Executive summary

About this document
In this document we are providing an overview of focus groups which were held with communities downstream from the proposed Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme in May 2016. We have also provided a summary of the outputs and what will happen next.

The focus groups
We held 3 focus groups during May 2016. We wanted to know what understanding there was amongst the downstream communities of the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme, and what these communities thought about the scheme. These workshops were organised following a public consultation earlier in the year during which it became clear that there were concerns about increased flood risk and misconceptions about the scheme.

Next steps
The outputs of the focus groups will help us to plan future engagement with downstream communities. We will be implementing our communications from Autumn 2016.

We will also start preparations for submitting our planning application shortly and, if it is granted, construction is planned to begin in 2018.

There will be further opportunities for public input when we hold our next consultation in Spring 2017.
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Introduction

Oxford has 4,500 properties at a 1% or higher risk of flooding each year (also referred to as a 1 in 100 flood). This number could rise to nearly 6,000 by the year 2080 with the predicted effects of climate change. Major roads, the railway line, schools and businesses could also be affected by flooding.

The Oxford Flood Risk Management Strategy, published in 2009, produced a detailed study of the flood risk from rivers in Oxford. The strategy described how flood risk can be managed in Oxford over the next 100 years, in 3 phases. The first phase included asset repairs and maintenance, and was completed in 2012.

The second phase identified that the best way to manage flood risk in Oxford was to construct a flood relief channel through the western floodplain. The Environment Agency is working in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council, Oxford City Council, Vale of White Horse District Council, Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee, Thames Water, the University of Oxford, Oxford Local Enterprise Partnership and the Oxford Flood Alliance, to develop a flood alleviation scheme. The proposed flood relief scheme will reduce the risk to over 1,000 homes and businesses as well reducing the impact of flooding on major transport routes.

We shared our outline proposals at a series of public events in the summer of 2015. These were attended by around 300 people who were asked to share their comments, ideas and concerns with our team.

The feedback from these events, along with further groundwork investigations and analysis, allowed consultants CH2M to prepare options to alleviate flood risk using the capacity of the western flood plain.

Our consultation in January to March 2016 presented these options to the public and stakeholders. The opinions, ideas and concerns expressed during this consultation are helping to identify the preferred route option.

We received feedback from the 2015 public events and the consultation in January – March 2016 from individuals and communities downstream from Oxford. The views they expressed included concern about flooding risk for their homes, businesses and communities, including concerns that the impact of floods is being transferred downstream from Oxford. We wanted to understand more about these views and concerns in order to help us develop appropriate and relevant communications for these stakeholders.

To find out more about the views and concerns expressed by those living in communities downstream from Oxford and the proposed Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme, we held focus groups.

Our objectives for these were to:
• improve our understanding of what downstream communities’ concerns are, and why they had these concerns.

• improve our understanding of what communities current understanding is of the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme.

• find out what tools people think would help our communication to downstream communities.

• engage with people who are influential in their communities.
The focus group process

When were the focus groups held?
The outputs of the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme consultation became available from late March 2016.

In April we contacted downstream communities to find out if they would be interested in participating in the focus groups. The focus groups had to be completed around restrictions of 2 separate pre-election periods for local elections held on 5 May and the EU Referendum on 23 June.

3 focus groups were held between 3 and 18 May 2016.

Who took part?
We identified all the communities downstream from the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme as far down river as Henley on Thames (Appendix 1).

We then reviewed the stakeholder database for the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme which holds records of all communications, to identify those communities and individuals which had been in touch and expressed concerns.

The communities we contacted to find out if they would be interested in participating in the focus groups were:

Streatley, Goring on Thames, Wallingford, Benson, Clifton Hampden, Long Wittenham, Appleton, Culham, Sutton Courtenay and Abingdon.

The communities which were represented at the focus groups were:

Wallingford, Long Wittenham, Goring on Thames, Sutton Courtenay, Abingdon.

The Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme team members taking part in the focus groups included our consultant from CH2M, Project Managers, Community Engagement Manager and Community Engagement Officers.

Separately, we contacted Sandford-on-Thames and asked if they would like us to hold an open public meeting with them, after the route of the scheme was shared with the public on 28 June. Meetings were also held with landowners and residents in Radley.

Where were they held?
We held 3 evening focus groups. Each venue was chosen to make it easy for the people taking part to attend. The events were held at:

- Wallingford - Town Council offices.
- Benson – Parish Hall.
- Abingdon – St Ethelwold’s House.
The focus group discussion topics

The agenda for the focus groups covered the following topics:

- existing knowledge of the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme.
- information on the scheme.
- what are the community talking about and why.
- developing effective communication tools.
- ways to communicate.
- what’s next.
- any questions.

