

<p>2776.</p>	<p>Machinery Replacement Programme The LDE explained that at the Engineering Committee meeting held 22nd November 2017 he was instructed to prepare a replacement programme based on engine hours rather than a fixed term replacement. Having considered the two programmes the LDE concluded that 7,000 engine hours was a rational benchmark for replacement. He had produced for members a programme that applied this approach. Most of the Board's plant completed 1,000 hours per annum. There were 3 machines that were used seasonally that could be pushed back to be replaced every nine years rather than every seven years based on engine hours. He had also taken into account peaks and troughs of expenditure in each financial year.</p> <p>Mr Simms supported the revised programme and said that it should be kept under review as information and experience was gathered.</p> <p><u>Energreen 1500 AU11 HCH</u> The Committee had deferred this replacement in 2018/19 for one year, owing to low hours. The LDE recommended that a replacement should be deferred for another year when he would expect the machine to have accumulated 6,000 hours. He did not want to replace this machine any later than this as it would clash with other replacements and create a financial spike in the programme.</p> <p><u>New Holland 3.6 wheeled Excavator WX09 FYF</u> The LDE had looked at replacement options for this machine. New Holland had discontinued the model. He reported he had only found one model that fitted the Board's requirements for weight, reach and stability; JCB Hydradig. The LDE hoped to have the machine on demonstration before he could make a commitment.</p> <p>Mr Cullimore asked if these machines came with an extended warranty. He suggested that a warranty extended by four years with a high excess would cover major repairs and may be attractive to the Board. The LDE undertook to check the insurance options prior to purchase.</p> <p>It was resolved that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Energreen 1500 be replaced in 2020/21. • The New Holland 3.6 wheeled excavator be replaced in 2019/20 with a JCB Hydradig subject to a working demonstration of this machine satisfying the LDE it is suitable for the Board's requirements. 	<p><u>Action 2</u> LDE to investigate extended warranty on new machinery purchases</p>
<p>2777.</p>	<p>De-maining The Board had accepted the principal of de-maintenance at the meeting held 27th June 2018 (minute 2683 refers). The Engineers were tasked to formulate a strategy to assess the rivers for de-maintenance.</p> <p>The CE reported that they had identified 83 km of low priority watercourses that could be demoted for less frequent maintenance. This would free resources to maintain the 16.2 km of proposed de-maintained watercourse namely: Longdon Brook, Tirley Main Drain and Wicksters/Capehall Brook</p> <p>If the Board wished to proceed the EA would be formally requested to begin the process of de-maintenance. The CE recommended that a provision of £30,000 be budgeted in 2019/20 to enable the Engineers to commission surveys such as the structure, condition and ecology of each watercourse in order to progress the application.</p> <p>The CE explained that the Engineering Committee could approve this budget but he felt the decision should be ratified by the full Board as it represented a strategic change of maintenance policy.</p>	

