

Residents Liaison Meeting



Date/Time: 23 September 2009 – 6.00pm
Venue: Conference Room, Mogden STW
Chair: Richard Aylard, Thames Water

Attendees:

Name	Representing
Richard Aylard	Thames Water
Councillor Jonathan Hardy	London Borough of Hounslow
Councillor Barbara Reid	London Borough of Hounslow
Councillor Andrew Dakers	London Borough of Hounslow
Councillor Ruth Cadbury	London Borough of Hounslow
Councillor Bradley Fisher	London Borough of Hounslow
Councillor Phil Andrews	London Borough of Hounslow
Councillor Paul Fisher	London Borough of Hounslow
Cathy Gallagher	London Borough of Hounslow
Gerry McCarthy	London Borough of Hounslow
Michael Mehta	London Borough of Hounslow
Tony Bull	London Borough of Hounslow
Simon Eaton-Walker	Mogden Resident Action Group
Barry Edwards	Mogden Resident Action Group
Adan Ahmed	Isleworth Somali Community Group
Keith Knight	St Johns Resident Association
Jane Talbot	Queensbridge Residents Co.
Richard Johnson	Queensbridge Residents Co.
Paul Stocker	Thames Water – Acting Catchment Manager
Andrew Georgiades	Thames Water – Plant Manager
Andy Gingell	Thames Water – Communications
Mark Mathews	Thames Water – Planner
Adrian Jack	Thames Water – Project Manager
Amy Dutton	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 and the Mosquito Awareness Campaign 2009 4. Tidal Thames Quality Improvements Project 5. Communications 6. AOB 	
	<p>Apologies received from:</p> <p>Councillor John Cooper Trevor Whittall Al Ayoby</p>	
1	<p>Review of previous minutes</p> <p>All actions had been carried out and no further comments were made.</p>	
2	<p>Agenda items 2 - 6</p> <p>Andy Gingell talked through the operational correspondence graphs, noting that there had been a high number of complaints this summer compared to last year. This is most likely to be linked to the extensive use of the storm tanks, owing to the heavy rainfall of summer and more recently continuing high groundwater levels.</p> <p>Andy explained that there have also been odours associated with the change over from the chemical odour control unit to the biological one. He explained that Thames Water had sent out a notification related to this work as the operational teams were aware that there may be some odours at the early stages of getting the plant running (known as the re-seeding phase). He explained that the management had been monitoring the plant's progress and were not happy with its effectiveness. As a result, a decision was made to shut down the unit and revert back to the chemical odour control unit. The manufacturers have been asked to investigate.</p> <p>Andy stated that the main source of odour relating to this summer's complaints was most likely to link to the extensive use of the storm tanks.</p> <p>Richard Aylard added that it's well documented that this year has been one of the wettest summers we've seen for a long time.</p> <p>Richard asked Paul Stocker to talk about flows into a sewage treatment works and the problems associated with the wet weather at Mogden.</p> <p>Paul Stocker explained that he is a process engineer who has worked on</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>a number of sites that vary in scale. He explained that on smaller works, flow trends show a clear daily pattern of peaks (morning and evening) and troughs of incoming flows. This means that if small sites' storm tanks are full, there is a clear opportunity to empty any storm water back into the process streams.</p> <p>Paul explained that, because of the size of the catchment, there is no clear daily pattern of highs and lows at Mogden. This means that it can be very difficult to return the contents of any full storm tanks back to the head of the works for processing.</p> <p>Paul also stressed that he has no commercial incentive to use the storm tanks, not only from a perspective of reducing complaints, but it costs money to pump sewage.</p> <p>Richard Aylard asked Paul what would happen if you 'pushed' the flow from the storm tanks through the works as an extra effort to get them empty.</p> <p>Paul Stocker explained that this would be very harmful to the environment. He elaborated, explaining that on a simple level; sewage treatment is a process involving the slowing down of waste water coming out of the sewer network to allow all of the solids in suspension to 'drop out'. If you increase the flow, or try and speed up the processing of the flows you will lose out on quality. This is something we cannot compromise on.</p> <p>Paul gave an example of how sensitive the site can be explaining that last Sunday at around 10pm he had process engineers inspecting the storm tanks in the dark trying to evaluate the potential risks to our final effluent discharge should we have to go to storm.</p> <p>Councillor Phil Andrews asked what the rationale behind storm tank use is, and could Thames Water provide an indication of the frequency of storm tank use?</p> <p>Paul Stocker explained that sewage treatment works are designed for a certain capacity. We estimate how much waste water is likely to come into the works based on factors such as number of properties, trade effluent discharges, infiltration, and cross connections.