Ahead of the focus group, we asked all the participants to think about any examples they had of successful engagement with their communities. This could be on any subject, not necessarily related to flood risk. We asked them to bring any visual materials they may have to the meeting.
Existing knowledge and concerns

What did the focus group participants know about the scheme?
The first discussion in the focus groups was about what communities and attendees already knew about the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme. We wanted to know what their understanding was, and what information they had already had access to. We received full responses from the Abingdon and Wallingford focus groups to this discussion.

Abingdon
The responses from the focus group participants to the opening questions in the discussion are as follows:

What have you read about the scheme?
- It's a scheme to provide flood relief for Oxford.
- The press releases around the public consultation.
- A little. Attended Vale (of White Horse) councillors briefing.
- The website and press coverage.

Have you been to any public events about the scheme?
- The one at Abbey House (Abingdon).
- Local public consultations back in March.

What community discussions have you had about the scheme?
- Just a few related discussions on the impact on Abingdon.
- At the cricket club we have had discussions re this at committee meetings.
- 12-15 residents have been in touch (Town Councillor).
Wallingford

The responses from the focus group participants in Wallingford to the opening questions in the discussion are as follows:

What have you read about the scheme?
- Options for the scheme and Principles for Design.
- Environment Agency consultation.
- OCC briefing – divert water away from Oxford into 'storage' areas around Oxford.

Have you been to any public events about the scheme?
- No, but have taken part in discussions in the River Users Group (Area 3).
- No, but fellow Councillors have.

What community discussions have you had about the scheme?
- Various – responses range from 'no problem' to outrage and fear.
- Nothing other than briefing from those who attended consultation.
- Some concern about flooding being displaced.
What is your interest in the scheme?
We also wanted to understand what interest the focus group participants had in the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme. The comments from each group are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>As the local cricket club is on the flood plain, we are concerned that our ground will be affected by increased flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Councillor representing Abbey Northcourt Ward. Also Town Councillor and resident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The impact on the St Helen’s Mill area. General impact on all Abingdon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson event</td>
<td>Will the Scheme increase flooding risk in Goring and Streatley?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representing Sutton Courtenay. Flooding is no 1 issue for Sutton Courtenay, with planning and new houses developments. Concerned about changes in Oxford and Abingdon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What will the effect be on Goring and Streatley?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Impact on villages downstream of Oxford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several people have asked me about the scheme and what effect it will have on those of us further downstream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on Wallingford. Keep residents informed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community concerns about the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme

We also asked the focus group participants what their communities are concerned about, and why they are concerned.

The participants told us that the concerns were:

- about the impact on their community, not just from the Oxford scheme, but also the cumulative impact taking into account proposed flood risk projects in Abingdon.
- about such as “flooding our villages to save Oxford” or “closing or opening of flood gates on the Ock, which in actual fact do not exist”. It was acknowledged that these views were often based on misconceptions or untruths.
- about spending money on a project of this nature at time when Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) is making cut backs. This was based on a misconception that OCC was the only funder.
- that flooding in future will become more severe, with different types of events.
- that no matter what the scheme aims to do “this won’t stop flooding”; and,
- that a simple demonstration of how the scheme will work is required, and this needs to show that the net flow will be no greater than before.

The reason communities have these concerns is because:

- they believe previous model predictions have not been accurate (the flooding of the River Ock in Abingdon was cited).
- people are fearful, partly because they do not have the information, and because they don’t have the facts.
- they struggle with the terminology, and what it actually means e.g. 1 in 100 years.
- they believe that their home, property or business is being ‘sacrificed’ to benefit other communities.

What communications have worked well for other projects?

We asked the focus group participants to discuss projects that they were familiar with, and which they felt had communicated well. These were not necessarily projects to do with rivers or flooding issues, and the examples cited included Neighbourhood Plan development and the Westfield and Bicester shopping destinations.

The feedback we received about successful communications elsewhere included general observations and also some specific ideas:

Open, concerned and up-front, and spend time with communities

We were told that for the communication to be successful, there must be trust. To gain this trust, the individuals involved in delivering the communication need to be genuinely open and concerned, and knowledgeable about flooding events in the area. This could include the opportunity for one-to-one conversations.
It was suggested that spending time with communities could help. Examples and suggestions included:

- offering guided walks, or experiences such as ‘spend a day with a hydrologist’.
- work with a local school and invite them to help build a model which explains the concept.

Interactive, and participative
We were told that people’s understanding of what is proposed would be enhanced with an interactive working model, where people could literally “press the button” or otherwise interact and see for themselves the processes and the engineering solutions proposed. Maps with buttons that light up were also suggested.

Presentation with a number of features
A drop-in event with a number of features was also suggested. This could include:

- a rolling video presentation with the principles of what is proposed, but not too long.
- informative boards/panels.
- opportunity for one-to-one with key personnel from partner organisations and local councillors.
- infographics and references that people can relate to (e.g. channel volumes as percentages).
What types of communication materials work?

