

External Incident Report



Incident Number	WR 3/24/0803		
Incident Title	Fish in distress, unnamed trib of Kells Water, [redacted] Kells		
Investigation Date	13/06/2024 09:20:00		
Investigation Details	13/06/24 From email update: Folks Was onsite this morning. No dead fish nor dead invertebrates present in that section of the waterway. As per [redacted] (25th June 2022 – so near 2 years bang on... [redacted] the NIW storm pipe that outfalls to the waterway at the rear of [redacted]. Now there was a misconnection/cross connection (of gross solids & SRD's) to this outfall which was sorted under [redacted]. This outfall takes in the site drainage of [redacted]. A drive through the area revealed only 2 [redacted]. Spoke with [redacted] [redacted] was done 3 months ago. No answer at [redacted] though – spotless brick driveway, but the patio slabs hadn't been touched. But then we don't know if the patios/yard at the rear of any of the houses had been cleaned yesterday evening – but if I do a letter drop, neighbours know... Spoke with complainant, [redacted] hadn't seen any dead fish either, just fish rising/struggling (due to being in the pollution plume as per [redacted] photographs). Updated on investigation – to do the NIEA Household Awareness leaflet drop to [redacted]. Have been asked to do an extended letter drop to the household/estates that also would drain into the same waterway – namely [redacted] etc. [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] 14/06/24 WQI letter drop of the Household Awareness Leaflet to the [redacted] dwellings ([redacted]) [redacted]. 19/06/24 Intention to proactive letter drop to other estates in the greater catchment of the waterway..		
Pollution Confirmed	Yes	Source	Domestic
Pollutant Category	Chemical	Pollution Severity	Low
PCA	3	Fishkill Figures From	
Fish Kill Severity			
Kill Count			

Report Executed by [REDACTED]

External Incident Report



Incident Number

WR 3/24/0516

Incident Title

Extensive foam in river at [REDACTED]

Investigation Date

02/10/2024 14:00:00

Investigation Details

Report of excessive foam in river. Upon investigation DO excellent at bridge. Walked upstream, Some slight foam on bend of river, just after a fast stretch of water. Expected to be natural.

Updated complainant by phone and also provided the foam leaflet. [REDACTED] and suspects its to do with the [REDACTED] upstream. [REDACTED] asked me if I had checked the confluence where the stream from the [REDACTED] met the river as he expected there to be lots of foam there. I advised [REDACTED] that I was still out on site and that was my next point to check. I checked there and there was little / no foam. I also checked several other nearby tributaries with similar characteristics and they all had foam. Its a common occurrence in Autumn and one that i have seen significantly in recent weeks.

Several weeks later I received an email from an angler - [REDACTED] - [REDACTED] had kept a daily record of foam levels, water levels, weather conditions and the foam would appear to be related to high water levels (as expected). [REDACTED] asked could an autosampler be installed - I said doubtful that the request would be actioned as there are only a few. That site is on our surface water monitoring programme and is sampled monthly. The results have always been excellent. Most recent one excellent also. [REDACTED]

Pollution Confirmed

No

Source

Pollutant Category

Pollution Severity

PCA

Fishkill Figures From

Fish Kill Severity

Kill Count

Report Executed by [REDACTED]

External Incident Report



Incident Number

Incident Title

Investigation Date

Investigation Details

WR 3/25/0521

Report of slurry

30/10/2025 20:15:00

30/10/25 @ 10:00 hours - slurry observed in [REDACTED] - by the [REDACTED] (who allegedly has past form with the alleged suspect [REDACTED])

30/10/25 @ 17:00 hours - this info passed onto a [REDACTED] who then at an unknown time passes it onto a [REDACTED] & [REDACTED] who then reports it to NIEA via the hotline at 19:30

30/10/25 @ 19:30hrs - reported received by DEPO, however at reported location are 2 different tribs, and looking at PIMS, no pollution history in the past decade for these stretches.

30/10/25 @ 19:41 - Oncall WQI contacted and to attend. Reports from several different [REDACTED] DEPO to try and narrow down details.

