



REPORT

To: **Harbour Board** **10 January 2008**

From: **Port Engineer**

Report No: **P&H-04-08-F**

Subject: **Revised Permit To Work Arrangements, Sullom Voe Terminal**

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The current arrangements for the control of maintenance activities on the Council owned Jetties on Sullom Voe Oil Terminal are about to change.
- 1.2 This change has come about due to both a request from BP for the SIC to take control of its activities on the site, and also a requirement for Ports and Harbours Operations staff to be better able to plan and execute maintenance duties in a time and cost effective manner.
- 1.3 This report aims to advise and reassure Members of the Harbour Board, that the new arrangements will provide a robust and suitable system of work, which allows maintenance standards to be achieved, whilst protecting both SIC and BP personnel.

2 Background

- 2.1 Shetland Islands Council owns the Jetties on the Sullom Voe Oil Terminal. Since their construction in the late seventies, all maintenance on these structures has been carried out by the SIC. The only exceptions to this rule are the fire fighting and oil handling systems, which are owned and maintained by BP and its partners. Over the years, various "Permit to Work Systems" have been put in place by the Oil Terminal Operators, and it has been the policy of Ports and Harbours Engineering Division to adhere to these procedures, thus contributing to their effectiveness.
- 2.2 A Permit to Work System is basically a clearly defined set of procedures that must be followed, to allow a piece of work to be carried out. Items for consideration in such a system will include a clear definition of the work required, risk assessment, energy isolation, hazardous materials, adjacent work and any other factors that may present a hazard to the operatives. When a permit to work is issued, it will authorise the operative(s) to work on the specified piece of plant for a pre-determined period of time.

3. Current Arrangements

- 3.1 At present, BP as operators of the Terminal, have an extremely rigorous Permit to Work System in place. This is to be expected, given the nature of the work that is undertaken by their own operatives, on plant that handles hazardous materials such as crude oil and gas. Permits for all work on site are controlled and issued by a dedicated team of "Control of Work Supervisors", who ensure that all the necessary requirements have been met, before allowing work to take place. In general, a permit will take at least four days to procure, although it should be noted that, in general, BP staff have endeavoured to assist the SIC as far as possible in ensuring that permits are available when required.
- 3.2 It is felt that, for the vast majority of work undertaken by the SIC on the jetties, this level of control is not necessary, and is counter productive to ensuring that maintenance standards are met. It has been agreed that the SIC will take responsibility for its own works from early 2008.

4. Proposed Arrangements

- 4.1 Extensive consultation is currently taking place between BP and Ports and Harbours maintenance managers, to ensure that all required controls are in place, before the changeover occurs.

There are three main areas of work that need to be considered:

- In house maintenance by Ports and Harbours Operations staff
 - Works under the Jetty Maintenance Contract (Currently held by Malakoff Ltd).
 - Services performed by other Contractors (Diving, Cathodic Protection surveys etc).
- 4.2 For each of these areas, the main controls that need to be considered are:
- A clear definition of the work to be undertaken
 - A risk assessment has been carried out for the task
 - Energy Isolations are in place where required
 - Any Hazardous materials involved in the process
 - Adjacent works
- 4.3 For in house work, and those works delivered by Contractors out with the Jetty Maintenance Contract, it is proposed that these controls are administered in the following way:

4.3.1 Clear definition of work to be carried out

The Engineering Division of Ports and Harbours Operations operates a Maintenance Management System (MMS). This system allows all the Departments assets to be logged, and records any maintenance carried out. Therefore, a service history is maintained for all assets, from Pilot Vessels to streetlights, allowing maintenance personnel to identify any trends occurring. This system allows “work orders” to be created, and these clearly identify the item of plant and work required.

4.3.2 Risk Assessment

Risk assessment is required for all operations undertaken, and in that respect, is no different to works carried out at any other Harbour area. Risk assessments for work on the Oil Terminal, will of course be more robust than usual, to take account of the enhanced level of risk which is to be found in such an environment. A suitable risk assessment form, which identifies these risks is being drawn up at present.

For small contract work, the service providers would submit their own risk assessments to the Port Engineer for approval.

4.3.3 Energy Isolation

Isolations will be carried out in accordance with current legislation and best practice. Isolation forms and key boxes are currently used for locations out with the Terminal, and the principles of this system will be applied to works within the Terminal. The current layout of electrical circuits means that other than total isolation of the jetty structure, all working isolations can be carried out from the SIC switchgear, by SIC staff without the need for BP intervention.

4.3.4 Hazardous Materials

Ports and Harbours operates a register of hazardous materials in use, as required under the “Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations”. The conditions imposed by any materials used can be applied both to the work order, and also to the risk assessment for any given task.

