

# Residents Liaison Meeting

Date/Time: 4 September 2013 6pm  
Venue: Conference Room, Mogden STW  
Chair: Richard Aylard, Thames Water



## Attendance

Name		Representing
* Richard Aylard	RA	Thames Water (Chair)
* Cllr Brad Fisher	BF	London Borough of Hounslow
* Cllr Ed Mayne	EM	London Borough of Hounslow
* Gerry McCarthy	GM	London Borough of Hounslow
* Tony Bull	TB	London Borough of Hounslow
* Keith Knight	KK	St John's Road Residents Association
* Barry Edwards	BE	Mogden Residents Action Group (MRAG)
* Paul Stocker	PS	Thames Water – Operations Manager
* Zak Espi-Castillo	ZEC	Thames Water – Process Manager
* Emily Goren	EG	Thames Water – Communications

### Apologies received from:

Mary Mcleod, MP		Member of Parliament for Brentford and Isleworth
Cllr Arnie Gibbons		London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
Cllr Matt Harmer		London Borough of Hounslow
Cllr Linda Davies		London Borough of Hounslow
Shaun Case		London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
Brian Pailin		Queensbridge (South) Residents Company
Murray Edwards		Mogden Residents Action Group (MRAG)
Clare Montgomery		Cole Park Residents Association
John Sullivan		Thames Water – Quality & Compliance Manager
Hilary Murgatroyd	HM	Thames Water – Local Government Liaison Officer

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

<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Review of previous minutes</b>	
1.05	1.1 A follow-up meeting with Entec has been arranged by HM for Monday 9 September.	Complete
1.10	1.3 Odour trend graphs are up-to-date as of 1 September.	Complete
1.15	1.4 EG has added the 'Council' category to the complaints graph.	Complete
1.20	1.5 BE would like to see the planning slides as he was not able to attend the last meeting.  <b>Post meeting note:</b> EG has emailed this as requested.	Complete
1.25	1.8 EG confirmed that Thames Water's Community Investment team would be happy to advertise for volunteers for a joint clean-up of the Duke of Northumberland river with the London Borough of Hounslow (LBH). GM and EM will discuss details and get back to EG.	GM/EM
1.30	3.2 BF is still surprised that Tescos don't complain about odour. There has been no change in LBH's investigation policy.	Complete
1.35	4.1 ZEC wrote to GM about the digesters, but GM still has concerns.	Complete
1.40	5.2 EG has produced a zoomed in graph for larvae activity as requested.	Complete
1.45	6.3 GM said that in general the test results were good, but that there are still questions to be answered.	James Clarke
1.50	7.2 ZEC reported that we are awaiting quotations from our grounds maintenance contractors for boundary work. BF said that our contractors had dumped green waste in a garden up Glen Walk. It was decided that EG would follow this up with Tina and Alan Wickes whom she met that day.	ZEC/EG
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Operations and Communications</b>	
2.1	<p>EG presented the slide saying that the Mogden Odour Management Plan (OMP) had been revised and signed off by the London Borough of Hounslow, with the exception of reducing the number of residents meetings from four a year to three.</p> <p>BE felt that as we are polluting the River Thames, four times a year would be appropriate.. RA replied that all discharges to the river are made under our consent from the Environment Agency (EA). They are the responsible body for determining whether or not pollution is occurring. BE asked if the EA consents to fish kills? RA said that he wasn't saying that, but nor had there been any fish kills since the extension became operational. PS added that there are also surcharges from the sewer system further downstream into the river during storms, hence why we are seeking permission to build the Thames Tideway Tunnel. BE said that he receives our rower notifications about Hammersmith. RA replied that Hammersmith will continue to discharge in storms until the tunnel is built.</p> <p>BE asked about the level of cleanliness of the river, because in 2015 there will be a ban on raw sewage going into rivers.* RA replied that we work within the regulatory framework of the EA, achieving the standards they set for our operations. RA recommended that BE contact the EA if he had concerns about the standards set.</p> <p>* BE may be referring to the revised European Bathing Water Directive due to come into force in 2015 relating to the standard of sea water at beaches. However, it should be noted that sewage is only one source of pollution that can cause beaches to fail the standards. More importantly, nowhere on the River Thames has been identified as a bathing beach.</p> <p>EM asked if additional meetings could be called if the need arose? RA said, yes. EM said that three or four meetings a year did not really make a difference. RA asked the attendees of the meeting if they agreed to reducing the meetings to three, everyone agreed.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> The next meeting will now be on Wednesday 5 February to spread the meetings more evenly though the year i.e. February, June and October.</p>	Note