</p> <p>Paul stated that in an ideal world we would have two separate systems with a sewer for rainwater and runoff, and another for sewage. He explained that historically, sewers have been allowed to be combined and this is why sewage treatment works need to use storm tanks as contingencies.</p> <p>Paul explained that whenever we build new sewage infrastructure, we factor in the storm return periods that we might expect, such as a 1 in 10 year rainfall event. Over the last summers, we are seeing more of the 1</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>in 100 year storms. He added that such storms are likely to become even more frequent in years to come.</p> <p>Councillor Phil Andrews asked how many times the tanks are used.</p> <p>Richard Aylard answered, explaining that during this wet summer, especially in July and August, he understood that the tanks were in use for most of the time, if not all of the time.</p> <p>Paul Stocker clarified that from July through to August, the tanks were in use all of the time. He reiterated that the main challenge comes in emptying the storm tanks. He explained that the only way to deal with this problem is to try and increase the treatment flows to the maximum rate without creating a risk of any compromise to final effluent quality.</p> <p>Richard Aylard went on to explain that the longer the tanks are left before they can be emptied back into the process, the more septic and odorous they become.</p> <p>Paul explained that to keep odours to a minimum, when we can't get the tanks empty, they are flushed with fresh effluent. Although this still won't remove all the odours, it makes a significant improvement over the septic sewage.</p> <p>Councillor Phil Andrews asked to what extent the previous odour management plans covered details regarding storm tanks.</p> <p>Richard answered, explaining that Paul wasn't in post at when the previous plans were in place and wouldn't be able to comment.</p> <p>Councillor Barbara Reid asked if Thames Water only use the storm tanks when it rains.</p> <p>Richard answered explaining that it's not necessarily the case as there are still issues, such as infiltration into the sewer network, that increase flows such that we need to use the storm tanks.</p> <p>Councillor Jonathan Hardy stated that only using the storm tanks when it rains is not true and that the tanks are in use for around 50% of the time as detailed in the information on a storm tank study. He went on to state the problem is that the plant has a daily treatment capacity of 510 mega litres per day.</p> <p>Richard Aylard clarified why we have to use the storm tanks, likening the situation to a laundrette. He explained, there is only so much washing you can put through the machines, when you get too much dirty washing coming through the door, you have to park it somewhere until a machine becomes free to clean it.</p> <p>Paul Stocker added to Richard's comments explaining that one of the</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>other limitations is our discharge consents, set by the Environment Agency. These consents allow us to discharge to the river only as a last resort.</p> <p>Paul Stocker asked Councillor Hardy where the 50% reference came from.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy responded stating that it was taken from some research carried out in 2006 and 2007.</p> <p>Paul stated he was unable to comment as he was not aware of the study but wanted to reassure Councillor Hardy that the storm tanks have not been used for 50% of the time this year.</p> <p>Councillor Cadbury asked Richard why Mogden treats 50% of Thames Water's customers' waste.</p> <p>Paul Stoker stated that 50% was not true. <i>Post meeting note: The figure is around 14%.</i></p> <p>Councillor Cadbury went on to ask if Mogden is the largest sewage treatment works in Europe.</p> <p>Richard responded stating that Mogden is one of the largest in the UK, and in the TW area is third to Beckton and Crossness in East London.</p> <p>Councillor Cadbury asked if Thames Water considered providing additional smaller works, rather than expanding Mogden.</p> <p>Richard answered yes, explaining that whenever we go to the regulator for funding, we have to go with proof that our preferred option will make the most efficient use of customers' money.</p> <p>Councillor Jonathan Hardy asked Richard as Thames Water talk about wetter summers, and clearly the storm tanks are a problem, could Thames Water clarify how much it would cost to cover the remaining storm tanks.</p> <p>Richard responded that estimates were around £20 million to cover the tanks and build a new odour control unit.</p> <p>Simon Eaton-Walker asked why Thames Water has only started focusing on the storm tanks as a source of odour. He stated that he found the timing too convenient given that Thames Water has submitted plans for an expansion to the works. Simon raised concerns that if Thames Water's application goes through, it will be years before residents see any benefit.</p> <p>Adrian Jack added that if we get final approval, the works will be complete by the back end of 2013.</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>Simon Eaton-Walker stated that the covering of the storm tanks attitude had changed and this wasn't what was committed in the odour project.