbishment of the scum removal system on tanks.</p>		
4.6	<p>Aeration Lanes: B.Edwards (MRAG) stated that 15% of odour comes from the aeration lanes, and asked how that could be improved upon. R.Dennett (TW) confirmed that the sludge stacks are high and part of the proposed work over the next 12 months is to improve the sludge treatment process by refurbishing an optimizing sludge handling assets.</p>		
4.7	<p>Other Investments: R.Dennett (TW) gave an overview of other TW investments: * £12-15 million investments to improve efficiency, serviceability and performance, * Replacement of aging assets, * replacing of air-blowers, (by March 2017)</p> <p>B.Edwards (MRAG) asked if the recent</p>		

Residents' Liaison Meeting



	<p>financial investments into Mogden STWs reflected the income that it generates. R.Aylard (TW) explained that it is difficult to isolate Mogden specific generated income from other TW works and from the costs of operating and maintaining the associated sewer network. R.Aylard (TW) valued the points made, however, he stated that it was important to take into account maintenance and operational costs. N.Watts (TW) added that the resident's question was valid, and that TW are continuously finding ways in which to improve service delivery.</p>		
5.0	Planning Application		
5.1	<p>Planning Application for multi-flue stack: M.Mathews (TW) provided an overview of the current planning application for the 26m high multi-flue stack to be positioned by the Power House, replacing the current stacks. He also noted that the CHP engines in the Power House are coming to the end of their life.</p> <p>M.Mathews (TW) explained that the air quality standards as stipulated by the EA, are much more stringent due to the change of engines, which in turn means that the current stacks' dispersion levels are not compliant with EA Standards. TW is required to improve air quality. It is for this reason that the proposed stack height is for 26m, thus ensuring a higher level of dispersion (which is Best Practice).</p> <p>M.Walsh (Resident) asked if it would be possible to contain the emissions rather than disperse them. S.Hedgman (eight20) provided further detail of the current dispersal process, and agreed to provide further information.</p> <p>B.Sparrow (Resident) wanted to know the process of choosing the proposed location for the new stack, and why it was going to be placed on southern side of the Power House. M.Mathews (TW) explained that the stack needs to be attached to the Power House in order to function correctly, that there are no suitable alternatives and that the northern side presents constraints by way of the access road (which cannot</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> S.Hedgman (eight20) to provide further information regarding to post-combustion abatement options and the question if the gasses can be "cleaned" within the stack. S.Hedgman (eight20) to provide further information as to how the location of the proposed stack was chosen. 	<p>TW will be in contact</p> <p>Next R meeting</p>

Residents' Liaison Meeting



	<p>be relocated). M.Walsh (Resident) would like to see a feasibility study on how the proposed location was decided upon.</p>		
5.2	<p>Visual Impacts: The eight2O representatives showcased a digital 3D model of the proposed 26m multi-flue stack. M.Mathews (TW) advised that there would be some visual impact for residents living in the residential areas to the south of the sewage treatment works, such as Beaumont Place.</p> <p>M.Walsh (Resident) commented on the 3D model being seasonal, and requested that the model show the visual impacts when there are no leaves on the trees. Furthermore, he was disappointed that the perspective was from the 1st floor of a building and argued that many homes have two or three floors. M.Mathews (TW) agreed that this would be beneficial, and stated that the 3D model was still being developed. He also requested that all stakeholders are free to offer suggestions on possible visual impact mitigation measures (such as colour etc). These can be made directly through the Customer & Stakeholder Manager at Mogden.</p> <p>M.Edwards (MRAG) asked if the existing bunds were put in place in order to mitigate the visual impacts of the Mogden site. R.Aylard (TW) stated that Mogden was built in 1935, at a time when it had no immediate neighbours. B.Edwards (MRAG) raised a concern over a perceived intensification of Mogden STW and queried if the building of the Thames Tunnel would be extended to Mogden, and take Mogden flows away for treatment elsewhere. R.Aylard (TW) countered this, confirming that all the updates at Mogden are due to service and performance improvement and not expansion. He stressed the importance of adapting modern and sustainable technology.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.Hegdman (eight2O) to provide assessment of impact in particular during winter months and review the approach taken to assess the visual impact from first floor and second/third floor windows. • M.Walsh (Resident) suggested that he would provide Thames Water with a photo from the top floor of his home in order to improve the visual impact assessment. 	<p>TW will be in contact</p> <p>TW will be in contact</p>
5.3	<p>Noise Impacts: R.Dennett (TW) provided an overview of the sound improvements to be expected</p>		

