

Residents Liaison Meeting

Date/Time: 8 March 2011 6pm
Venue: Conference Room, Mogden STW
Chair: John Sullivan, Thames Water



Attendance

Name		Representing
* John Sullivan	JS	Thames Water (Chair)
* Cllr Arnie Gibbons	AG	London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
* Cllr Corinna Smart	CS	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
* PC Jan Thomson	JT	Metropolitan Police Service
* Joyce Diment	JD	WERFA (Woodlands Estate Residents Association)
* Keith Knight	KK	Resident
* Bruce Montgomery	BM	Cole Park Residents Association
* Barry Edwards	BE	Mogden Residents Action Group (MRAG)
* Steve Taylor	ST	Mogden Residents Action Group (MRAG)
* Murray Edwards	ME	Mogden Residents Action Group (MRAG)
* Mark Grimshaw	MG	Thames Water – Operations Manager
* Zak Espi-Castillo	ZEC	Thames Water – Process Manager
* Adrian Jack	AJ	Thames Water – Project Manager
* Matt Warburton	MW	Thames Water – Complex Delivery Manager
* Sonia Rana	SR	Thames Water – Communications
* Emily Goren	EG	Thames Water – Communications

Apologies received from:

Richard Aylard	RA	Thames Water
Cllr Ruth Cadbury		London Borough of Hounslow
Cllr Linda Davies		London Borough of Hounslow
Cllr Sue Sampson		London Borough of Hounslow
Cllr Mindu Bains		London Borough of Hounslow
Cathy Gallagher		London Borough of Hounslow
Michael Mehta		London Borough of Hounslow
Shaun Case		London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
Richard Johnson		Queensbridge (North) Residents Company
Clare Montgomery		Cole Park Residents Association
Simon Eaton-Walker	SEW	Mogden Residents Action Group (MRAG)

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

Item	Description	Action
1.0	Review of previous minutes	
1.1	GM will be putting the new version of the odour management plan on the London Borough of Hounslow website.	
1.2	The residents did in fact receive the previous newsletter, however, an email notification will still be sent for the next one.	EG/SR
1.3	TB said that the report he was waiting for was the off site survey from the summer of 2009, not the Section 106 report. EG apologised for the mistake and said that she would forward this on.	EG
1.4	MG reported that the smoke test of the covered storm tanks has not been carried out yet, as TW have not been able to source enough dry ice machines (carbon dioxide). Using oil-based smoke may affect the east side odour control unit (OCU) and so this option has been dismissed.	MG/ZEC
1.5	MW said that the west side monitor was to be linked to the site's SCADA computer system by the end of March at the latest.	MW/AJ
1.6	EG stated that the mosquito awareness leaflet was being designed and once ready approval would be sought from TB and SC.	EG
1.7	EM was asked how the issue with the gritting of the Mogden footpath had progressed. EM said that he would look into it.	EM
1.8	There were no other comments and so the previous minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting.	
2.0	Operations and correspondence	
2.1	<p>EG ran through the operations update, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The completion of the redoming of Battery C aeration lanes and that Battery D has been started. Battery B will follow in the spring. • The replacing of two of our 'Longwood' screens. • Zak Espi-Castillo has now officially taken over the role of Process Manager at Mogden. <p>EG also spoke about the complaints that have been received to date this year and the notifications we have issued.</p>	
2.2	BE said that he would like the amount of storm discharge and the duration to be added to the rower notifications. EG is to check if this is possible.	EG
2.3	ST asked what amount of sewage Mogden treats per day? MG replied that it was currently between 720 and 790 MI/d.	
2.4	ST asked questions about the joint LBH/TW site inspection reports that are posted on the website. ST went on to ask why it takes LBH to point out the problems at Mogden? MG said that this was not the case and we proactively clean the storm tanks, but the council may ask for the order in which we clean tanks to be changed. ST then asked why the peaks in odour monitor readings occur over weekends and bank holidays?	
2.5	EM asked about the notification regarding a sludge spill and whether we keep sludge on site. ZEC said no, as it wasn't beneficial, as we want the sludge in our digesters producing biogas that we can burn in our combined heat and power (CHP) engines. GM asked how do we balance our obligations to the EA regarding final effluent consent versus controlling odour for our residents? JS replied that both are a legal requirement. GM went on to ask if after 2 dry weeks we would use the storm tanks? ZEC answered that it would depend on what was happening on site, for instance, tank 8 is used as a buffer during high tides.	