30/10/25 @ 20:15 - WQI onsite [REDACTED] Access to both waterways via field (1/070/090/4) [REDACTED]. Field partially flooded, no cattle present, dozen odd sheep. Note pitch black/darkness, weather warning for wind across NI at this time, but only default/lashing rainfall.

The unnamed trib that [REDACTED] - slow flowing/sheugh, slight discolouration to waterway (but heavy rainfall all day), DO of 8.50mg/l, no fungal growth evident nor slurry odour - only prevailing sheep dung odour.

The unnamed [REDACTED] - fast flowing waterway, slight discolouration to waterway (but heavy rainfall all day), DO of 9.47mg/l, no fungal growth evident nor slurry odour - only prevailing sheep dung odour.

The unnamed trib that crosses [REDACTED] (now above [REDACTED] but below the [REDACTED] that had issues [REDACTED] for a few years, but all clear since then) - fast flowing waterway, slight discolouration to waterway (but heavy rainfall all day), DO of 9.05mg/l, no fungal growth evident nor slurry odour.

The unnamed trib that [REDACTED] - fast flowing waterway, slight discolouration to waterway (but heavy rainfall that day), DO of 9.44mg/l, no fungal growth evident nor slurry odour.

30/10/25 @ 21:20 WQI meet with [REDACTED] onsite [REDACTED], explained investigation so far. They in turn explained that the report they received (via the nearby [REDACTED] That the [REDACTED] purposely dumped [REDACTED] into the unnamed waterway earlier that morning at 10:00. But [REDACTED] had no photos/evidence to corroborate this alleged event. WQI to return following morning and inspect said [REDACTED]

DEPO updated. DEPO to try get IF onsite tomorrow and check for fish kill. None observed by WQI that evening, nor reported observed by the [REDACTED] that night.

31/10/25 @ 10:25hrs WQI [REDACTED] and WQI [REDACTED] onsite at [REDACTED] - note: zero past pollution history on the [REDACTED] just a [REDACTED] & [REDACTED]; Records in [REDACTED]. No answer at door, [REDACTED]. WQI phoned the mobile on the [REDACTED], explained that report of slurry received and investigated last night immediately downstream of [REDACTED] on the waterway that borders [REDACTED] Content for WQI

to proceed to access through [REDACTED] to waterway in question. Passing through the [REDACTED] to the access lane that leads down to the waterway in question you walk past [REDACTED]. They have [REDACTED]. Looking at the historical ortho's the original [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] whereas the new adjacent [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] effluent is currently captured/collection channel to a tank with submersible pump which then can be pumped to further tanks as required. The new [REDACTED] is covered, whereas the old [REDACTED] has been opened and is in use. The old [REDACTED] has been in use for some time, with only [REDACTED] stored on the floor too.

Down the lane [REDACTED] to the waterway in question. [REDACTED] left at the side of the waterway; but plenty of tire tracks up/down lane. But it is now 24hrs after the alleged event. And would there be a need to use [REDACTED] (which can be pumped empty in less than 5mins), when a simply [REDACTED] piped to the waterway some 200m would suffice.

There is gully service the surface [REDACTED] run off at the 'top of the lane'; only 16m from the [REDACTED] tanks if they were so inclined. A section of the [REDACTED] not the cleanest (it's been in use) flows to this gully. Whereas the [REDACTED] above/around the [REDACTED]'s were spotless, and would drain to this low point on the [REDACTED].

Off [REDACTED] 10:47hrs.

River walk downstream carried out along this [REDACTED], and again a few fields [REDACTED]. No dead fish noted. [REDACTED] r still high and in spate with the recent rainfall the day before.

14:42 hrs - WQI [REDACTED] returned to [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. Biosecurity applied, and over the course of the visit met with the [REDACTED] on file - [REDACTED].

Initially met [REDACTED] identified myself and explained reason for visit and to give an update on the morning phonecall/visit. [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] as I tried to escort him to the [REDACTED] and my concerns on the management of the system. Shortly after [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] wondered off as WQI and [REDACTED] walked down the lane towards the waterway as WQI explained the reason for the visit and the observations from that morning. [REDACTED] On returning towards [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] arrived and was a [REDACTED]. I repeated my observations on their style of [REDACTED] management.