</p> <p>Richard Aylard responded stating that it was cost effective to cover two tanks to take the initial and most odorous flush of storm sewage. At the time, this part of the works was not the most odorous piece of plant. Richard asked Paul to clarify if storm tanks were now the most odorous part of the whole plant.</p> <p>Paul Stocker responded saying the east side monitor had shown signs of breaching the investigation trigger levels, and that these spikes have either been linked to the storm tanks or to the other known problems on site such as the biological odour control unit changeover. He explained that this summer, in his opinion, the storm tanks have accounted for the 'lions share' of the odour.</p> <p>Councillor Bradley Fisher asked if there have been problems with machinery as residents keep receiving notifications about malfunctions. He asked if the plant is maintained properly as there seemed to be an increased number of failures occurring on a regular basis.</p> <p>Paul Stocker explained that the plant is maintained properly, but Thames Water had had to adapt to some of the new plant.</p> <p>Barry Edward suggested that Thames Water should know more as the plant has been here for a long time.</p> <p>Paul Stocker went on to explain that the effluent received at Mogden is very aggressive, creating heavy loadings. If it were a clean water plant, Thames Water would have an element of control over the wear and tear; however you never know exactly what's going to come into the gates of a sewage treatment works. This means blockages and such are all too common challenges in running a sewage treatment works. We have a detailed maintenance programme that focuses on the plant that is likely to take the most loading and pieces that are most likely become defective.</p> <p>Paul added that we have a very good maintenance team who have supplies of spare parts and good lead times with their suppliers.</p> <p>Jane Talbot asked how Mogden compares to the other sewage treatment works such as Beckton and Crossness.</p> <p>Paul Stocker replied stating the processes are fairly similar, just on different scales.</p> <p>Jane Talbot went on to ask if Mogden still gets the effluent from Heathrow, if so, how the planned extensions there were factored into running the site.</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>Richard responded stating that Mogden does take sewage from Heathrow and that the impact of the extensions had been factored into what the works can take.</p> <p>Richard explained that Thames Water have catchment and asset planners who do all of this for the Company.</p> <p><u>Richard suggested that we could consider getting a representative from the asset planning team to the next resident meeting to discuss how we calculate flows within the sewer network and into the works.</u></p> <p>Councillor Hardy stated that he understood there was an under-spend of a similar order to the costs of covering the remaining tanks. He asked why Thames couldn't just bypass the Ofwat funding process and fund the covers with the efficiencies made on the odour improvement project. He asked if the money just went back to the shareholders.</p> <p>Richard replied explained that any out-performance of Ofwat's assumptions is retained in the business for five years and then returned to customers in the form of lower prices. He also explained that the company's shareholders could choose to invest in projects not funded by customers, but if they did they would never earn any return on that capital. It was also relevant that Thames Water did not have freedom to set its own prices. The regulator sets price limits on the basis of allowing a well-managed company to finance its functions (including paying an acceptable dividend to shareholders). If the company invested outside the regulatory process it would mean shareholders taking a lower dividend than the economic regulator had decided was appropriate. In response to a supplementary question he explained that shareholders have about £2bn of equity in the business and, in a typical year, might look to take a dividend of around £200m (ie a 10% return on their investment). However, this year they would be taking a smaller dividend because of the economic climate. He added that if shareholders were minded to invest outside the regulatory process (ie on a discretionary basis) there would be many other high priority options for investment, including removing the threat of sewer flooding from more properties that already been flooded internally with sewage on at least one occasion.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy asked Richard if there were any other cheaper options that had been considered for covering the storm tanks.</p> <p>Adrian Jack answered explaining that whatever the option, you still need an odour control unit to treat the gases that build up from covering a tank, which would be expensive.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy stated that we had also saved £¼ million on odour reducing chemical dosing.</p> <p>Paul Stocker responded by saying that he did not recognise that figure,</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>but dosing isn't just used for odour control.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy said that dosing to reduce odour surely is a best practice measure of odour control.