4.3.5 Adjacent Works

Control of this aspect is vital to the smooth and safe operation of maintenance activities on the Jetties. For this reason, it has been decided that an “Area Authority” should be nominated, who will have responsibility to ensure that works by both BP and SIC in the Jetty area, do not conflict with each other, creating additional hazards. It is my intention that the resident engineer from Fraenkel Maritime, who currently supervises the Jetty Maintenance Contract, will undertake this role. This makes sense, as the bulk of the work performed in this area is done under this Contract. Therefore, when either BP or SIC wish to undertake any works on the Jetties, this

individual will be able to identify any conflicts before approving the works.

- 4.4 Works under the Jetty Maintenance Contract are controlled in a slightly different way, in that they do not form part of the Departments Maintenance Management System. However, the works are clearly identified under the contract, and all risk assessments and COSHH requirements are also met. A separate piece of legislation known as the “Construction Design and Management Regulations” (CDM) apply to works of this nature, and I am confident that the Department meets its obligations under these regulations. Isolations required under this Contract will be performed by Ports and Harbours Operations staff as outlined above. Again, by nominating the supervising Engineer for this Contract as the “area Authority”, I am confident that any conflicting and adjacent works can be identified before a hazard is created.
- 4.5 The key to ensuring that works proceed in a safe and efficient manner is communication between all parties. Weather, shipping and the differing priorities for maintenance posed by each party will all influence how works are carried out. Regular meetings are held between interested parties from the Terminal and Ports and Harbours Operations, to discuss maintenance and access requirements.

5 Links to Corporate Priorities

- 5.1 This report, which seeks to introduce changes to the permit system for carrying out maintenance on the jetties at Sullom Voe, would contribute to the Corporate Improvement Plan target of “providing a safe and healthy workplace for all employees”.

6 Financial Implications

- 6.1 There are no expenditure implications as a result of this report. All expenditure incurred as a result of Jetty Maintenance is directly charged back to the Operators of Sullom Voe Terminal.
- 6.2 Efforts will of course, be made to ensure that any financial burden is minimised as far as is reasonably practicable.
- 6.3 Staffing levels within the Engineering division dictate that any system introduced, must be in a format that can be administered by current staff. No increase in staffing levels is anticipated.

7 Policy and Delegated Authority

- 7.1 The Harbour Board has full delegated authority for the oversight and decision making in respect of the management and operation of the Council’s Harbour undertakings in accordance with overall Council policy and the requirements of the Port Marine Safety Code as described in Section 16 of the Council’s Scheme of Delegations. As

the terms of this report relates to operational matters there are no policy implications.

8 Recommendation

8.1 I recommend that the Harbour Board note the contents of this report.

Our Reference: RO-O P&H-04-08-F AJI/SM Date: 18 December 2007



REPORT

To: **Harbour Board**

10 January 2008

From: **Operations Manager - Ports**

Report No: **P&H-02-08-F**

Subject: **Port Security**

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report is to inform the Harbour Board of the EC Regulations governing maritime security.

2 Link to Council Priorities

- 2.1 Contributing to Community Safety by implementing effective port security in compliance with EC Regulation 725/2004.

3 Background

- 3.1 Following the terrorist attacks in September 2001 there was world-wide acknowledgement that the threat to transport systems, including maritime had changed.
- 3.2 The International Maritime Organisation (IMO), responding to the attacks, developed new security requirements for ships and port facilities. These requirements took the form of amendments to the Convention on the Safety of Life at Sea 1974 (SOLAS) and a new International Ship and Port Facility Security Code (ISPS Code).
- 3.3 The SOLAS amendments and ISPS Code were formally adopted in December 2002 and implemented throughout 2004.
- 3.4 The IMO requirements apply to passenger ships and cargo ships over 500 gross tonnes *engaged on international voyages*, and the port facilities which service them.
- 3.5 The EC Regulation 725/2004 provides for the harmonised implementation of the international maritime security regime agreed by the IMO. Although the EC Regulation is directly applicable, certain of its provisions require UK legislation to make them fully effective. The Ship and Port Facility (Security) Regulations 2004 contain provisions which supplement the EC Regulation, by establishing an enforcement regime.

- 3.6 The regulatory bodies are the MCA for ships and the Department for Transport for port facilities.