[REDACTED] as (a) the [REDACTED] was put in dry and (b) the floor was kept (fairly) clean as they continued to remove and draw down the [REDACTED]. I explained that since the [REDACTED] was open and in use, with dregs/scrapings of [REDACTED] still on the floor, that to be compliant with [REDACTED] any rainfall runoff from this area would need to be collected... just as if a [REDACTED] is dirty, [REDACTED] is generated with rainfall, and thus it would need to be collected too.

[REDACTED]

I explained that this [REDACTED] had been assessed downstream of [REDACTED] and found to be of a poorer state than should be expected, that NIEA will be [REDACTED] staff at this waterway to determine the cause of the pressures on the waterway, and that it would be in [REDACTED] best interest to have their management of the [REDACTED] spotless.

WQI may revisit.

15:21hrs - WQI [REDACTED]

15:33hrs - WQI updated by [REDACTED] of IF. No dead fish observed during their river walk that morning, and may revisit again tomorrow. He has sent an update email to his line manager.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

WQI to issue their own advisory letter for the [REDACTED] to be formally noted and reminded of their [REDACTED] management responsibilities and the impact it may have... hoping to issue wk bg 16/11/25

The 8 [REDACTED]; evidence of a [REDACTED] in the waterway event that we have is the audio of the smell reported in the video submitted by the [REDACTED] presume taken at the confluence of the [REDACTED] some 270m downstream of where the WQI was. Their location would also have included the surface water discharge [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Pollution Confirmed

No

Source

Pollutant Category

Pollution Severity

PCA

3

Fishkill Figures From

Fish Kill Severity

Kill Count

Report Executed by [REDACTED]

External Incident Report



Incident Number	WR 3/25/0805
Incident Title	Black discharge to tributary of [redacted]
Investigation Date	26/12/2025 09:30:00
Investigation Details	Report of black effluent discharging to a tributary of the [redacted] opposite the entrance to [redacted] which was first reported on 24/12/2025 and assessed as low severity initially as the complainant stated [redacted] thought it was possibly sewage. There was no on call cover from 24/12/2025 to 28/12/2025 due to staff shortages. DEPO requested [redacted] to inspect the waterway for [redacted] which [redacted] did on 25/12/2025 and confirmed no evidence of [redacted] discharging to the waterway. I carried out a follow-up inspection of the waterway on 26/12/2026 to confirm the no pollution found report by [redacted] but when I inspected the waterway, I observed it was black and had an [redacted] odour. I followed the waterway to the point it is piped at [redacted] and it was black to this point. The waterway is then open again at the rear of [redacted] I inspected the waterway and observed it was black. I followed the waterway to the point it was no longer black and discovered a [redacted] pipe which was covered with vegetation. The black discharge was coming from this pipe. It was laid in the direction of the corner of a hedge line and I checked the hedge line to see if there was an open waterway but there wasn't. The hedge was in the direction of a [redacted] which I inspected along with the [redacted]. I observed the waterway at the rear of the [redacted] was black in colour and we continued upstream along the rear of the [redacted] until I observed a black discharge entering the waterway. Upstream of this point the waterway was visually clean. [redacted] informed me that he thought [redacted] knew what the issue was. [redacted] stated [redacted] had received [redacted] from another [redacted] into a [redacted] on 23/12/2025 and there must be a leak from the tank. He stated when [redacted] built the tank [redacted] put a surface water pipe around the edge of the tank to prevent water causing the tank to rise and some of the [redacted] must be entering the pipe which led to the waterway. [redacted] explained that [redacted] had already got an engineer's report confirming the tank was fit to be used before using it. [redacted] stated [redacted] would carry out remedial work immediately to initially stop the discharge and then carry out futher work to correct the fault. I informed him that I intended to collect a statutory sample of the discharge which I did at 10:53 hours and this was witnessed [redacted]. While I was sealing and labelling the statutory sample, [redacted] carried out work to stop the discharge and before I left the [redacted], I confirmed there was no further discharge to the waterway. However, there was a significant volume of [redacted] in the waterway, which was going to tank time to work its way through the system. I arranged to call back the [redacted] at the beginning of January 2026 to inspect the waterway and complete a [redacted] Awaiting results of the statutory sample.