Residents' Liaison Meeting



	<p>from general refurbishment within the Power House. B.Sparrow (Resident) asked why the Power House doors were often left open, emitting noise. R.Dennett (TW) agreed that this practice was not desirable and was due to the combination of hot weather and the heat build-up of the engines in a confined space. However, this practice should soon cease, with the introduction of engines enclosed in a soundproof container. B.Edwards (MRAG) requested further clarification of engines used. N.Watts (TW) agreed, and requested that before and after data regarding air quality and noise be made available. M.Walsh (Resident) asked if a noise impact study had been undertaken as part of the planning application which was confirmed by M.Mathews (TW).</p> <p>M.Edwards (MRAG) stated that Local Authority guidelines stipulate that noise cannot be added to an existing area, G.McCarthy (LBH) said this would be considered by the Council</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R.Dennett (TW) to provide a noise assessment of the proposed plant, including a before and after assessment of noise levels. Before is to be a measurement of current engines and after is to be recorded once the new engines have been installed. 	<p>TW will be in contact</p>
<p>5.4</p>	<p>Odour Impacts & Air Emissions: In relation to the proposed 26m stack, and specifically its dispersion height, M.Walsh (Resident) asked if TW had taken into account Heathrow Airport and its flight lanes. S.Hedgman (eight2O) confirmed that Thames Water had taken this into account but that there is no evidence that airplanes approaching Heathrow have an impact on the much lower plume from the proposed stack. Furthermore, the relatively low height of the proposed stack does not trigger the need to consult with the Civil Aviation Authority.</p> <p>B.Edwards (MRAG) requested further discussion regarding the need for new stacks and new engines. M.Mathews (TW) explained that the EA have extremely stringent air quality guidelines, and in order to meet these requirements there is a constant need for improvement. Furthermore, in order to meet the permitting process, TW must comply with new standards – something that is not feasible with older technology.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> S.Hedgman (eight2O) to provide further information on air quality, in particular a comparison of the existing and proposed plant. Including a comparison of dispersion of current stacks against a prediction of dispersion of the proposed 26m height stack. 	<p>Next R Meeting</p>

Residents' Liaison Meeting



	I.Cranshaw (TW) added that the proposed 26m stack will create a higher dispersion that will result in a lower level of ground level concentrations at ground level. Also that the new engines (that are more efficient and sustainable) will be in acoustic enclosures.		
6.0	Stakeholder Communication & Engagement		
6.1	Notifications: C.Larkin (TW) provided an overview of the notification process, stating that most notifications concern OCUs and the ongoing refurbishment.		
6.2	Community Engagement: C.Larkin (TW) gave an overview of recent community engagement activities, and stressed the importance that TW place on community relations. She also gave an update on the engagement activities currently undertaken in local schools.		
7.0	Odour Surveys		
7.1	Odour Monitors: R.Dennett (TW) revealed that the position of two odour monitors has been repositioned, and this was a direct result of the last Residents Meeting. Monitors 6 & 7 have been moved to the perimeter of the site. B.Edwards (MRAG) requested the link to the odour monitor graphs that can also be viewed on the Mogden STW's website.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R.Crawford (TW) to include link of Mogden Odour Graphs in MoM. http://www.thameswater.co.uk/about-us/923.htm	Link attached to MoM
7.2	Odour Complaints: C.Larkin (TW) announced that there were zero complaints received in November concerning odour. Both B.Sparrow (Resident) and M.Edwards (MRAG) provided positive feedback, agreeing that Thames Water have greatly improved odour control in recent years. B.Edwards (MRAG) was concerned that the lack of complaints may be down to customer fatigue. B.Sparrow (Resident) asked why odour tended to be stronger at night, and wanted to ensure there wasn't an increase in Mogden's STWs activity.		

Residents' Liaison Meeting



	<p>I.Cranshaw (TW) suggested that this is likely, due to the fact that wind velocity is higher during the day. Dispersion is naturally lower at night which results in poorer dispersion resulting in more odour levels. The same scenario can be found with landfill sites. R.Dennett (TW) confirmed that no extra work activity takes place during the night.</p>		
8.0	Mosquito Survey		
8.1	<p>Mosquito Results & Data: C.Larkin (TW) provided an overview of the mosquito surveys undertaken on behalf of Thames Water. Adding that during the summer months surveys took place every week, whilst in the winter months the surveys took place once every second week.</p> <p>T.Bull (LBH) confirmed that TW are following the correct protocol for mosquito surveying. He also noted that the methods TW use and the complaints received regarding mosquitos are steadily improving; he insisted that TW should not relax, and should strive to maintain their high standards.</p>		
8.2	<p>Mosquito Complaints: C.Larkin (TW) announced that there was 1 fly complaint this year, however, under investigation it has not been confirmed to be from Mogden. T.Bull (LBH) was unable to confirm this fact. During his audits he can confirm that breeding sites in Mogden are down. T.Bull (LBH) has received 5 complaints about mosquitos this year he confirmed that not all were about Mogden. B.Edwards (MRAG) wanted it noted in the minutes, that he feels TW have made huge improvements in reducing the number of mosquitos and the associated impacts.</p>		
9.0	AOB		
9.1	<p>106 Odour Reduction Agreement: G.McCarthy (LBH) stated that he was still awaiting a reply from Council officials regarding the submission made by TW on the 106 agreement.</p> <p>B.Edwards (MRAG) requested odour monitoring and testing on a smaller site than Mogden as was previously</p>		

Residents' Liaison Meeting



	discussed with L.Gosden (TW). N.Watts (TW) confirmed that he will arrange a meeting with the TW innovation team in order to progress this discussion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N.Watts (TW) to arrange internal meeting with TW Innovation team, in order to discuss the possibility of conducting an odour survey on a smaller site than Mogden. 	Will report findings at next R Meeting
9.2	24hr telephone line: T.Stanbridge (TW) gave an explanation of the new 24hr line process. The purpose of line is to get real time reporting of odour problems, so that it can be investigated and resolved at the time that the customer is experiencing it. The customer will then be contacted during office hours		
9.3	Next Meeting: The next Resident Meeting will be held in February 2016, the exact details are TBC.		