During this session of the focus group, we asked the participants to review a range of materials which could be used to support communication about the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme to their communities, and also to other downstream communities.

The materials we prepared were:

- infographics.
- drawings and diagrams.
- information sheets and briefings.
- flood maps, modelling results and graphs.
- photos with flood marks of before and after flooding events.
- videos.

Examples of the materials are included in the appendices to this report, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
<td>Infographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td>Drawings and diagrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
<td>Information sheets and briefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 5</td>
<td>Flood maps, modelling results and graphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 6</td>
<td>Photos with flood marks before and after flooding events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 7</td>
<td>Videos (links)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infographics
We presented a range of infographic material to the focus group participants and received detailed feedback from the Wallingford and Abingdon participants.

Who would this method reach?
We asked the focus group participants who they thought would be most likely to respond to infographic material.

They said that that:

- people who want facts, but don't have much time.
- people who struggle with a lot of text and detail, and possibly dyslexics.
- visual learners.
- website users - those who go and look for information.
- younger demographic (20-60).
- visitors to exhibitions, and
- newspaper readers.

What are the pros for this type of communication material?
The participants told us that this type of material is:

- clear, concise and easy to understand.
- has words and pictures, so will be remembered.
- good visually, and dependent on styles, graphic and engaging.

What are the cons for this type of communication material?
We asked what the downside of this type of material could be, and the Abingdon and Wallingford focus group participants said that:

- there is little evidence to back up the facts, and no sense of where the numbers have come from, therefore trust would need to have been established in order for this type of communication to be effective.
- some participants felt that the materials were too complicated and trying to give too much information, while others felt they were too simplistic.
Drawings and diagrams
We presented a range of material comprising different styles of drawings and diagrams to the focus group participants. We received general feedback, and also detailed responses on specific items from participants in all 3 focus groups.

Who would this method reach?
The people who were most likely to respond to this method of communication were considered to be:

- visual learners, and people who are comfortable reading maps.
- visitors to exhibitions.
- younger people, where a cartoon style was adopted.

What are the pros for this type of communication material?
The general comments were that this type of material can be very concise, and can provide images demonstrating different angles of a situation or event.

What are the cons for this type of communication material?
The focus groups told us that this type of material is problematic for some people who just can’t read diagrams. We were also told that this method of communication is disjointed, “not connected the things we relate to”. Supporting information would be required and if at an event someone would need to be available to provide an explanation.

We also received specific comments on one particular illustration:
We were told that this diagram needed more explanation and that it was confusing, being described as a 2 stage channel, when in fact there are 3 illustrations. It was also commented upon that there was no source or other identifying information. This demonstrates that this illustration might be better used to explain what the scheme would look like at different stages of flood, rather than an explanation of two-stage channels.

The focus groups understood the concept, and told us that it could be better explained by:

- use of a time lapse video e.g. like flooding in the Okavanga Delta, and
- using a physical model, such as a tank filled with sand.
Information sheets and briefings

Who would this method reach?
The focus group participants told us that they felt that these types of communications were best suited to:

- people who want to be signposted to further details, but do it in their own time.
- those who are very interested, or already know some of the details, but would nevertheless find the material useful.

What are the pros for this type of communication material?
We were told that this type of material could be used to show quite a bit of information and could also draw the reader into wanting more information.

We were also told that it could be effective to deliver information sheets at the weekends, when there is little other post and people have more time.

What are the cons for this type of communication material?
Some of our focus group participants told us that there was too much detail for the lay person and that it was difficult to extract specific information. Others suggested that changing the layout to 2 columns and blocks could make it more accessible.

We were told that the content of the newsletter described the process, but didn’t actually provide the information that the reader wanted to hear. Specific information about, for example, how many properties were flooded, or when this last occurred was missing.

One respondent also commented that there is too much paper-based communication around and it would get lost.
Flood maps, modelling results and graphs

Who would this method reach?
The focus group participants told us that these types of materials are best suited to people:

- who are technically minded.
- who read things carefully and will spend time.
- who live close to the river.

What are the pros for this type of communication material?
We were told that this type of material is good for deep data analysis, and makes things seem grounded in reality.

What are the cons for this type of communication material?
We were told that for most people these materials are too technical, and many people can’t read maps or graphs. We were also told that the materials could be confusing and did not help with understanding a 3 dimensional situation.

Comments
We also received specific comments about the layout and design of the materials:

- colours are important e.g. red should be highest, not lowest risk.
- graphs should be simple.
- “before” and “after” should be presented.
- graphs or charts should be presented side by side, or super imposed.
Photos with flood marks of before and after flooding events
We asked the focus group participants to give us feedback on photographs which showed flood marks, like the example below:

Caption: Flood level before the scheme

Who would this method reach?
The Wallingford focus group told us that this method is straightforward and would reach lots of people.

