



Large Water Resource Options Stakeholder Technical Meeting No. 2 Minutes

Date: 7th January 2015
Location: Clearwater Court, Reading
Notes of key discussion points
1. Smaller resource options (<50MI/d)
<p>a. Stakeholders expressed an interest in the smaller resource options and requested further information on how these are being assessed. TW confirmed that smaller resource options (< 50 MI/d) will be assessed using the same methodological approach as the larger water resource options. This process will be undertaken once the screening approach and criteria have been agreed with regulators and stakeholders for the larger options. TW will provide further information on the timeline at the next meeting (26 March). TW confirmed that there will be consultation with regulators and stakeholders as this work is undertaken.</p>
2. National and regional options and regional strategies
<p>a. Stakeholders raised questions around national options, such as a national water grid, and how TW would assess these. TW confirmed that Defra and the EA are responsible for consideration of national options. TW has raised this point with the EA.</p> <p>b. Stakeholders also raised queries on the work of WRSE and how this will feed into TW's work. TW explained that it is a member of WRSE. The purpose of WRSE is to consider water resources from a regional perspective and the intention is for WRSE to take a more strategic approach for WRMP19 than that taken at WRMP14. One of the WRSE work stream is considering options and options appraisal.</p>
3. Rejection register review
<p>a. Grand Union Canal – There was discussion around the sources of water for the canal options. The Canal and River Trust are progressing a study to review the opportunities to use the canal network for transfers. TW, alongside other water companies, are participating in this study. The timings of this work was raised as a concern.</p> <p>b. Abstraction support using effluent – This option involves transfer of effluent from Mogden STW to facilitate abstraction. TW confirmed that this option is in discussion with the EA to understand the feasibility from an environmental perspective. This option is TBC until discussions are concluded with the EA. It was noted that if this option is excluded, the Beckton option could be reactivated.</p> <p>c. Existing reservoir stability study – There were a number of points raised regarding reservoirs including opportunities for deepening, the rate of fill due to embankment stability, and unused storage volume. TW explained that the desiccation of the cores has left deepening of reservoirs/raising of embankments unlikely without significant work. There was reference to a number of studies which have been completed. GARD asked that this is an area for further consideration.</p> <p>d. The transparency of third party options was raised, specifically the non-disclosure agreements between TW and United Utilities (UU) and Severn Trent Water (STW). UU and STW explained that the agreements were implemented to ensure information was disseminated in a managed and controlled way. UU and STW confirmed that further development work is required on these options. They also confirmed that they are willing to consider information requests from stakeholders. GARD welcomed the response and agreed to send specific questions and information requests to UU and STW for their consideration.</p>

e. Tankering – Albion Water stated that they understood that the option was screened out on the basis of cost and stated that it will respond to the coarse screening feedback.
4. Fine screening
a. Cost
i. Utilisation of options was a key discussion topic in the context of cost. TW explained that determination of utilisation of options is not straightforward as the assessment needs to take account of demand, operating rules, external conditions and how schemes work in conjunction with each other. Inclusion of a most likely utilisation scenario as well as the maximum and minimum utilisation envelope was generally supported by attendees. It was suggested that credible design scenarios need to be used taking account of the wider system operation.
ii. Stakeholders expressed interest in understanding assumptions on contingencies and optimism bias. This was also discussed in terms of third party options to understand if options would be compared on a consistent basis.
iii. Albion Water requested further information on the process and timeline to respond to a drought. TW referenced the Drought Plan which sets out the steps to help to manage water use and the timeline for the implementation of these steps.
b. Environment and Social (E&S)
i. The E&S assessment is qualitative, as are other criteria, there was discussion about how the qualitative assessments will be considered in combination with quantitative assessments (AIC & C). TW explained that the intention is to set out a clear narrative for each criteria, this will ensure all information is clear and transparent and informs the decision making. This approach was supported by stakeholders.
ii. In the context of the STTs, it was suggested that TW should take account of the lessons learnt from Essex and Suffolk Water Ely-Ouse to Essex transfer.
iii. To date E&S assessments have not been completed for options which were not included on the constrained options list for WRMP14. TW confirmed that the STW and UU options will be taken forward to fine screening. TW will request further information from STW and UU to inform the fine screening assessment.
c. Promotability
i. The need to consider the benefits of resource development to other water resource zones (e.g. SWOX) was raised.
ii. In view of recent updated housing projections, the point was raised that demands across Oxfordshire, as well as London, need consideration. Furthermore consideration of how the growth may ultimately be dispersed across a wider area is also needed.
iii. Impact on integrated river basin management (catchment management - considering flooding and biodiversity) was suggested as a gap in the assessment. For example would an option facilitate reducing abstractions in the Kennet? Would there be an impact of flood risk?
iv. Cost implications of regulatory acceptability (e.g. changes required for meeting discharge consents) was raised as an issue for consideration.
d. Flexibility
i. GARD suggested that a distinction could be made between rural and urban pipelines.
ii. The importance of phasing options was raised.
iii. Stakeholders supported consideration of flexible approaches such as TE2100