</p> <p>Michael Mehta stated that ferric dosing used to be practiced at the works, but was not sure whether that was still the case.</p> <p><u>Paul Stocker responded saying he would confirm the chemical dosing processes for odour outside the meeting.</u></p> <p><i>Note: Thames Water doses Ferrous Chloride solution, for odour suppression, all year round. It is dosed at the main inlet on the west side, where it joins the west inlet and the sewer to the east inlet, so both sides of the works receive ferrous dosed influent.</i></p> <p>Barry Edwards spoke. He explained that he had been living near Mogden for 15 years. He explained that Mogden was an old works with old systems. He added that the new systems will address these issues. He added that Thames Water has a duty of care over the old works. He stated that he believes it can fulfil its function as a sewage treatment works; it just needs a low tech innovative solution.</p> <p>Barry went on to explain that, in his opinion, a solution could be developed to address the issue at source, for example something that could be put in a toilet system that could start the treatment process before the wastewater even hits the works. He stated that innovative solutions are what are needed to solve the odour.</p> <p>Barry added that he was surprised that we don't have the bathing standards in the rivers and tributaries like on the coast so the swimming club at Richmond can't use the river. He asked Thames Water to come up with a solution that addresses all these issues.</p> <p>Simon Eaton-Walker suggested that if you see the storm tanks as swimming pools, why can't you have some form of Lilo type system floating on top to prevent the odours from escaping?</p> <p>Barry Edwards responded stating that this wouldn't be the best solution as there would be no way to collect the gasses.</p> <p>Paul Stoker went on to discuss the different odour notifications as detailed on the slides.</p> <p>Jane Talbot enquired how reliable the odour control units were.</p> <p>Paul Stocker explained that as long as the media within the unit matched the odour which they need to process they are reliable and look after themselves.</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>Jane asked what the life span of an odour control unit was.</p> <p>Paul responded stating that the unit is just a box containing a media which the odour treating bacteria grow on. The media is inspected, and is expected to last a good number of years.</p> <p>Jane asked if a chemical odour control unit was better than a biological one.</p> <p>Andrew Georgiades explained that there is not much between them. He explained that the chemical unit has a number of bolt-ons that mean it's a three stage treatment process. Although this sounds better, it does mean that there are more parts and pumps to be maintained. He explained that the biological plants are much simpler in make-up. He also echoed the earlier comment regarding the recent changeover to the bio plant being stopped and that the manufacturers were investigating further improvements.</p> <p>Jane Talbot asked what gases come out of the odour control unit stack.</p> <p>Paul Stoker replied stating gases were mainly made up of hydrogen sulphide. He explained that we measure unit performance using this gas, and that performance is also measured in total odour units by experts with calibrated noses. He stated that these detailed tests are being carried out at the moment and we should have early results known within the next six months or so.</p> <p><u>Paul Stocker agreed to take on an action to provide more information to Jane related to gas make-up.</u></p> <p>Barry Edwards raised concerns that since the fans have gone in on the odour control unit there had been a high pitch noise that had disturbed him.</p> <p>Michael Mehta explained that the council had received complaints of noise. He stated that it wasn't the odour control units, but the stirrers on the pasteurisation units. He explained that Thames Water had done some acoustic work and this seemed to have addressed the problem.</p> <p>Michael stated that he had been down Barry's road and was unable to hear the noise at the time of his visit. He also added that complaints had stopped since Thames Water had carried out their work.</p> <p>Keith Knight added that he had noticed the noise though he couldn't state whether it had come back recently.</p> <p>Michael Mehta stated that he was quite prepared to take the issue further with Thames Water should residents still have any concerns.</p> <p>Councillor Paul Fisher raised concerns that Thames Water hadn't been</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>sending out notices on all their spills.</p> <p>Andy Gingell responded stating that we notify residents when there is risk of odour as a result of work being carried out on site or when something unplanned occurs on site that has generated an odour. The joint reports sometimes refer to minor spills. These are often caused by the digester foaming and over flowing on to the lip of the seals. He added that such occurrences are quickly cleaned up and not likely to cause any notable increase of odour.</p> <p>Richard Aylard said that Thames Water will be writing to residents to explain what has happened on site this summer, as soon as planning approval for the extension has been granted. He also explained that Councillor Dakers and Councillor Hardy are coming to see him onsite in October.