What are the pros for this type of communication material?
Photographs can be easily understood, and can be very powerful when locally recognised places are used.

What are the cons for this type of communication material?
The photographs on their own could make people suspicious and need to have written explanations. We were also told that photographs showing flood marks are emotive and convey everything negative about flooding.
Videos
We showed the focus group participants 5 videos in different styles, all of which depicted water or river management initiatives.

This type of interpretation received many comments.

Who would this method reach?
The focus group participants told us that video materials could be used:

- to communicate to visitors at an exhibition or an event.
- by people using the internet.
- to convey via a short video (computer based) or longer documentary.
- by community TV channels.
- by other stakeholders, who could share links to a YouTube (or similar) post.

What are the pros for this type of communication material?
We were told that video is a good format because it can be accessed online, and “in your own time”. People can also be made aware of the material via social media.

We received specific comments on the videos:

Medmerry – this video demonstrates the managed realignment scheme in West Sussex on the South Coast of England where new defences were built inland from the coast and a new ‘intertidal’ area was formed seaward of the new defences (see appendix 7 for link).

The focus group participants told us that this video is good, that there are other things there which give scale, and the story works. They also told us that it gave a good explanation, demonstrating what will happen, although they also told us that it should part of a communications package, not standalone.

A criticism of the Medmerry video was that it appeared to be in 2D and did not provide any concept of relief.

What are the cons for this type of communication material?
The focus group participants told us the things which they didn’t like about the videos, and factors which we should be aware of:

- the video needs to be of a recognisable area – generic river shots won’t work.
- a simple style is good, but be aware not to be too simplistic, or to ‘dumb down’.
- be sure to include ‘what’ as well as ‘why’, and provide context.
- sounds can be annoying – so choose carefully.

Ideas for video
Our focus group participants were particularly engaged with video as a method of communication and as well as feedback, they generated ideas:
Video style and content

**Use of video**

The focus group participants suggested that video material should be hosted on a YouTube channel, or partner website (e.g. Oxfordshire County Council) and the web link should be shared via parish/village newsletters, websites and social media.
One of our focus group participants sketched the following model after viewing the sample material to illustrate that increasing level of complexity of visual materials used in communication materials, where detailed information and data is most complex and infographics least complex.
Ways we engage

What works best for your community?
We asked the focus group participants to tell us what sort of communications work best for their communities. There were some features which were common to all the communities represented, but also some things which were quite specific.

Generic:
Timing of communications
We were told that there was little point in trying to engage with communities over the summer months, but to wait until after the summer holiday period.

Events have been suggested, and the focus groups have told us that the timing of these needs to include evenings and Saturday.

Local magazines
Most villages and communities have a village or parish magazine. The focus groups told us that we should submit a one-page article to all the community press. Things to be aware of:

- some magazines are issued only every 2 months.
- some do not have August or January issues, and
- lead time can be as much as 8 weeks.

We were also recommended to contact the “Round and About” free delivery local commercial magazine which includes some editorial “jottings”.

Work with partners
We were told that working with local partners would be helpful.

Specific recommendations included:

- investigate working with the Earth Trust, the environmental learning charity which owns and manages land with river frontage around Little Wittenham, Dorchester on Thames and Shillingford, and also Wallingford Castle Meadows and Thrupp Lake near Abingdon. This is perceived to be a ‘trusted brand’. [http://www.earthtrust.org.uk/About-us.aspx](http://www.earthtrust.org.uk/About-us.aspx)
- use OXFAS partners to enhance web presence e.g. Oxfordshire County Council to host web info and also seek to get links from County, District and Town Council websites.
- include local councillors in events, and work with them to help communications to different stakeholders.

Web based calendars and events
There are established Facebook and Google pages for communities, where people are used to looking for information. We were advised to use these channels to inform people about events, or point them to webpages.
**Drop in events/public exhibition**
We were told that there should be the opportunity for people in the downstream communities to see materials and speak directly to someone. The focus group participants emphasised that people staffing these events would need to be knowledgeable about the area, including flooding history, and the proposed Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme. Some visitors attending could be emotional about the issue, and would require detailed responses to a range of issues – the right person needs to be there to have the conversation.

**Build a physical model – do something different**
We were told that to get people’s attention, we should do something different. Suggestions included:

- building a physical model, or printing in 3D.
- engage with local schools, colleges or universities – to help with the model design and construction and to debate causes of flooding (Geography and Citizenship).
- go out to local parishes with the visualisation so that those without internet can see it.
- work with broadcasters e.g. BBC, to get the video shown/
- organise events or activities which are ‘experiences’, such as ‘day with a hydrologist’, or a walking tour of a neighbourhood and river led by someone from Environment Agency with detailed local knowledge and the OXFAS scheme/
- have an ‘information boat’ on the river.