Pollution Confirmed	Yes	Source	[redacted]
Pollutant Category	[redacted]	Pollution Severity	Medium
PCA	3	Fishkill Figures From	
Fish Kill Severity			
Kill Count			

Report Executed by [REDACTED]

External Incident Report



Incident Number	WR 3/24/0093		
Incident Title	Poor invertebrates below discharge E [redacted]		
Investigation Date	29/07/2024 15:00:00		
Investigation Details	Phone call from [redacted] [redacted] Had been undertaking some kick sampling the previous day, downstream of [redacted]. The first few kicks were good - cased caddis, flathead nymphs, olives etc. At one point, there was just a small beetle and 1 leech. Discovered that this was near where [redacted] (an emergency discharge) from the [redacted] would discharge to. There was a flow from [redacted] on that occasion. WQI visited 29/7 and found the same thing. Plenty of various types of mayflies, caddis etc upstream of the discharge point. But immediately downstream of the discharge point to [redacted], there only seemed to be midge larvae and a leech or two. And a small frog! By approx. 30 m downstream of the discharge point to [redacted], the mayflies were returning and number of midge larvae diminishing. The [redacted] is at this point a small upland burn. Not many other potential impacts apart from a few houses in the area. There is a sign marked [redacted] near the road and it is at this point that a small waterway issues from under the road. It meanders through an overgrown grassland area, before discharging to the [redacted]. From the consent it would appear that [redacted] is an emergency overflow of [redacted]. There was a very strong smell of chlorine and the bed was rather silty. Consent states : "when the [redacted] is made continuously over a period of 7 days or more, the discharge must be sampled once per week. In such cases a sampling program must be forwarded to NIEA for the stated period; the day of sampling in the week must be varied across all 7 days and the time of sampling varied throughout the day". Referred to [redacted] who forwarded to [redacted].		
Pollution Confirmed	Yes	Source	[redacted]
Pollutant Category	[redacted]	Pollution Severity	Low
PCA	3	Fishkill Figures From	[redacted]
Fish Kill Severity			
Kill Count			

Report Executed by [REDACTED]

External Incident Report



Incident Number	WR 3/25/0522		
Incident Title	Low Kick sample in [REDACTED]		
Investigation Date	26/11/2025 10:00:00		
Investigation Details	Report of a low kick sample in the [REDACTED] at the rear of 8 [REDACTED]. Met [REDACTED] from FMA Team on 26/11/2025 and they did three kick samples in the [REDACTED]. One at the same location as the kick sample done by the complainant, one upstream of the domestic properties in [REDACTED] and one approximately 1km upstream of the village. [REDACTED]. All three sites were similar, with no improvement shown in the samples upstream of the village. The report suggests the entire catchment may be under pressure due to diffuse pressures. The investigation revealed no specific point source pressure at the site at the rear of [REDACTED], however results suggest that catchment wide pressures are resulting in a suppressed invertebrate community across all sites. The ASPT classification (Moderate at all three sites) suggests that the issue is organic in nature, however sewage fungus recorded at sites 2 and 3 was minimal. The pressure is likely to be diffuse in nature, and the catchment scale mitigation may need to be considered. It is also important to consider the impact of recent storms and high river flows. Often during periods of flooding and high flows, invertebrates can be scoured from the habitat and can take time to recover. [REDACTED] on 25/11/2025 stated that [REDACTED] were going back to the [REDACTED] to collect more samples further up the catchment to try and pinpoint what may be causing the low kick sample results.		
Pollution Confirmed	No	Source	[REDACTED]
Pollutant Category	[REDACTED]	Pollution Severity	[REDACTED]
PCA	3	Fishkill Figures From	[REDACTED]
Fish Kill Severity	[REDACTED]		
Kill Count	[REDACTED]		