4 Implications for SIC

- 4.1 Port facilities identified as servicing ships on international voyages are required to have a Port Facility Security Plan (PFSP) in place which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Department for Transport's security section, TRANSEC. The Council's facilities which fall into this category are Scalloway Harbour and the Construction Jetty at Sullom Voe. PFSPs for both facilities were approved in 2004.
- 4.2 All Port Facility Security Plans are prepared using a TRANSEC template regardless of size of facility or operation.
- 4.3 As the regulations apply to facilities within a harbour, and not the harbour itself, responsibility for the oil terminal's security plan lies with the Terminal Operator, BP.

5 A Brief Description of the ISPS Code

- 5.1 Within the ISPS Code there are four categories of Port Facility with security requirements appropriate to the type of facility. The categories are;
Chemical Oil and Gas - COG
Container & Roll on/Roll off - CRR
Other Bulk Cargo - OBC
Passenger - PAX
- Scalloway and the Construction Jetty are both categorised as OBC
- 5.2 The ISPS Code has three levels of security with Security Level 1 being the routine operating level and Security Level 3 the level at which maximum precautions are taken. Port facility security levels can only be changed on instructions from TRANSEC.
- 5.3 Security control measures required by any facility, e.g. CCTV, fencing, security patrols, etc. are decided by TRANSEC following a Port Security Assessment. The TRANSEC inspectors have been fairly pragmatic about what additional physical measures it is reasonable to expect small ports to install.
- 5.4 The Code requires a PFSP to address a number of measures such as access control, procedures for responding to security incidents, reporting procedures and duties of port facility personnel assigned security duties.
- 5.5 Under the Code, vessels are required to inform port authorities and facilities, prior to arrival, of the previous ten ports of calls and the security levels in operation at each port.

6 Outline of Scalloway/Construction Jetty Plans

- 6.1 Both plans have sections which deal with port facility details, security management, communications and security measures for security levels 1,2 and 3.
- 6.2 Additional physical security measures for Scalloway were limited to installation of a wire fence which allows for access control to the commercial quay if required. No additional measures were required for the Construction Jetty as any increase in security levels will also apply to the Sullom Voe Oil Terminal, which has the infrastructure and procedures required for ISPS Code compliance in place.
- 6.3 At Security Level 1 both SIC facilities have open access, i.e. no overt security measures in operation. As the facilities move up the security levels standard security measures are put in place. These measures include foot and waterborne security patrols, and implementing access control with all visitors requiring photographic ID passes. There will also be restrictions on vehicle access.
- 6.4 At the increased security levels all vehicles will be liable to search prior to entry to the facility, with checks to include manifest reconciliation, visual checks of the vehicle and questioning of the driver. There will be 100% application of these measures at Security Level 3 with only essential personnel permitted entry. However to maintain some perspective about port security, since the introduction of the ISPS Code, and despite terrorist events in London and Glasgow, no UK port has been required to increase security above level 1.

7 Financial Implications

- 7.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

8 Policy & Delegated Authority

- 8.1 The Harbour Board has full delegated authority for oversight and decision making in respect of the management and operation of the Council's harbour undertaking in accordance with overall Council policy and the requirements of the Port Marine Safety Code (as described in section 16 of the Council's Scheme of Delegation). However, this report is for information only and there are no Policy and Delegated Authority issues to address.

9 Recommendations

- 9.1 That the Harbour Board notes the content of this report.

Date: 18 December 2007
Our Ref: RO-O

Report No: P&H-02-08-F



REPORT

To: Harbour Board **10 January 2008**
From: General Manager
Report No: P&H-03-08-F
Subject: Ports Project Monitoring Report

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The most up to date information on all projects is incorporated in this report.
- 1.2 Budget Information is attached as Appendix A.

2 Links to Corporate Plan

- 2.1 Projects in this report would make contributions to the Council's priorities of strengthening rural areas and supporting the local economy.

3 Reserve Fund Programme Areas

3.1 Scalloway Dredging – RCM 2308

The Scalloway dredging project has still to be costed and approved by Shetland Islands Council before placement and prioritisation on the Capital programme. However funds have been vired to allow application for the consents to dredge. Natural Capital have been appointed as planning and environmental consultants. Capital Programme Services are due to meet with Natural Capital to obtain guidance on the consents required. Tenders closed for the Lerwick harbour dredging contract on Friday 19 September 2007 and have been evaluated.

Discussions between Capital Programme Service and Lerwick Port Authority's preferred tenderer regarding costs are ongoing. The General Manager will make a verbal update.

3.2 Dock Symbister – RCM 2309

As reported verbally at the last Harbour Board meeting, a draft copy of the conservation engineer's report has been received. The Port Engineer will give a verbal update on progress.