**Specific:**

**Wallingford**
We were told that Wallingford would be a good location for an event for downstream communities. Drop-in events that have worked well in past (Neighbourhood Plan consultations) have been held on Thursday afternoon and evening, and also Saturday afternoon.

The best time to hold an event would be from September onwards, after holidays.

In addition to parish/village newsletters, we were also recommended to contact the Herald and Guardian newspapers.

**Abingdon**
We were advised that the best way to reach people in Abingdon is to “be where people will see you” and that this can be achieved by taking a week long (7 day) booking of the Community Shop. This shop unit is run by Friends Of Abingdon Civic Society. This shop would offer:

- weekday and Saturday – when people are around.
• windows to display material 24 hrs per day.

The Abingdon focus group participants recommended that our communications should also “piggy back” on other events in the town, including:

• Science Festival – where we could consider ‘taking a slot’.
• Fun in the Park – hosting an activity.
• Christmas Extravaganza – booking a stall.

Other suggestions from Abingdon participants were to:

• add “fun things” to mail/paper based communications to help people to remember.
• use the Town Council Information Centre.
• consider leaflet drops in the areas where people are most concerned.
• engage with local groups such as U3A, WI groups and groups at 35 Ock Street.

Sutton Courtenay

Sutton Courtenay Newsletter (monthly, but not January or August)

Sutton Courtenay Parish Council website. Suggestion to add links to Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme web page.

Notice boards.

Web based campaign.

We were told that the community in Sutton Courtenay is also concerned about development, housing and infrastructure issues, not just flooding and will require representatives from various organisations, including Councils, who can answer questions on these matters.

It was also commented upon that the comments submitted by the Environment Agency to planning applications in Sutton Courtenay are ‘not strong enough’.

Existing events and activities, such as the Duck Race.

Materials which would help people to understand:

• maps, videos or diagrams similar to those used for GCSE Geography.
• photos (real pictures) which people can hold and touch.
• film of incidents.
• interviews with the public.
• visualisations of ‘before’ and ‘after’ from Botley Lock all the way downstream to Mapledurham.

The participants suggested that ‘open day’ type activities such as those organised by the Earth Trust, Diamond Light Source and Ardley Waste could be good models to
emulate. For Sutton Courtenay, this could include creative site visits and events by the river or meet by the locks for walks. There is an Environment Centre in Sutton Courtenay.

Suggestion to make more of the major engineering feat – lots of people are interested so make more of it.

Meet with Gervase Duffield, Vale of White Horse Councillor for Sutton Courtenay.

**Goring**

The Goring Gap monthly newsletter (and website).

Goring on Thames Parish Council website.

Need to have the right people, who can answer the detailed questions.

There are concerns about the Maidenhead Scheme and Jubilee River – how do we know that the same won't happen here?

For this parish, the best time for consultations and drop-ins is considered to be 3.30pm to 8.30 pm midweek.
What happens next

The preferred route for the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme was announced on 28 June 2016. There is more modelling of the River Thames downstream of the scheme to be conducted.

Planning the communications
During the summer 2016 we will look at what the focus groups told us. We will develop a communication plan for the downstream communities, to be implemented from September 2016.

Further opportunities for public comments on the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme
The detailed design stage of the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme will take place in the coming months, and we will hold our next public consultation by Spring 2017.

At this stage we will also be preparing for a planning permission application. If permission is granted, construction could begin in 2018.
Further feedback on communications from St Helen’s Mill, Abingdon

We held a meeting with residents of St Helen’s Mill, Abingdon on 19 May 2016. The people who attended that meeting, and the team facilitating, gave us some useful comments about the materials we use to support our communications.

They told us that a lot of people struggle to understand 2D flood maps which just show flood extent.

They also told us that other important factors that need to be considered include flood depths, durations, velocities, and hydrograph bell curves. Lack of understanding of these things contribute to peoples misunderstandings around flooding.

At this event, the facilitating team explained some of the more difficult queries, but they have suggested that it would be really useful to have some basic training on things like flood mechanisms, how models work and how to explain flooding and modelling to the public.

They also suggested that other things, like visualisations, should be able to help with alternative displays to the 2D flood maps.

The facilitating team found that some of the colours on the flood maps were hard to distinguish. They have suggested that this is something to address early on other projects. They also suggested that the introduction of a consistent colouring system for consultants could help.