	<p>Members questioned whether the EA should fund the survey works. The CE said that de-mainment would not happen if the Board did not undertake the necessary surveys.</p> <p>Mr Simms was concerned that the proposed strategy would not incur additional costs. The CE replied that the strategy should not increase the maintenance budget but there could be extra capital expenditure on structures that the Board may have to commit to; this would not be known until the survey works had been completed.</p> <p>Regarding the transfer of EA resources; the CE explained that the EA categorised these watercourses as low priority, as they only protected agricultural land and therefore there was no budget to transfer.</p> <p>Some members were concerned about mowing the low priority watercourses less frequently.</p> <p>Members debated whether there were benefits of applying for all three watercourses or singly. The CE advised that to apply for them individually would be a long-drawn-out process that could take years.</p> <p>Mr Hyslop asked whether Worcestershire Wildlife Trust had already completed an ecological survey where they owned land alongside the Longdon Brook.</p> <p>The CE explained that riparian owners involved on a watercourse had very different objectives and it would be difficult to find a balance that accommodated all the interested individuals.</p> <p>A majority were in favour of the recommendations There were no objections.</p> <p>It was resolved that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environment Agency be formally approached to consider the de-maining of the Longdon Brook, Tirley Main Drain, and the Wicksters/Capehall Brook. • A budget of £30,000 be provided in the financial year 2019/20 for the commissioning of surveys required to process a de-mainment application, to be ratified by the Board. 	<p><u>Action 3</u> Add to the Board agenda for ratification</p>
<p>2778.</p>	<p>Production of Capital Programme</p> <p>In accordance with Minute 2693 the PO had produced a draft Capital Programme. He explained that this was a working document. The plan included the pump replacement programme and machinery replacement programme. In consultation with the Engineers and Accounts Officer, eight new projects had been added that could be considered once the pump replacement programme had been completed.</p> <p>The PO had also proposed assessment criteria to evaluate the merits and benefits of each project and prioritise the schemes. He envisaged there would be several drafts for the Committee to consider before a final version was accepted by the Board</p> <p>The AO explained that the £350k per annum that had been generated from rates to fund the pump replacement programme could be used to finance the Capital Programme, if members decided to adopt the programme.</p> <p>Mr Hyslop was mindful that the pump replacements programme was just underway and it was too early to know what the final expenditure would be.</p>	<p><u>Action 3</u> The Capital Programme to include a brief</p>

	<p>Mr Simms stated that the Board needed to consider the future and that this programme would start a healthy process and debate.</p> <p>It was resolved that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The format and proposed assessment criteria for the Capital Programme, as set out at Appendix 2, be referred to the Board for approval; (2) All Members be invited to propose projects for inclusion in the Programme (3) The Capital Programme be included on all Committee agendas at least on an annual basis. (4) The Capital Programme be included as a standard item on the agenda for all future Engineering Committee meetings so that information can be regularly updated and progress monitored. (5) The Engineering Committee continue to manage the Programme on behalf of the Board. 	description of the new projects
2779.	<p>Gloucestershire Severn Estuary Stakeholders Meeting The Engineers and Members from the Board had attended a recent meeting of this group.</p> <p>Representatives from the EA Midlands and Wessex regions informed attendees that the EA had reviewed their approach to the maintenance of outfalls between Avonmouth and Sharpness and in future would take a reactive approach. CCTV would be installed to monitor the outfalls and the EA would respond when an outfall did not operate.</p> <p>Members that attended had considered that this could be an improvement on the current situation.</p>	
2780.	<p>EA/IDB Liaison Meeting THE LDE had raised the Board's concerns at the Liaison Meeting with regard to Hill Pill and Arlingham Pill.</p>	
	The meeting closed at 11.55 am	

Lower Severn (2005) Internal Drainage Board]
Biosecurity Policy

PURPOSE

This document sets out the Biosecurity Policy of the Lower Severn IDB. It covers activities undertaken by the IDB on a daily basis to reduce the spread and damage from invasive non-native species.

It is intended that the Board's staff and contractors will follow procedures commensurate with this Policy.

POLICY STATEMENT

Invasive non-native species are widespread nationally and if left uncontrolled present a threat to our aquatic and riparian systems. It is imperative that our field operations to manage flood risk and water levels do not exacerbate the risks to the environment and economy that are posed by these species. Failure to minimise the spread of invasive non-native species, when visiting a site where an invasive non-native species is known to be present, can risk prosecution under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981.

Vigilance is required if we are to stop the spread of invasive non-native species, and it is imperative that we integrate basic biosecurity in our operations to prevent this spread. Much to do with biosecurity involves awareness, common sense and agreed procedures.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The Board is responsible for reviewing and approving the content and implementation of this Policy.

The Board will ensure any new contracts let will include reference to the Policy where a risk is considered to exist arising from the works involved.

All Board Members, staff and contractors are required to comply with the Policy's requirements and share responsibility for performance in implementing the Policy in regard to the health, safety and welfare of the environment.

IMPLEMENTATION

This Policy is implemented through supporting guidance documentation covering biosecurity procedures.