</p> <p>A question was asked as to why the Thames Tunnel can't come all the way to Mogden.</p> <p>Richard explained that the Tidal Thames Quality Improvements (including the extension at Mogden) will mean a reduction of storm water discharges, with spills estimated to be around 1 per year, on average. Significantly extending the tunnel to Mogden is not a cost effective solution give the forecast small number of spills per year.</p> <p>Richard added that transferring all of the flows from Mogden was also not an option. This is because the treated effluent discharged from Mogden constitutes a significant proportion of the freshwater inflow in the upper reaches of the Tidal River Thames during dry summer conditions.</p> <p>Barry Edwards asked for reassurance that should it be necessary, the tunnel could be extended to Mogden at a later date.</p> <p><u>Councillor Reid asked if a full explanation could be put in writing on to the web.</u></p> <p>Jane Talbot stated that she wanted to find out more information about the tunnels but could not find it on Thames Water's website.</p> <p><u>Andy Gingell agreed to send on the link.</u></p> <p>Andy Gingell read through the different mosquito slides and graphs. He also explained that concerns had been raised relating to the distribution of the mosquito leaflet.</p> <p>Tony Bull stated that he had asked Thames Water for a response on this issue. He added that complaints had been unusually low this year.</p> <p>Andy Gingell apologised to Tony for not getting back to him sooner and</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>went on to explain that we had passed on residents' concerns to the distribution contractors and they responded with the statement detailed on the presentation slide.</p> <p>Councillors Andrews and Reid explained that they had used distributors in the past and found it difficult to get the success rate they were looking to achieve.</p> <p>Andy Gingell went on to explain the reason we chose the contractor was for their previous work with a London Borough and their quality checking processes.</p> <p>Richard stated that he will be asking the MD of Guaranteed Leaflet Distribution to come to Thames Water Head Office to justify his statement. In the absence of an explanation we would not use this firm again.</p> <p>Andy also added, should residents have any concerns about mosquitoes, there are details on the Mogden pages of the Thames Water website, including a copy of the leaflet.</p> <p>Spare copies of the leaflet were passed around the room.</p> <p>Councillor Paul Fisher asked if Thames Water were still contributing to gully cleansing.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher and Richard Aylard responded yes.</p> <p>Councillor Paul Fisher asked what Thames Water's relationship was with Greenhunter.</p> <p>Tony Bull answered explaining that Greenhunter was bought by Cannon. Bioguard formed later, and these are the contractors who carry out all of the mosquito control. He added that the team from Bioguard are the same individuals that used to work for Greenhunter.</p> <p>Paul Stocker discussed the recent concerns relating to the fly infestation. Paul explained that there had been a build-up of fat, oil and grease on the surface of one of the covered primary tanks. This had created a breeding site for the small black flies. Once the infestation was found, we had to work out a way to remedy the situation. Unfortunately, we were unable to use insecticide products as they require ultra violet light to break down environmentally harmful chemicals, and in a covered environment, this is not possible.</p> <p>A second solution was considered which involved draining down and cleaning each of the tanks with a fat, oil and grease build-up. This was the chosen option.</p> <p>Upon review, Thames Water established the cause of the infestation to</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>be related to the new scraper system not working as it should on the primary tank, caused by an installation fault.</p> <p>The installation fault is now being rectified and in addition, Thames Water's chemical engineers are meeting with our independent entomologists to investigate future solutions should we ever get any infestation within a covered tank again.</p> <p>Paul expressed his sincere apologies for any residents who may have noticed any of the small black flies.</p> <p>Councillor Jonathan Hardy asked if the infestation occurred on the underside of the lid covers.</p> <p>Paul Stoker responded, explaining that the flies had developed of the floating fat, oil and grease which should have been removed into the hoppers by the scraper system.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy asked how operatives missed the failure given the number of inspections that are carried out on site.</p> <p>Paul Stocker explained that there is a monitoring regime, and on this occasion, the build-up of flies had happened over a relatively short period of time. He added that his teams are closely monitoring the tank and using hoses to break-up any floating matter on the primary tanks.</p> <p>Simon Eaton-Walker asked why no notification was sent out.