The team who took part in the event also commented that for future events of this type it will be helpful to take along maps of historic flood events. These can be used to support discussions with residents and make comparisons.
# Appendix

**Appendix 1: Downstream Communities – from Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme to Henley on Thames**

### OXFAS

**Communities on the Thames, going downstream**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council</th>
<th>Local authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Wytham</td>
<td>VoWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 North Hinksey</td>
<td>VoWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 South Hinksey</td>
<td>VoWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sandford On Thames Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Kennington</td>
<td>VoWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Radley</td>
<td>VoWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 <strong>ABINGDON</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Culham Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sutton Courtenay</td>
<td>VoWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Appleford on Thames</td>
<td>VoWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Clifton Hampden Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Long Wittenham Parish Council</td>
<td>VoWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Little Wittenham Parish Meeting</td>
<td>VoWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Berinsfield Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dorchester Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Warborough Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Benson Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 <strong>WALLINGFORD</strong> Town Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Crowmarsh Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cholsey Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Moulsoir Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 South Stoke Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Goring on Thames Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Streatley</td>
<td>WBerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Basildon</td>
<td>WBerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Pangbourne</td>
<td>WBerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Goring Heath Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Whitchurch On Thames Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Mapledurham Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Tidmarsh with Sulham</td>
<td>WBerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Tilehurst</td>
<td>WBerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Purley on Thames</td>
<td>WBerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 <strong>READING &amp; CAVERSHAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Earley</td>
<td>Wham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Eye and Dunsden Parish Council</td>
<td>SODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Sonning</td>
<td>Wham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charvil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Shiplake Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Harpsden Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wargrave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Remenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td><strong>HENLEY ON THAMES</strong> Town Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of materials used in the focus groups:
Sidestreams will hold silverfish

Find pike at the tail of wiers

Dace tend to drop down into deep water

Look for steady water in the centre to find barbel

Chub prefer eddies
Future flood risk in the UK

More action is needed to help the UK adapt to climate change, alongside significant new investment, if we're to address the increasing risk of flooding due to rising global temperatures.

**Cost of UK Residential Flood Damage**
Expected annual flood damage, assuming current approaches to flood risk management continue.

- **Today:** £340 million
- **2050s:** £428 million
- **4°C of global warming:** £619 million

**UK Homes in Areas of High Flood Risk**
1 in 15 annual chance of flooding or greater.

- 860,000
- 1,040,000
- 1,316,000

**Rising Sea Levels Add Further Risk**
Around 20% of the total length of coastal defences in England could be vulnerable to failure if sea levels rise by 0.3–1m.

- This could happen as early as 2100

**Key**
- Indicates areas where coastal flood defences are most vulnerable to failure.

If sea levels rise by 1m, 2000 km² of land and 400,000 properties would be at risk of inundation if these defences failed during a total surge event.
Flood and coastal erosion risk management in England
Investment programme 2015 to 2021

£2.3 billion capital investment to reduce risk of flooding and coastal erosion

- Attracting over £345 million in additional funding through partnership contributions
- Over £235 million planned savings through new, more efficient working, to be re-invested in managing flood risk

45% spent on coastal flood and erosion risk management and 55% on inland flood risk management

300,000 households with a reduced risk of flooding

- Households at risk will benefit from improved forecasting, mapping, telemetry and flood warnings
- Better protecting 1,800 households through individual property measures
- Includes 15,000 households better protected from coastal erosion
- At-risk households better protected from flooding from rivers, the sea, groundwater and surface water

Total additional benefits to society from capital investment of £30.3 billion

- £1.5 billion in benefits to the agriculture sector through flood risk reduction
- £600 million in benefits through improved biodiversity and local environments
- £5.1 billion in long term benefits to transport, infrastructure, commerce and industry
- £23.1 billion in benefits through damages avoided from 300,000 households being better protected

Visit gov.uk/government/publications/programme-of-flood-and-coastal-erosion-risk-management-schemes to find out what is happening in your area

DT 20906
It's time for our leaders to give our lifeblood the care it so desperately needs

The Murray-Darling Basin: A Timeline

1999-2008
Drought cripples Basin

2009
Benefits of water buybacks and delivery start to show

2010: October
Guide to draft Basin Plan released

2011: June
All South Australian federal leaders sign a pledge to "support a Basin Plan which ends the overuse of water and returns the Murray to health"

2011: November
Draft Basin Plan released

2012: April
7000+ people provide submissions on the Basin Plan saying it needs to restore river health

2012: September
Bureau of Meteorology predicts El Nino conditions (dry, hot weather) will return across Australia

2012: Basin Plan likely to be put to a vote before Federal Parliament.

2030
CSIRO predicts water availability may decline by around 11% across the entire Murray-Darling Basin
Our nation’s lifeblood is seriously ill and we are suffering the side effects.

For decades, we’ve been forcing the Murray-Darling to live off less than it needs. By taking too much water for irrigation, we’ve turned wetlands, decimated native fish and waterfowl populations and created a toxic cocktail of salt and acids at the river mouth.

Long-term studies show that in parts of the Basin, 80% of the waterbirds have disappeared.

Native fish populations have declined by 90% or pre-European levels.

The Murray Mouth closed in 1997 for the first time in recorded history and would have closed again in 2002 had it not been kept open artificially by dredging.

In the last drought...

At the Murray Mouth, salt water turtle eggs are dormant in the shells of freshwater turtles, weighing down the turtles so they suffocate and drown.

