

Minutes

EA – CRT Proposed Transfer meeting

Date: 20 October 2016
Time: 10:30am to 16:30pm
Venue: Mary Sumner House, London

In attendance

Howard Davidson (HD)	Environment Agency
Gillian Pratt (GP)	Environment Agency
Jim Barlow (JB)	Environment Agency
Mark Ormrod (MO)	Environment Agency
Matt Oakes (MOa)	Environment Agency
Irven Forbes (IF)	Environment Agency
Neil Pope (NP)	Environment Agency
Ian Mawdsley (IM)	Environment Agency
Julie Sharman (JS)	Canal & River Trust
Peter Walker (PW)	Canal & River Trust
Richard Wakelen-by phone (RW)	Canal & River Trust

Agenda

Item	Discussion	
1	Principles used by EA to identify potential ownership	
2	Partnership funding policy	
3	Agree the input parameters for the CRT models used to determine our likely maintenance and capital investment costs	
4	Confirmation of the weirs/sluices. (Retain/Transfer) and agree the list of assets proposed for transfer	
5	Examination of these assets – Review using available photos	
6	Timetable for the provision of missing asset data e.g. condition information	
7	Operating agreements – water level management / flooding events	

Minutes and actions

Introduction

Verbal introduction by EA and CRT and both organisations commitment to working together, for a sustainable solution for the transfer of navigations.

Principles used by the EA to identify potential ownership

Howard Davidson provided an overview of the assumptions which had been used by EA to assess which assets could transfer and which the EA would look to retain. Clear Navigation assets would transfer (lock, layby etc – assets funded through Nav GiA/charges). HD provided an explanation as to the thinking as to which weirs and sluices should transfer with the navigations. Weirs were initially built to support water levels for navigations and milling for example. Once installed weirs, if they malfunctioned, could have an impact on flood aspects. This has led to FCRM GiA (as well as H&S or Emergency works) being used in the past. However the Defra partnership funding policy means this work can no longer be fully funded from FCRM GiA.

Third party owned assets were discussed and how the EA intervene under permissive powers as a flood authority.

Partnership funding policy

Acknowledgement by CRT of partnership funding restrictions.

JB – Partnership Funding (PF) is a government policy which we have to follow. This determines the benefits of the project and determines how much money FCRM can contribute, 'the cap'. If this funding is above the cost of the works then FCRM can proceed. If not, as will be the case on the weirs, contributions from other beneficiaries will be required. In this case we need conversations with government on how we proceed?

JS – challenged why the partnership funding policy applies to navigations as the policy suggests it's around flood risk assets. It does not address the statutory Right of Navigation that exists on these rivers. JB explained the model which is based on allocation of DEFRA funding against defined outcomes, this is all set out in guidance, but is weighted heavily to protection of existing property.

IF – discussed closed assets in Anglian and legal challenges they have had. It was agreed that an option which may need to form part of the discussion with government' is the possibility that we may have to close some navigations in the future (on health and safety grounds) if we're unable to fund the repair and maintenance of the assets. This is not an option that CRT are comfortable with proposing as "keeping navigations open is our raison d'être".

JS – would like the EA to agree the input values for the CRT Steady State and RADAR costing models, the model will be more accurate with improved costs from the EA on weirs and sluices. EA noted we will improve the accuracy of the data over time. It would be useful to reach a common agreement with CRT's model to agree what the overall funding gap is.

IM - Weirs and sluices inspections on Thames are complete, some work has been done on assessing weir refurbishment/ replacement costs.

Asset data discussion – examination of assets and the assets lists

Photos were shown of the weir and sluices in the Thames and Anglian areas by IM and NP – discussions were held on their partnership funding scores

An explanation was given as to the differences in data quality across Thames, Medway and Anglian – 'Estates undertook a review on Thames and Medway in the last review, but did not do same for Anglian. However the EA acknowledged where we are trying to get to, as an agreement to enable a way forward on the quality of the asset data lists.

Asset inspection information examples over the past 10 years (from AIMS) for Thames weirs can be provided to CRT by IM. Some information had already been provided over the last few months, from FCRM colleagues. Anglian data isn't as strong so EA has not been able to provide the same level of data as yet.

EA to provide a summary document as to what criteria/ how they arrived at what assets are retained and what are considered for transfer. Although the weirs and sluices on the Medway have been historically managed by the navigations team, CRT feel that, for consistency, they should be assessed using the same criteria as the weirs and sluices on Thames and Anglian.

These discussions will help us understand the whole risk involved, recognising the assets lists may change over time. We should look at it as a holistic approach, and how we will manage the navigations going forwards whichever organisations manages them.

Options for funding need to be considered, recognising these may be different for both organisations depending on what options are available.

It was noted that CRT are not a risk management authority under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.

CRT asked about the Wareham moorings and the EA confirmed they are not in scope as they are not in an area where the EA are navigation authority. They are classed as recreational moorings. However it was agreed if we receive support to continue then a full review of assets in ownership should be undertaken.

CRT asked if the EA would consider taking ownership of the Trust's Brent Reservoir in North London. It was agreed that should the project move to the next stage then Brent Reservoir and EA assets on CRT waterways would be included in our discussions.

CRT cost models

CRT described the model they are using to estimate likely costs of taking on EA navigations under a range of different scenarios. The view from those in the meeting was the model is as good as it can be with the level of information that we have so far.

It was agreed for the models that we would use 20% PF Score for Thames and 10% for Anglian and Medway.

There is an action on areas to focus on removing errors and duplications from the asset spreadsheet and proving cost data for weirs/sluices.

Actions

Item	Action	Who
1	Leads from EA/CRT to get together to understand the modelling CRT are using	RW
2	Asset condition history to be provided for EA weirs and sluices	MOa/JB
3	Share with CRT the criteria used so far for splitting weirs and sluices between retain/transfer	MO/MOa
4	Clearer statement on Partnership funding contributions to be looked into	JB
5	Upload pictures of weirs and sluices to shared drive	MOa
6	Need to test the funding options for retaining/funding the assets under the conditions of partnership funding.	MO
7	Need to do a walkthrough of operating the weirs/sluices at a number of different sites to see how we would operate under the differing ownership scenarios and tease out the potential risks.	MO/PW
8	Arrange to take JS/GP out to visit some of the weirs on Thames (and Anglian) with local team	MO/IM
9	RW to re run W/C 31 st oct the Steady State and Radar models with latest information for assets to transfer with PF contribution included and Weirs and Sluices not transferring with assumed contribution rates, 80% (Thames) and 90% (Medway, Anglian). PW to share	RW/PW
10	On an extended timetable i.e. 6 months we will need to identify the PF scores for all our assets. However, the group agreed for the short term the average percentage noted above are the ones we will use until such time we have completed a full review	Action if transfer goes ahead
11	Sheena Wilson and NP to meet and go through the assets data to resolve any issues on Anglian navigations.	NP
12	Thames to provide maintenance costs for weirs and sluices	IM
13	Moorings that we own (i.e. in Wareham) do we want to retain these or include these within the transfer discussions. Need to list all these sites and identify whether they're included or not as well as list of other issues such as CRT's reservoir in London	Action if transfer goes ahead
14	EA to review costs against Rye Harbour, is there any PF contribution to these assets?	MOa