</p> <p>Richard Aylard acknowledged that a notification should have been sent.</p> <p>Andy Gingell apologised, adding that he understood that LB Hounslow would be writing to local residents to explain it from a pest control perspective. He also added that a response to complaints relating to this had been on our website for some time.</p> <p>Tony Bull asked for more information as to why insecticides couldn't be used as he understood there were products that broke down by heat.</p> <p>Paul Stocker replied stating that he has to follow the advice and guidance of our internal chemical and process experts and on this occasion, they said no.</p> <p><u>Richard asked that an update from the meeting with the entomologists should be sent to himself, TW's Chief Operating Officer and Tony Bull.</u></p> <p>Paul Fisher asked Andy Gingell why no notification was sent out.</p> <p>Richard Aylard answered, again acknowledging that one should have been sent and apologised for not sending one.</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>Councillor Barbara Reid spoke, explaining that she couldn't understand why Thames Water showed no pro-activity, nor the desire to do everything it can, referring to Mogden as the 'nasal Heathrow'. Councillor Reid added that she thought that management at Mogden can do more.</p> <p>Richard Aylard replied stating that he would take her comments on board,</p> <p>Councillor Bradley Fisher spoke, adding that something wasn't working and Thames Water didn't know about it. He enquired to when the next outbreak might be. He explained that he has around 4000 residents, to whom he regularly has to justify Thames Waters' actions.</p> <p>Councillor Reid added that there have clearly been problems at the site recently.</p> <p>Richard Aylard responded, stating that we are aware there have been odours amongst other challenges such as the flies and biological odour control unit. He tried to reassure the meeting attendees that this is being dealt with at the highest level with the Chief Executive, Chief Operating Officer and the operational managers.</p> <p>Simon Eaton-Walker stated that something needs to be done now.</p> <p>Richard Aylard responded to Simon stating that we have always taken odour at Mogden very seriously.</p> <p>Jane Talbot raised concerns relating to communications. She referred to the joint reports and asked when an environmental health officer raises concerns of odorous pieces of plant on site, how long does it take Thames Water to fix the problem.</p> <p>Andy Gingell answered, stating any problems are rectified at the earliest opportunity. Quite often, things can be dealt with on the spot, and they are. Andy invited Michael Mehta for comment.</p> <p>Michael explained that any remedial action is normally carried out on that same day.</p> <p>Councillor Dakers spoke. He raised concerns that the recent fly outbreak demonstrated Thames Water's attitude to the public, and this does not build trust.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy added his earlier point concerning the alleged under spend on the odour improvement project.</p> <p>Councillor Phil Andrews asked what happens with money saved from under spend efficiencies.</p> <p>Richard Aylard answered stating that most under spends are re-invested</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>back into the business.</p> <p>Councillor Andrews asked why the money was not invested in further odour reducing measures.</p> <p>Richard Aylard responded stating that within the business, we have under spends and overspends that need to be balanced, but in each case we needed to achieve the formal output agreed with Ofwat. In the case of Mogden, should we not have achieved the required odour reduction, we would have re-invested funds at Mogden.</p> <p>Councillor Andrews asked what would happen if the odour improvement work did not deliver what was required.</p> <p>Richard stated that we would have had to address the issues and invest until it did.</p> <p>Councillor Dakers spoke. He stated that once an application is approved by Ofwat, investment is effectively customer money and customers have a right to know where the money has gone. He sought further clarity on any under spend, stating a wish to know what was spent and how it was spent as it was a public concern.</p> <p>Richard replied, explaining that the company was required to achieve clearly defined outputs specified by Ofwat, who also set price limits. In this case, Ofwat allowed had allowed investment in odour improvements at Mogden. We achieved the required output with a reduction of 66.2%, as evaluated by an independent odour company.</p> <p>Simon Eaton-Walker stated that a percentage reduction requirement from the regulator had never been mentioned before any of the improvements were carried out and asked why that was the case.</p> <p>Richard responded, explaining that attitudes regarding disclosure had changed for the better under new management at Thames Water, and this is the most likely reason why percentages may not have been entirely clear at the outset. Richard added that the outputs from every project are thoroughly audited by independent contractors working for the regulator.</p> <p>Adrian Jack provided an update on his two projects at Mogden.