Where biosecurity risks have been identified operational Staff will be provided with training and information on identification of invasive non-native species likely to be found within the Drainage District.

All operational machinery, tools and personal protection equipment (PPE) identified as at risk of cross-contamination will be subject to 'check, clean, dry' decontamination procedures before moving between operations on watercourses and sites.

All Operational Staff will report sightings of invasive non-native species to the Board's Civil Engineer or the GB Non-Native Species Secretariat directly.

APPROVAL

This Policy was approved by the Board on 6 February 2019. This Policy will be reviewed, at a minimum, every five years.

Lower Severn (2005) Internal Drainage Board

Biosecurity Procedures

PURPOSE

These procedures aim to help Board members, staff, and operators working for the IDB to identify key biosecurity risks pertinent to the internal drainage district and the Board's activities, and identify measures to address these risks.

Accidentally spread invasive non-native species may be harmful to the environment and potentially damaging the reputation of the Board, compromising its ability to operate, or work with partners. Operators visiting a site where an invasive non-native species is known to be present, should take measures to ensure they do not spread it. Failure to do so can risk prosecution under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981.

OBJECTIVES

- Increase awareness around invasive non-native species via training.
- Identify, and keep a record of, known areas where invasive non-native species are an issue.
- Ensure effective cleaning of equipment, machinery, and clothes.
- Ensure operators take care to avoid transporting water and material between water bodies where a risk has been identified.
- Ensure ongoing monitoring of invasive non-native species when undertaking operations.
- Remain vigilant when undertaking operations to identify any further areas where invasive non-native species exist.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Awareness

The Civil Engineer will have oversight of biosecurity, disseminate information, and report on these matters.

The Board's staff will be encouraged to seek information on invasive non-native species and biosecurity practices. The Environment Agency and Non-native Species Secretariat have relevant useful information.

If a risk is identified then the operator concerned or contractor should be made aware of the priority invasive non-native species, with specific attention to aquatic and riparian species of concern and those known to be present in the surrounding area. Training for staff and operatives shall be provided as appropriate, and information will be disseminated through toolbox talks, workshops, leaflets, emails etc. Contractors should be asked to confirm that they have similar arrangements in place.

Signage, species alerts/information sheets, or guidance should be in place, making operators aware of the risks, and providing advice on how to prevent spread.

Monitoring

Operators should be vigilant in the field for invasive non-native species and have an appropriate mechanism for recording and reporting sightings of suspected species, location, and relevant details.

New sightings should be reported to the Civil Engineer and other authorities and/or land managers as appropriate. The PlantTracker app (www.plantracker.org.uk/), available free for Apple and Android devices, shows you how to identify invasive non-native plant species and enables you to easily submit geo-located photos whenever you find one.

Planning works

Biosecurity should be taken into consideration alongside other factors, such as health and safety, when planning operations and standard working procedures.

The risk of spreading invasive non-native species can be reduced by reducing the contact time in which equipment is exposed to the water. This is particularly important for items such as trailers, which have cavities that may retain water and be hard to inspect.

Propagules are small bits of plant that become detached and give rise to a new plant. Working practices that either reduce, or contain and remove, propagules should be encouraged where practicable, especially in regards to mechanical vegetation control.

Cleaning

Remember: Check, Clean, Dry - www.nonnativespecies.org/checkcleandry/

Decontamination is an essential process to be carried out prior to leaving a site where invasive species are present. This ensures that any foreign matter remains on the land/watercourse of origin, rather than taking it to another location.

Where it is not possible to conduct the decontamination prior to leaving the land/watercourse where the work was conducted (e.g. steam cleaning larger equipment), the operation should be carried out immediately afterwards at the depot or another secure site before the next operation.

Where a cross contamination risk has been identified any field team moving from a contaminated site should carry a 'disinfection box'. This should contain an appropriate commercial disinfectant, a spray bottle, cloths or sponges, a scrubbing brush and protective gloves.

