

Trialling GEP for ports and maritime navigation. Jan Brooke. 23-11-07

Trialling GEP classification for ports and  
maritime navigation:  
Outcomes and lessons learned to date

Presentation by  
Jan Brooke

23<sup>rd</sup> November 2007

## Scope of presentation

- Mitigation measures
  - Is measure already in place and adequate?
- Would measure have an adverse effect on use or on the wider environment?
- How to achieve classification within the available timetable?
  - Other lessons learned

## Mitigation measures (dredging/disposal)

- Avoid need to dredge
- Prepare dredging/disposal strategy
- Reduce area, depth, etc. of dredging
  - Reduce sediment resuspension
    - Timing dredging/disposal
    - Disposal site selection
    - Sediment management
  - Indirect or off-site mitigation
    - Research

## Mitigation measures (vessel movement)

- Modify channel
- Modify vessel design
- Vessel management (eg. speed limits, passage planning)

## Measures (structures/reclamation)

- Remove obsolete structure
  - Modify structure
  - Flow manipulation

## 'Already in place and adequate'

- Requirement of licence or consent (eg. FEPA, river works licence)
  - Enforced bylaws, etc.
- Agreed protocol, monitored and reviewed process (eg. regulators group, dredging liaison group, maintenance dredging protocol)
- Also consider cost (eg. minimise dredging, minimise under keel clearance)

## 'Adverse effect on use'

- Safety implications (eg. underkeel clearance too low; vessel manoeuvrability if speed too low)
- Practicality (eg. need to close port to implement measure; stationary operation in busy channel)
- Viability of use (eg. speed limit on 'fast commuter service')
  - NOT disproportionate cost alone
- Also port's ability to influence (eg. vessel design)

## 'Adverse effect on wider environment'

- Operation needed to meet Habitats Directive requirement (eg. deliberate overspill)
- Knock on implications (eg. for coastal processes/tidal prism)
- Other use of affected area/structure (eg. high tide roost)
- Sediment management not viable if sediment quality too poor

## How to achieve in time?

- Ideally: consensus of 'expert group' including port(s) representative(s), regulator, EA, facilitator
- Practical given number of water bodies?  
Time available? Cost?
- Second-best: port(s) to complete proforma; EA/regulator to review
- Transparency important; language and presentation require attention

## Other lessons learned

- For ports, 'impact-led' seems best
- Thereafter focus on contributory (sub) pressures, possible mitigation measures
  - Otherwise much repetition
- Time/resource requirement could threaten quality of output
  - Water body grouping often not possible
  - Some water bodies may need to be split

## Other lessons learned

- Need to be clear about link between impact and WFD quality elements
- Need to identify/acknowledge uncertainty
  - Transparency is vital, essential to substantiate response
- Indication of possible disproportionate cost useful; also 'only slight benefit'
- TraC HMWBs not finalised until Feb 2008?