Water in the Coorong near the Murray Mouth became so more salty than the sea.

Poor quality water and drought conditions have reduced dairy operations around the Murray Mouth by 70% since 2002.

2002 – 2012: $4.6 billion spent on sand dredging to manage what critics call the mouth of the Murray River.

The Basin Plan offers our lifeblood a band-aid when it desperately needs intensive care.

Rivers die from the bottom up. The Murray was on its deathbed in South Australia during the last drought. Unless the Basin Plan is improved so that it ends the overuse of water, the damage will continue to spread upstream.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Focus Group</strong></th>
<th><strong>Who would this method reach?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>People who want facts, but don’t have much time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>People who struggle with a lot of text and detail (dyslexics?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Visual learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Website users - those who go and look for information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Younger demographic (20-60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>General society. Time poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Visitors to exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Newspaper readers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pros</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cons</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Drawings and diagrams

Examples of the drawings and diagrams used in the focus groups.

Example of a simple diagram which could be produced to show how the flood plain is used before and after a flood relief channel. Including expected flood levels up and downstream of a new channel.
MAKING SPACE FOR WATER - HOW A 2-STAGE CHANNEL WORKS

A WIDE CHANNEL IS EXCAVATED TO MAKE SPACE FOR WATER IN TIMES OF FLOOD.

In dry weather, water is restricted to a low-flow channel.

In wet weather, there is space for water in the wider channel.

In extreme weather, water covers the natural flood plain.
### Drawings and diagrams

#### Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who would this method reach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pros

| Wallingford | 2c easiest to understand (making space for water illustration) |
| Abingdon | Different angles are good |
| Abingdon | Good if there is someone to answer questions that they may produce |
| Abingdon | Very concise |
| Abingdon | D2 and D3 - combine the 2 diagrams and drawings |
| Benson | Cross section - not many words, visual, real water, trees, people, not typed and |
| Benson | Same concept could be improved by time lapse video (eg Okavanga, David |
| Benson | A tank would also work, with sand and the water dissipating. |

#### Cons

| Wallingford | Need a model |
| Abingdon | Some people can't read diagrams |
| Abingdon | Disjointed, not connected the things we relate to. |
| Abingdon | No supporting information |
| Abingdon | D3 - 2 stage channel has 3 diagrams, so it is a 3 stage channel? Needs more |
| Benson | Couldn't understand, too small and can't read writing and doesn't look real |
| Benson | Looks random. 3D angle doesn't work |
Appendix 4: Information Sheets and Briefings
Examples of information sheets and briefings used in focus groups.
In the Redbridge area the proposed channel will need to pass under the railway line and local roads before rejoining the River Thames downstream. We would need to add new culverts below Old Abingdon Road and increase the size of several existing road and railway culverts in this area to ensure these do not act as constrictions to the flow of flood water.

After the channel has rejoined the River Thames via the Hinksey Stream, a further second channel is required downstream to help increase the capacity of the Thames in this area. Through bypassing this section of the Thames we will help reduce the amount of water which backs up in this area, which would otherwise reduce the effectiveness of the new channel in the western floodplain.

The River Thames will then flow through a rural catchment with a largely undeveloped floodplain for 7km before reaching Abingdon. In this area between Oxford and Abingdon floodwaters will continue to disperse across the rural floodplain and flood flows will be naturally attenuated in the same way as they are now.

**Impact on flood risk in Oxford and downstream**

In Oxford, flood water and river levels rise slowly in response to rainfall and flooding continues for many days. The size and nature of the Thames catchment upstream of Oxford means that the city is mainly at risk of flooding during periods of excessive rainfall, combined with saturated or frozen ground conditions.

To reduce flood levels across Oxford the scheme aims to direct more water out of the River Thames and into the undeveloped areas of the Western floodplain. To allow more water to travel through the floodplain we will construct a series of 2-stage channels. If we were to just widen the existing channels, this would increase the speed at which the water flows in a flood and increase the flood risk to downstream communities. We work to reduce flood risk, not to transfer it from one community to another and these 2-stage channels manage the speed at which water travels through them to ensure the water does not reach downstream communities more quickly.

The channel will reduce flood risk but it cannot remove it completely. The scheme is designed to reduce the impacts of floods, and will reduce the risk at least 1,000 of the properties currently at risk from smaller, more frequent floods. However, the nature of the scheme means that in more extreme rainfall events, the floodplain may still not have enough capacity to retain all of the water. This may mean that flooding could still affect properties currently at risk both in Oxford and downstream, although in this situation the new channels will help reduce the impact on properties in Oxford, whilst the extent of flooding for properties downstream will remain unchanged.