<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Action</b>
2.2	<p>EG went through the operational correspondence graph. GM handed out his own analysis of the complaints that LBH have received. GM added that he had had two complaints that day, one from Heather Close and one from Harvesters Close about an effluent smell. GM added that LBH have sent out a leaflet to residents around Mogden giving details of how to complain. GM said that they had an out of hours call-out last Wednesday around 1am. ZEC was on call that night and handled it.</p> <p>PS commented that it would be helpful if MRAG sent through complaints as soon as possible. PS added that things have improved dramatically since he was last at Mogden so it does help.</p> <p>BE asked if GM had carried out an analysis on multiple complaints from the same people, as this would suggest where efforts needed to be concentrated. GM replied that he receives duplicates from MRAG.</p>	
2.3	<p>PS gave an explanation about how the digesters at Mogden work. BE asked why a rubber seal couldn't be used on the annular sludge seal? ZEC replied that it wasn't possible because the roof needs to be free to move and gas to escape if needs be.</p> <p>BE said that the digesters are now more odorous than any other part of the site. PS replied that we work hard to keep them in good order. ZEC added that as per the OMP a minimum of two checks are carried out of the digester area and each of the digesters is treated with anti-foam. PS continued that anti-foam works like soap to bubble bath foam. PS went on that automating the addition of anti-foam had been looked at but wasn't practical. KK said that the manual addition of the chemical couldn't be the most efficient way of doing it? PS said that we would continue to look into automated dosing, and that we would also keep investigating the odour around Tesco's/Mogden Lane but we need to be sure we have found the source of any problem before taking action.</p> <p>BF asked what the ideal level was? ZEC said it can vary depending on where the digester is on the fill sequence.</p> <p>GM said that since the gas take off pipes had been changed from underground to overground, and the gas coming off the digesters is around 37 degrees in temperature, it goes into steel that is at ambient temperature. What is done about condensation? ZEC replied that there are automated drainage points, of which we have recently replaced five. Water in the gas affects the composition and so it is in our interest to remove it.</p> <p>GM asked about the 60m<sup>3</sup> being pumped in and out. ZEC answered that that represented one fill cycle of which three are carried out per day. ZEC added that the sludge is then sent to Iver South for dewatering.</p> <p>GM said that gassing through the annular seals is seen on council site visits, causing a very pungent, although localised odour. It is still a problem though in GM's opinion.</p> <p>PS asked GM's opinion on the smell. GM said that there is a problem in the south-west corner of the site. RA asked ZEC's opinion. ZEC replied that there are always people on site, and that he and EG go around site regularly themselves and raise any issues seen. ZEC added that the Whessoe pressure release valves on the digesters are very rarely used and only serve as a safety mechanism.</p> <p>GM asked about the digester dome heights varying. ZEC replied that this is due to the digesters being filled at different rates, times and containing different amounts of gas. PS added that the domes being at different heights do not necessarily indicate an issue. GM asked if the PCEs needed more training? PS said that he believed not, but that we are currently assessing the six PCEs skill levels. PS added that ZEC has two huddles with the operatives a day. RA asked if GM met the PCEs. GM said yes, that he knew them all.</p> <p>BE said that the mystery was coming back and that we were saying that we didn't know what the smell was. BE continued that he feels we are going backwards. BE added that the technology is there, so he can't understand why we don't have a sealed system. EG replied that she has been in contact with a specialist company in the USA but they are not able to help us due to the design of our digesters. BE</p>	

