

| ASSET INVESTIGATION DETAILS  |  |   |                     |   |   |    |
|--|--|---|---------------------|---|---|----|
| SAP Asset Name:  | Flint Mountain SPS   |   |                     | Asset Template reference  | CM0010901-FLINT MOUNTAIN SPS FLINT MOUNTAIN-71267-Stage 1 - OC-Flintshire & Wrexham |    |
| Investigation Type   | SOAF (River)   |   |                     |   |   |    |
| Year of breach:  | 2021   | Spill Trigger cause:                          |                     | OC Continuation Restriction (Flow Control)  |   |    |
| Year of Investigation:   | 2022   | Investigation year performance:               |                     | 73  |   |    |
| Population of Asset  | 36   | Modelled Performance: (DESIGN) / (CALIBRATED) |                     | 9 / 9   |   |    |
| Permit Details   |  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| Storm Permit ID:   | CM0010901  | Storm Permit Name:                            |                     | Flint Mountain Sewage Pumping Station   |   |    |
| Asset NGR:   | SJ2379070170   | Waterbody ID                                  |                     | GB111067056920  |   |    |
| Discharge NGR:   | SJ2379070170   | Water body Discharge location                 |                     | Un-named Dee Estuary South  |   |    |
| Brief description of asset<br>(Screen, PFF flow control, Storage, outfall)   |  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| <p>If the CSO is in the network:<br/> Incoming Pipe: 150mm; CSO Type: surcharge relief pipe; Screening: copa sacks; Flow Control: pump capacity; PFF Pipe: 80mm rising main; Storage 11.53 m3 (Modelled); Consent: 1.6 l/s (Permit).</p> <p>If the incoming flow exceeds the capacity of the flow restriction, the level in the wet well rises. Spill flows pass to the storm holding tank. Once full, spill flows pass through copa sack screens to spill chamber, discharging over the weir to the outfall pipe.</p> |  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| SOAF STAGE 1   |  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| Details of assessment:   | <p>Asset condition surveys supported by hydraulic model assessment of the asset performance against available telemetry information (EDM and radar rainfall datasets).</p> <p>Additional flow and rainfall monitoring was undertaken to improve the baseline model accuracy and assist in defining the root cause of spills.</p>   |   |                     |   |   |    |
| Permit Compliance  |  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| PFF  | Design Compliant – Operational Intervention required to restore  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| Storage  | Compliant  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| Screening  | Compliant  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| Bespoke/Other  | N/A  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| SOAF Stage 1 findings  |  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| <p>Following the hydraulic model assessment, the cause of the high spills at the asset is concluded to be OC Continuation Restriction (Flow Control).</p> <p>While the predicted pass-forward flow is within 10% of consent prior to the first spill, the pump is not consistently performing at this level throughout the assessment year.</p> <p>The model is fit for use, based on the reported spill numbers and telemetry trends.</p>   |  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| Cause of spill count :   | Other Cause  | Yes   | Catchment Hydraulic | No  | Infiltration & IRP required   | No |
| Future Operational Management Proposal:  | <p>The primary cause of the spills are operational factors that have been assessed as deliverable in the short term. The asset has been added to the SOAF Intervention programme with the details outlined below.</p>  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| Operational intervention required:   | <p>Increase pump maintenance and servicing. Operational issue identified with pump at time of survey and throughout assessment year. Telemetry data from December 2022 and reduced spill count for 2023 indicate this issue appears to have been resolved. Continue monitoring pump performance going forward to ensure design operation.</p> <p>Once these interventions are in place, the hydraulic modelling indicates the asset will be compliant with its discharge permit.</p> |   |                     |   |   |    |
| SOAF Operational Intervention  |  |   |                     |   |   |    |
| Start Date:  | Aug-24   | Completion Date:                              | TBC                 | Indicative future annual spill performance<br>(less than 40 do not continue to stage 2) |   | 0  |

|                            |        |   |   |  |  |
|----------------------------|--------|---|---|--|--|
| Intervention Description:  |        | Pump Performance has been identified as a factor in excess spills at this asset, the assessment has determined that the pump performance requires a review and implementation of recommendations in order to achieve PFF. |   |  |  |
| Target Completion by Date: | Aug-25 | Data years to be excluded from future SOAF triggers calculations  | - | Request to hold stage 2 surveys for environment recovery |  |