We will be developing detailed river modelling to demonstrate the effect on both flows and flood levels in the areas downstream of Oxford. This modelling will be checked by an independent organisation. Modelling also forms part of the assessment for the planning application and must demonstrate that flood risk is not passed from one community to another. We must also provide details of any mitigation measures we will take, if required, to protect properties in the unlikely event that their flood risk is changed.

Alongside the Oxford FAS we are also developing business cases to provide flood alleviation schemes for other communities at risk of flooding from the River Thames, as part of our six year plan of works.

It is important to reiterate that a final scheme for Oxford has not been approved or designed and there is still a significant amount of work required to enable the business case to be prepared. The earliest that approval will be given for a scheme to go ahead will be spring 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Who would this method reach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>People who want to be signposted to further details but do it in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Large mailing list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>People who like a reasonable amount of information but don't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Not many. The very interested or already know, but useful for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>those groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pros**

- **Abingdon**: Deliver at weekend - more time and not much other post
- **Abingdon**: Shows a lot of info
- **Benson**: Entices and draws the reader into wanting more information

**Cons**

- **Wallingford**: Too much detail for the lay person
- **Abingdon**: Difficult to extract specifics
- **Abingdon**: People receive so much paper these days they ignore it. Paper
- **Abingdon**: Info sheet has whetted appetite, but not enough detail.
- **Abingdon**: 2 columns and blocks so it's accessible to more.
- **Benson**: Tells the reader about the process but doesn't tell them what they want to hear.
- **Benson**: Doesn't mention how many houses are flooded
- **Benson**: Headline should be how many properties were last flooded
Appendix 5: Flood maps, modelling results and graphs
Examples of flood maps and modelling results and graphs used in focus groups.

Example of a flood map showing flood risk to an area before and after a flood alleviation scheme is built.
Example of a graph showing flow rates before and after a flood relief channel is built.
Example of graphs showing normal, low and high flow rates in a river with the black line showing readings of flow rates during a flood.

**Figure 3.1:** Monthly mean river flows at indicator sites for February 2016, expressed as a percentage of the respective long term average and classed relative to an analysis of historic February monthly means (Source: Environment Agency). Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Environment Agency, 100026380, 2015.
Example of a graph showing flows and volumes of water in the floodplain with and without a flood relief channel.

This plot shows the flow (cubic metres per second) in the lower Thames between mid-December and mid-January. Flows rose again to a higher peak in February.

Levels and flows were almost constant for over 2 days at the peak of the flood. The change in the volume of water on the floodplain would have been negligible, and therefore would not have affected flows downstream.

The orange line shows the estimated flow if the Jubilee river had not operated. The flow required to fill the flood plain over several days would have reduced the downstream flow by a negligible amount.

Bank full flow—flows higher than this will start spilling on to the flood plain.

This is the volume of the Maidenhead-Windsor flood plain (2.85M cu m) plotted at the same scale as the volume of the flow in the river.
## Flood maps, modelling results and graphs

### Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>People who read things carefully and will spend time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Open minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Technical minded people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Systems and data minded people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Me! I like maps!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Technical experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>More techy people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Most people, especially those who can't read hydrographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>People living beside the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>All maps and graphs need to be very large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>makes things seem grounded in reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Plenty of data and real numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Deep data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Higher level of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>maps are good and don't cut it off at Sandford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Water is 3 dimensional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>But too technical for most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Confusing for lay people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>language used not clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>A lot of people can't read maps and graphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>map is too small scale to be mastermap, base mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Not enough info, can't compare or put into perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Far too small, don't know what lines mean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>too detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>looks like a medical diagram colours are important. Red should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>highest risk, not lowest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Keep graphs simple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide before and after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Put graphs or charts side by side or super impose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Photos with flood markers before and after flooding events
Examples of photos used in focus groups:

Photos could be taken of known places and flood markers showing expected levels before and after flooding. This could be combined with other techniques such as put on flood maps or made into a video of water moving through known points.

[Images of flood markers before and after scheme]

Flood level before scheme

Flood level after scheme
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Who would this method reach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Lots of people. Straightforward and understandable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pros**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Pros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Very powerful when locally recognised places are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Easily understood in terms people understand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Too simple and it might make people suspicious. Needs words to explain too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Emotive - says everything negative about flooding in one picture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Videos

The videos which were used in the focus groups:

- Clacton on Sea – Coastal Defence Detailed Design Works – Environment Agency scheme - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bH0e7LG_8go
- Boston Barrier (Environment Agency TV) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PWtUsgTCe7Q
- Netherlands Room for the River https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ux1Vam2fAVs
- Sacramento River Flood Control System https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cMCge2mZCWc
- Medmerry video [link tbc]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Who would this method reach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medmerry</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Visitors to an exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medmerry</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>People who use the net (ditto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medmerry</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>Everybody in an exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Community TV channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Short video on computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>In depth documentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Web users and at events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Use you tube and get links from other websites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>