<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<p>explained about how the Eden project deals with such things, but EG replied that their system would have been built from scratch.</p> <p>KK voiced his concern about manual control, asking if it could be run by computer? ZEC answered that the digesters are fully operated via computer software, but that the PCEs can adjust the automatic settings if needs be. ZEC added that the only manual operation is the dosing with anti-foam. PS continued that with pasteurisation back online and us increasing the temperature of the digesters, we should see less foaming. PS went on that we have to be careful with the digesters because they are effectively a living organism due to the bacteria they contain.</p> <p>BE said that he had always said that gas came off the aeration lanes, but that we didn't accept it until the Entec service was done. ZEC responded that the Entec report highlighted that the aeration lanes because of their size gave off the most odour units, but that the odour wasn't offensive. BE replied that if we get the seals right on the digesters, it will sort out the odour problem. ZEC replied that the digesters have been a real focus for a number of years and that this will continue. BE said that we will have to continue the work because residents will continue to think that Mogden stinks until the last odour source is eliminated. RA said that we are not complacent about this issue and that GM's inspections are very helpful. ZEC added that we are always looking to improve things on site as new technologies become available.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Odour – general discussion</b>	
3.1	EM said that he had experienced odour in his flat at night during the summer this year (Maltings Estate). RA said that when inversions form, sudden, strong odours can arise and persist at night. BF reported that this year and last year he had been able to sit out in his garden. BF added that he lives directly west of the site. EM agreed that things were definitely better, as he had been disturbed maybe two nights this year by odour. BE said that this was why he was pushing low cost / low tech solutions for Mogden because Thames Water can't control atmospheric conditions.	
3.2	EM said that he still believes that the odour at Memorial Square and Twickenham Road is from the drains rather than Mogden, and he has been in touch with the Thames Water Pollution Team. However, there was no odour on the day that the technician came to site so he was not able to suggest a course of action. KK said that the odour in Memorial Square is from a sewer lid venting and that a polythene lid was added to seal it, however, this is not always replaced when technicians go into the sewer. EG to follow up.	EG
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Mosquito survey results</b>	
4.1	TB requested that the non-zoomed graphs are removed.	EG
4.2	TB said that he was at Mogden last week auditing the site and the site was fine. TB's two comments are that wording should be looked at carefully to avoid a repeat of the 'historically low' misunderstanding, and that some of the EFKs (electronic fly killers) on site are not working. ZEC said that the funding has been granted and they will be replaced in a month.	ZEC
4.3	BE asked if a baseline could be added to the graph overlaid with just the current year to make it less 'busy'. TB and EG will liaise on this.	TB/EG
<b>5.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
5.1	BE asked about dechlorination and whether we monitor the level of chlorine in our final effluent before it is discharged into the river, as chlorine is very toxic to fish. BE continued saying that in the USA activated charcoal is added at sewage treatment works to purify the effluent. RA and PS explained that drinking water is dechlorinated before it goes into supply in the UK, with the residual chlorine leaving the water before it comes out of the tap. BE said most chemicals don't degrade, they change into something else.	

<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Action</b>
5.2	EM would like data on how much the storm tanks are used. EG said that the storm tank twice daily logs are faxed over to LBH every day. ZEC added that there is no benefit to us using the tanks. EM said he just wanted some data on it. RA asked if EG could put something together for EM. GM said that the EA data may help.	EG
5.3	BE asked about detergents in the sewer system, and asked if we monitor for them. PS said no, because they are not covered by our consent. PS continued that P (phosphate), which is the harmful aspect of detergent for river life, should not be a problem at Mogden, as we already dose the incoming effluent with ferrous chloride.	

<b>Dates of future meetings</b>	Wednesday 5 February 2014 Wednesday 4 June 2014 Wednesday 8 October 2014	<b>Time</b>	6pm
<b>Location</b>	Conference Room, Mogden STW		