| SOAF STAGE 2                   |              |                               |   |  |   |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Receiving Waterbody WFD Status |              |                               | -   |  |   |
| Stage 2a                       |              |                               |   |  |   |
| Aesthetic survey:              | Spring       | -                             | Aesthetic Total score (inclusive of amenity classification, previous complaints & pollutions) | -  | - |
|                                | Autumn       | -                             |   | -  | - |
| Stage 2b                       |              |                               |   | Yes / No unable due to culverted watercourse |   |
| Invertebrate survey:           | Spring       | -                             | Invertebrate survey score:  | -  | - |
|                                | Autumn       | -                             |   | -  | - |
| Stage 2c Required:             |              |                               |   | Yes / No                                     |   |
| Stage 2c screening:            | Not required | Progressed through screening? | No  | Stage 2c water quality assessment Score:     | - |

| SOAF STAGE 3 - STEP 1>3            |           |                     |                     |     |              |     |
|------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Options assessed                   | Rainscape |                     | Traditional Storage | N   | PFF Increase | N   |
| Equivalent storage volume required | -         | Rainscape Cost      |                     | -   | CBR          | -   |
| Bespoke future trigger agreement   | 40        | Traditional Storage |                     | -   | CBR          | -   |
|                                    |           | Other               |                     | N/A | CBR          | N/A |
| Key Constraints                    | -         |                     |                     |     |              |     |
| Future Active Management Proposal  | -         |                     |                     |     |              |     |

| Conclusion and Future Spill Reduction Proposals |  |                       |     |                                  |   |
|---|--|-----------------------|-----|----------------------------------|---|
| Summary   | <p>Flint Mountain Sewage Pumping Station Based on the direction from the Welsh Government led Better River Quality Task Force, DCWW Storm overflow spill reduction programme will target the elimination of ecological harm and prevention of adverse ecological impact of any SO.</p> <p>With a large programme of assets requiring improvement priority will be given to CSOs having the greatest impact in the most sensitive receiving waters.</p> <p>To ensure that the improvement delivered is long term, the improvements for each site will be based on the expectation that water quality upstream of the discharge meets good or high ecological status (GES) irrespective of the actual status of the water.</p> <p>This approach has formed the basis of DCWW's portfolio investment plan for Storm Overflows.</p> <p>Flint Mountain Sewage Pumping Station was shown to have an other cause issue resulting in higher spills which are expected to reduce once a resolution has been implemented.</p> <p>The asset will undertake classification as part of DCWW's GN066 in AMP6, to establish any impact that there might be.</p> |                       |     |                                  |   |
| Asset Prioritisation Level                      | -  |                       |     | Delivery Predicted Period        | - |
| Asset NEP ID                                    | N/A  | Asset NEP Driver Code | N/A | Detailed Design Predicted Period | - |
| Progression to Stage 5 In AMP                   | No   |                       |     |                                  |   |

| SOAF AGREEMENT         |                            |  |   |  |  |                    |
|------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|--|--|--------------------|
|                        | Date                       | SOAF STAGE                               |   | Name   | Contact Details  | Location of Output |
| DCWW Approval          | 01/08/2024                 | Stage 1 - OC                             |   | Christian Phillips Adams   | <a href="mailto:christian.phillipsadams@dwrwymru.com">christian.phillipsadams@dwrwymru.com</a> | Email              |
| Regulator Liaison Date | Click here to enter a date |  |   |  |  |                    |
| CSO Classification     |                            |  |   |  |  |                    |
| Satisfactory           | N                          | Unsatisfactory                           | Y | Sub Standard   | N  |                    |
|                        |                            | Any operation in dry weather conditions? | Y | Does not meet modern standards of engineering and aesthetic control for storm overflow structures set out in the British standard BS EN 752:2017 drain and sewer systems outside buildings | N  |                    |

|  |            |  |          |
|--|------------|--|----------|
| Any operation in breach of permit conditions?  | <b>Y</b>   | Does not have sufficient hydraulic capacity compared to accepted minimum design standards  | <b>N</b> |
| Any significant visual or aesthetic impact due to solids or sewage fungus?   | <b>N/A</b> | Risks becoming unsatisfactory because discharges have increased beyond the original design due to infiltration, growth and urban creep | <b>N</b> |
| Cause or significantly contributes to a deterioration in the biological or chemical status of the receiving water? | <b>N/A</b> |  |          |
| Causes or significantly contributes to failures in bathing water quality standards for identified bathing waters?  | <b>N/A</b> |  |          |
| Causes or significantly contributes to failures in shellfish quality standards for identified shellfish waters     | <b>N/A</b> |  |          |
| Causes or significantly contribute to failures in water quality standards in coastal and transitional waters?      | <b>N/A</b> |  |          |
| Causes pollution of groundwater?   | <b>N/A</b> |  |          |