</p> <p>Adrian explained that the east-side primary tank improvements are progressing well and should be operational by the end of the year.</p> <p>Adrian spoke about the Tidal Thames Quality Improvements explaining that Thames Water and LB Hounslow are close to completing the S106 agreements and once complete, Thames Water will be able to award a contract to commence work.</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>He added that the first activity that is likely to happen on site will be the vegetation clearance, and this needs to be carried out before the bird nesting season begins. It is of great importance that this is done as if we miss the time window to clear the vegetation, this will have implications on the regulatory deadline to complete the work.</p> <p>Richard Aylard stated that once the s106 is signed, we will be actively communicating the project update to local residents. Richard asked Adrian to explain when the project benefits will be delivered.</p> <p>Adrian Jack explained that benefits are phased. He referred to the example of fixing the digester roofs, stating that where operational constraints do not impede progress, improvements will be made at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Michael Mehta expressed concerns relating to plant failures and asked if the new process stream was going to be using new technologies or whether it would be the same as what's already in place.</p> <p>Adrian Jack responded explaining that in terms of process, the treatment phases are the same. In terms of plant, we have been using the learning points from previous experiences to come up with a solution in line with the best available technology.</p> <p>Michael asked if we had carried out any benchmarking activity against other sewage works.</p> <p>Adrian answered yes, adding that we have been designing the plant in line with best practise, whilst trying to keep an element of commonality with the existing processes, i.e. making sure that the treatment flow rates do not detrimentally affect the existing plant processes already in place.</p> <p>Councillor Paul Fisher asked what would happen if Thames Water missed the bird nesting season.</p> <p>Adrian Jack responded, stating that his project team would need to find ways of making up time on the project.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher added that in the past, Thames Water and LB Hounslow have been quite far apart from each other, as we've moved through the planning application processes and various Sustainable Development Committees things had improved.</p> <p>Councillor Paul Fisher asked Cathy Gallagher if LB Hounslow is ready to sign.</p> <p>Cathy Gallagher responded stating that we are working on the final details relating to the Odour Management Plan. Cathy added that the Local Authority has asked Thames Water for a residents' representative to be involved in the quarterly meetings and that the ball was in the Local</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p data-bbox="256 327 472 353">Authority's 'court'.</p> <p data-bbox="256 394 1091 562">Councillor Paul Fisher referred back to his previous point relating to Thames Waters regulatory deadline, and stated that he imagined that Thames Water would be liable for a significant fine if they missed their deadline. He asked Adrian, how Thames Water would make up the delays so they could meet the regulatory requirements.</p> <p data-bbox="256 602 1050 701">Adrian Jack answered stating that he would need to accelerate the construction work, which could mean extended working hours and maybe even weekend working.</p> <p data-bbox="256 741 1086 801">Councillor Paul Fisher responded, acknowledging that this could pose even more problems.</p> <p data-bbox="256 842 986 869">Jane Talbot asked what the Mayor thought of the application.</p> <p data-bbox="256 909 1110 969">Cathy Gallagher answered explaining that the Mayor had stated that LB Hounslow could determine the application.</p> <p data-bbox="256 1010 1083 1070">Richard Johnson asked what the terms were relating to the use of the uncovered storm tanks.</p> <p data-bbox="256 1111 1102 1249">Cathy Gallagher answered explaining that Thames Water would be required to approach Ofwat should they use the tanks more than 6 times, with an unacceptable odour occurrence, within a rolling one year time period upon commencement of the work.</p> <p data-bbox="256 1290 1123 1350">Councillor Paul Fisher asked if Thames Water were dragging their feet in signing the section 106 agreement.</p> <p data-bbox="256 1391 1107 1451">Richard Aylard responded no, explaining that Thames Water was doing everything they could to get the s106 signed.</p> <p data-bbox="256 1491 1067 1552">Councillor Hardy asked how Thames Water is planning to empty the storm tanks.</p> <p data-bbox="256 1592 1114 1832">Paul Stocker responded explaining there are a series of pumps and valves which drain the tanks. He added that they also have a series of mobile pumps as contingencies. Paul stressed that the greatest benefit of this work will be that the works will have a greater capacity to treat flows as they arrive at the works meaning less flow will be in the storm tanks and there is a greater capacity for emptying them, should there be a need to use them at all.