Item	Description	Action
3.0	Communications	
3.1	<p>EG ran through the first communications slide, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next newsletter being mailed out to residents. • The update of our interpretation boards in conjunction with the London Borough of Hounslow has begun. • The mosquito awareness campaign leaflet is currently being finalised. <p>SR went through the second communications slide, which advertised a community work day where the Friends of the River Crane Environment (FORCE) along with staff from Mogden would be planting wild flowers and creating habitats for wildlife along the Duke of Northumberland river (DNR).</p>	
3.2	<p>JD said that the DNR flows through the Woodlands Estate and that they would be interested in community days like these. JD and JT asked if SR would take their email addresses so that FORCE could let them know more about the day. JS asked SR if there was anything else on the radar? And SR replied, no.</p>	SR
4.0	Independent Odour Research Study – final report	
4.1	<p>BE expressed his dissatisfaction with the whole study, as BE had told TW previously that the aeration lanes were odorous. BE also stated that RA had said that BE could be involved and was expecting an invitation from TW's R&D department. BE said that he did not feel the study was independent, that not all the odour sources were found and that nothing has been done to eliminate odour. BE went on to add that the Section 106 states that the community would be involved in meetings every 2 weeks and BE feels that 1 presentation at the end of the study doesn't satisfy the S106 requirements. JS said that he would take on RA's action.</p>	JS (RA)
4.2	<p>ST added that he was amazed as the issue with skips on site was raised in 2004 and it has taken 7 years for an independent consultant to say cover them. ZEC responded saying that our skips are covered with tarpaulins but ST felt that tarpaulins aren't good enough as they tear. MG added that the skips on the east side of the works are odour controlled and the skips covered with tarpaulins are on the west side. MG said that the study had shown that the west side skips weren't odorous, but TW had taken the decision to cover them anyway.</p>	
5.0	Grounds Maintenance Issues	
5.1	<p>EG said that there was correspondence last year regarding grounds maintenance in Bankside Close, Hillary Drive, Lynton Close and Mogden Lane, but that these issues had been resolved. EG added that TW have a long standing complaint from SEW on this subject and that we wanted to give him the opportunity to speak about it, but unfortunately SEW was not well enough to attend the meeting. Therefore EG read a statement from SEW in which he says the following:</p> <p><i>The grounds maintenance issues raised in previous meetings, which date back to October 2008, remain unresolved as far as SEW is concerned, despite assurances given that matters would be addressed. Several managers of the Mogden site have been charged with the task of resolving these issues and SEW has had countless meetings where agreements have been reached to satisfactorily conclude these matters. SEW feels that none of the agreed actions have been fully carried out.</i></p> <p><i>SEW states that by contrast, the removal of an access gate which he says was left unlocked on several occasions by Thames Water employees was swift, costly and feels it was merely a cover up for incompetence without consideration for its actual purpose. SEW goes on to say that contractors now have to carry equipment a quarter of a mile to do any work in this area and also states that the gate was repositioned within another set of locked gates because staff cannot be trusted to remember to lock it.</i></p> <p><i>SEW thinks that staff employed at Mogden whose responsibility it is to ensure</i></p>	

Item	Description	Action
	<i>satisfactory completion of grounds maintenance work are not doing their jobs. SEW goes on to say that if such basic tasks cannot be completed, what standards are being strived for and how can SEW be confident that other more important matters are being given appropriate attention? SEW feels that standards at Mogden are sloppy.</i>	
5.2	BE and ST said they would visit SEW to see the problem for themselves.	BE/ST
5.3	JS asked EG to send SEW the slides from the presentation.	EG
6.0	Mosquitoes	
6.1	EG ran through the mosquito update, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated graphs showing mosquito activity 	
6.2	EM asked why the graphs stopped at 43 weeks. EG apologised, saying that adding 2011 had caused a problem and she will fix them before posting the slides to the website.	EG
6.3	BE asked if there was anything else that TW could do to improve the mosquito situation and continued that the reason for low complaint numbers was complaint fatigue, but added that residents had noticed a difference.	
6.4	ST asked if the gully cleansing carried out by LBH would be lost as part of the cutbacks going on in the council, as it had helped? GM said that he hoped not. TB added that was why he wanted the off-site survey results, as he feels it will strengthen the case to keep the cleaning.	
7.0	Sewage Treatment Works Upgrade Project – an update	
7.1	AJ and MW ran through the extension project update, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The progress so far on the embankment, new tunnel to the high level sewer, piling and digester modifications. • The programme of work coming up. • B&V have been nominated for a Considerate Constructor Scheme award. 	
7.2	ME asked about the break in the piling work coming up. MW replied that piling would cease at the end of April, with the break lasting for May and June; however, this may be subject to change if the programme needs to be accelerated.	
7.3	AJ asked the attendees if they knew whether a barrage balloon was anchored in the area during the war? As a large concrete block has been discovered buried. It is the size of a mini and is a thick walled chamber. EM said that the Isleworth Society may know. BE asked if it was Anderson shaped and AJ replied, no, box shaped. JS said that photographs would be helpful. TB suggested it may be an old air raid shelter but MW said that it was too small. JS said that he had old photos of Mogden before it was built that could shed some light on it.	
8.0	AOB	
8.1	BE said that he has been asked by several river groups about the Thames interceptor (Thames Tideway Tunnel) and whether Mogden is to be connected? JS replied that it was not due to the improvements currently taking place that will reduce storm discharges, as well as the fact that in the summer months, we provide a significant portion of the flow of the River Thames at this point. BE added that green field sites were being targeted for the TBMs (tunnel boring machines) eg Barn Elms. JS said that he would ask Phil Stride from the Thames Tunnel team to do a presentation for this meeting. JS added that TW do want to use brown field sites but that we have to keep negotiations quiet otherwise the price suddenly rises and we need to get best value for money for our customers.	JS
8.2	EM would like an update on the community payment given to LBH under the S106 agreement. GM said that he would find out how it has been spent and report back. EM said that an email about it would be helpful.	GM

Item	Description	Action
8.3	The date of the next meeting was set for 8 June, but has now been rescheduled for 15 June.	Note

Dates of future meetings		Time	
	Wednesday 15 June 2011 (Please note date change above)		6pm
	Wednesday 7 September 2011		
	Wednesday 7 December 2011		

Location	
	Conference Room, Mogden STW