On completion of a field operation, for situations where cross contamination is identified as a risk, the following principles apply:

1. Visually inspect all tools, equipment and machinery that has come into contact with the water for evidence of attached plant or animal material, or adherent mud or debris.
2. Remove any attached or adherent material before leaving the site of operation.
3. Washing/hosing with water will be sufficient to remove debris from most tools, equipment and machinery. Use hot water where possible.
4. Ensure that all water is drained from any water retaining compartments, outboard motors, tanks and other equipment before transportation elsewhere.
5. A high pressure washer or steam cleaner may be essential for more difficult stains or soil, paying particular attention to the tyres, tracks and undercarriage of vehicles and buckets, hulls, outboard motors and submerged parts of machinery. High-pressure steam cleaning, with water >40°C, is recommended for larger equipment, excavators, boats, trailers, and outboard motors that are being moved from one watercourse to another.
6. Clothing and PPE should be visually inspected and any attached vegetation or debris removed. Soiled clothing and PPE should be removed for laundering and boots scrubbed clean; hands and other body parts may also need cleaning.
7. Finally, decontamination by spraying on a commercial disinfectant at the recommended strength to the cleaned boots, tools, equipment or machinery will ensure any remaining disease agents or pests are destroyed.

Every effort should be made to ensure that the decontamination process is a public exercise and where appropriate tactfully brought to the attention of the land owner or manager at the appropriate time. It is not just a question of doing the right thing but also being seen to be doing it. In this way, public confidence will be maintained in flood and water level management operations.

APPROVAL

These procedures were adopted on 6 February 2019.

Assessment Criteria

In order to ensure consistency and fair consideration for all potential projects, it will be helpful to identify and agree the criteria by which these projects will be judged prior to their inclusion in the programme. The following criteria are proposed:

1. The number of residential, agricultural and commercial properties that will enjoy greater flood protection benefits.
2. The area of farmland that will enjoy greater flood protection benefits.
3. The status of the land, ie where it is designated as a RAMSAR, SPA or SSSI site, the site of a Scheduled Ancient Monument or supports the implementation of the Board's Biodiversity Action Plan.
4. The extent (if any) to which the project assists the Board in the discharge of its statutory responsibilities.
5. The ongoing maintenance costs of the project (if any) post-completion.
6. The extent to which the Board's general maintenance programme might reduce as a result of the proposed works.
7. Confirmation of the Board's ability to finance the project in the proposed timescale.
8. The availability of external funding to support the financing of the works.
9. Where it can be measured, the Return On Investment for the project.

These principles should also govern the priority attached to each project. Should the Board need to respond urgently to a flooding event, then funds may have to be diverted from the Capital Programme. In such a case slippage might be unavoidable.

LSIDB PROJECTS 2019/20 - 2025/26

PROJECT	BENEFITS	NET COST ESTIMATE £k	MAINTENANCE IMPLICATIONS + OR -	TIMESCALE	RETURN ON INVESTMENT	COMMENTS Description of scheme Criteria met
Plant + Vehicles Tractor/mower	Health & Safety and Efficiency	140*		2021/22		Offset by sale of old m/c
Excavator	Health & Safety and Efficiency	90* 130* 110*		2019/20 2021/22 2023/24		Offset by sale of old m/c
Vehicles	Health & Safety and Efficiency	25* 25*		2023/24 2024/25		Offset by sale of old m/c
Spearhead m/cs	Health & Safety and Efficiency	170* 360* 260*		2020/21 2022/23 2024/25		Offset by part exchange
Pumping Stations Renewals	Statutory, Environmental and Efficiency	200* 225* 250* 275*		2019/20 2020/21 2021/22 2022/23		
Drainage Schemes						
Hill Pill outfall		75				Survey work approved
Aust/Olveston		500		?		
Demainment works		30		2019/20		
Cornham		500		?		
Rea Lane pumps		250		?		
Epney				?		
Rockhampton				?		
Renew office and workshop		400		?		

* Sum already budgeted.