</p> <p data-bbox="256 1872 1086 1933">Councillor Bradley Fisher asked if, when complete, the plant would be running at maximum capacity all the time.</p> <p data-bbox="256 1973 1107 2033">Richard Aylard stated that, because of the extra capacity, the works will be 40% more efficient, and there will be many times when we won't be</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>running at 100%.</p> <p>Councillor Bradley Fisher added that this would also give more opportunity for Thames Water to carry out maintenance activities, without having to rely on the storm tanks.</p> <p>Paul Stocker agreed.</p> <p>Andy Gingell gave a brief update on the communications activities and ran through the details on the slide.</p> <p>Questions were asked about the lack of newsletters.</p> <p>Richard responded saying that we are committed to keeping residents up to date and that once the S106 has been signed and there are no further changes, we will write to all the residents around the works. Richard stated that we do want to do a news letter and residents will have one soon, but that it was important to be able to explain clearly what would be happening, and this required the s106 to be signed first, so that we could say that we had been granted planning approval for the extension.</p> <p>Adrian Jack added that the news letter is of great importance for his project and he as been working with Andy Gingell's team to get the communications moving.</p> <p>Councillor Jonathan Hardy referred to Thames Water's communications activities as a 'communications blackout' and asked if Thames Water are deliberately not communicating or is it just a case of forgetting to.</p> <p>Simon Eaton-Walker made a comment that local residents had not been engaged about the planning application.</p> <p>Richard Aylard responded stating that Thames Water had gone into great depth with their consultation activities in regard to the planning application with local residents and residents have had plenty of opportunity to speak with us and the Local Authority. We also have good methods of communication such as the notification systems and a detailed and regularly updated website with many pages specific to Mogden</p> <p>Councillor Andrews asked why we chose not to send out a newsletter regarding the fly infestation.</p> <p>Richard responded stating that Thames Water wouldn't be sending out newsletters to cover every eventuality as we have other methods of communications such as the website which can help with announcements like that. He reiterated that Thames Water will be writing to local residents regarding what has happened this summer and to provide an update on the planning application as soon as the S106</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>had been signed.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy asked Richard why Thames Water doesn't want to engage with MRAG.</p> <p>Richard responded stating that wasn't the case, and that Thames Water treats MRAG in the same way that it treats any other resident group, hence why we have these meetings. He added that we are in litigation with many members of MRAG and such issues should be kept away from this community forum.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy asked Richard to clarify that Thames Water treat MRAG in exactly the same way as any other community group.</p> <p>Richard responded yes, though Thames Water naturally needs to bear the group litigation in mind.</p> <p>Councillor Hardy was not convinced by Thames Water's commitment.</p> <p>Councillor Phil Andrews spoke, suggesting that MRAG could communicate on Thames Water's behalf.</p> <p>Simon Eaton-Walker wanted to know what had been happening with all the complaints.</p> <p>Andy Gingell responded to both comments, saying that responses to all complaints go on our website, this included the fly concerns and referring to Richard's statement, reassured attendees that a newsletter would be coming out once the S106 had been signed.</p> <p>Jane Talbot asked if there is a more low-tech way which we can communicate with residents as there appears to be a gap between Mogden and the residents.</p> <p>Councillor Reid added that Thames Water seemed to be missing the point suggesting that Thames Water should send a newsletter even if there is nothing to say.</p> <p>Richard Aylard responded saying that he will take all these points being made into consideration, but he thought it was important to wait a few weeks until we could be certain about the works extension.</p> <p>Councillor Fisher added that residents meetings should happen every quarter and newsletters should be at least every 6 months.</p> <p>Jane Talbot asked about why the odour monitors had been flat lining.</p> <p>Paul Stocker responded explaining that sometimes there are loose commutations with the unit or there can be electrical faults. He added that we try and repair them as quickly as we can, but sometimes they</p>	



No	Item	Actions
	<p>need to be sent off for repair, back to America.</p> <p>Jane asked if there was a direct dial telephone number for Mogden.</p> <p>Andy Gingell replied that as part of the S106, we are finalising a priority line to Thames Water for odour complaints.</p>	
	<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>TBA</p>	