e. Deliverability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Stakeholders challenged that the lack of TW experience of construction/operation of an option should be an impediment to delivery as this could be mitigated through buying in relevant skills and knowledge. TW explained, using desalination as a case study, that despite buying in knowledge scheme costs can increase substantially if there is limited operational experience in the company.
f. Resilience
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The need for a planning horizon which extends beyond 25 years was raised. ii. The resilience assessment for the unsupported STT was challenged. iii. The resilience of the Abingdon reservoir was challenged in regard to the potential impact on the Lower Thames reservoirs as a consequence of refill during the winter months. iv. A gap identified was catchment management – It was raised that TW should consider planning from a catchment perspective for example taking account of flood relief schemes. v. A further dimension to resilience proposed was terrorism/vandalism and that this should be explicitly considered for options.
5. Phase 2 Investigations
a. Canals
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Contribution of resource from the River Froome to the Cotswold Canal was proposed as a secondary investigation. ii. The cost assumptions regarding the canal and the Deerhurst pipeline options were challenged and stakeholders requested that these need to be investigated more fully. iii. The point of discharge was raised as an important point for consideration for canal transfers. This may negate the need for the Lechlade to Culham pipeline as part of the canal transfer option which would reduce costs. iv. Options which deliver benefit for both SWOX and London require further consideration and the benefit assessment needs to take this into account. v. Bankside storage requirements at Deerhurst requires further consideration (Jacobs report/secondary investigation) vi. Potential for energy recapture in pipelines or hydropower was put forward for consideration (Jacobs report/secondary investigation).
b. Desalination
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Stakeholders queried if further work had been completed to consider renewable energy sources (secondary investigation)
c. Reservoir
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Catchment management was flagged and the need to consider these schemes in a more holistic manner. ii. Impact of flood management plans for the River Thames on deployable outputs.
d. River abstraction
e. Wastewater reuse
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. An option previously proposed by STW involved reuse at Minworth STW which had a relatively low cost (a cost of 25p/m³ was quoted). STW stated that this option was not proposed in WRMP14 and that these costs may no longer be applicable. GARD stated that further information will be requested from STW.
f. Stormwater/greywater
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Use of stormwater/greywater recycling at a localised level was raised for further



	consideration.
g.	Other
i.	Information was requested on the programme of work to review the LTCD. TW confirmed that this work is progressing. A timeline is set out in TWs response to the consultation on the environmental objectives which is available on TWs website www.thameswater.co.uk/wrmp (Stakeholder engagement section).
ii.	Sensitivities around deployable output (DO) ranges for options was raised. TW confirmed that DO assessments prepared for WRMP14 have been utilised. The DO assessments will be revisited if any changes are found following LTCD development.
iii.	Ecosystem services – This was raised as a potentially helpful approach to consider multiple benefits.
iv.	TW explained that it is reviewing Future Flows and climate change variation

Date of next meeting: 26 March 2015 at Thames Water offices, Reading. Invitations will be sent in February.

Attendees

Environment Agency	Sarah Wardell
London Fire Brigade	Andy Hanson
RWE Npower	Martin Pilbin
GARD	John Lawson
Cotswolds Rivers Trust	Trevor Cramphorn
WWF	Colin Fenn
Thames Rivers Trust	Peter Spillett
United Utilities	Richard Blackwell
Albion Water	Malcolm Jeffery
Wiltshire and Berkshire Canal Trust	Dave Cook
Cotswold Canal Trust	John Beatty
Oxfordshire County Council	Linda Currie
Severn Trent Water	Ken MacDonald

Apologies

CCWater	Ana Millan-Villaneda
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	Keith Faricy