3.3 Tug Replacement Programme - RCM 2313

A meeting took place with representatives from Union Naval Valencia, Sener, Lloyds and the Marine & Coastguard Agency (MCA) at Glasgow on 29 November 2007. Discussion took place on:

- The areas of authorisation to be placed on Lloyds by the MCA.
- Areas of responsibility by the MCA. This will be limited to Stability & Safety Management.
- Timetables were discussed and confirmed.
- Methodology for approval of plans.

3.4 Uyeasound – RCM 2314

The creation of the new Harbour Area at Uyea Sound, by way of a Harbour Jurisdiction Order under the terms of the Zetland County Council Act 1974, came into effect on 19 September 2007. Application has been made for planning and other statutory consents.

Tulloch Developments have been appointed as the main contractor. Detailed contractual arrangements are being finalised. Subject to final agreement on cost, preparatory works should take place over the winter months with marine works programmed to start in April 2008.

4 **Harbour Account**

4.1 Plant, Vehicles and Equipment – PCM 2101

Three vehicles have been purchased as planned.

Three expressions of interest have been received with regard to the replacement of the standby generation system for the Port Administration Building and an order has been placed.

The budget will be fully utilised by the completion of the financial year.

4.2 Navigational Aids – PCM 2104

The radio equipment to allow remote operation of Scalloway VHF from Sullom Voe VTS during out of hours has been received. Installation expected in January 2008.

An AIS transceiver has been fitted and is operational on the Lyrie. The plotter unit is still to be upgraded and is expected to be fitted by Williamsons by February.

Fitting of a remote operated camera at Scalloway, to link in with current Sullom Voe VTS system is planned but is dependent on the Pathfinder project.

Radar at Port Control is 10 years old. A new radar has been ordered, which is expected to be fitted by March.

Alterations to navigation lights at Scalloway are being investigated.

5 **Revenue Projects**

5.1 Sullom Voe Terminal Jetty Maintenance Contract

The maintenance contract is running on schedule and to budget.

6 **Other Business**

6.1 Walls Pier

Following consultation with pier users and the wider community, a preferred layout has been selected. The Feasibility Study has been completed and presented to CPRT. Progress beyond this point will be dependant on the prioritisation of the Capital Programme for 2008/09, which has yet to be finalised.

6.2 Warehouse, Scalloway

A proposal has been put forward for a new warehouse on the old TTF Ltd site at Scalloway. The proposal is for 3 units to store salmon feed. The project is to be funded by Shetland Property and Leasing (SLAP) on the understanding that potential tenants express an interest. Early indications are that there are a number of interested parties.

The architectural and engineering company Arch Henderson LLP, have been appointed as the project managers. Provisional plans have been drawn up and informal discussions have taken place with the planning department. During these discussions the planning department highlighted a number of concerns.

- Potential obstructed views of Scalloway Castle.
- Lack of car parking space
- Perceived over development of the area.

Arch Henderson's are working on addressing these concerns. Should planning permission be granted, it is likely that there will be some restriction on the use of the buildings. This should not affect the proposed use of the warehouse units, but any future re-development or re-designation of the site would be subject to planning approval.

Should the project be completed, SLAP will receive the rent from the site as a return on the investment. Any return to the Harbour will be through Harbour Dues and the passing of salmon feed over the pier

7 Financial Implications

- 7.1 This report is for information only. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

8 Policy and Delegated Authority

- 8.1 Harbour Board has full delegated authority for the oversight and decision making in respect of the management and operation of the Council's harbour undertakings in accordance with the overall Council policy, revenue budgets and the requirements of the Port Marine Safety Code, as described in Section 16 of the Council's Scheme of Delegations. However, this report is for information only and there are no Policy and Delegated Authority issues to be addressed.

9 Recommendations

- 9.1 I recommend that the Harbour Board note the areas of progress.



REPORT

To: Harbour Board

From: General Manager

Report No: P&H-05-08-F

Subject: Port Operations Report

10 January 2008

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report provides an overview of port operations since the issue of the last Port Operations Report.

2 Pilotage

2.1 Sullom Voe

- 2.1.1 Since the issue of the last Port Operations Report, pilotage operations have been mainly routine with no major incidents.

- 2.1.2 There are twelve first class authorised pilots for Sullom Voe

2.2 Scalloway

- 2.2.1 During October and November there were 23 acts of Pilotage.

- 2.2.2 There are thirteen authorised pilots for Scalloway including the twelve duly authorised for Sullom Voe.

- 2.2.3 Details of ship visits to Scalloway are shown in Appendix A. Up to date figures will be provided to the next meeting.

2.3 Small Piers and Harbours

- 2.3.1 Appendix B shows the current actual income for small piers and harbours.

3 Staffing – Port Operations

- 3.1 Appendix C gives the staffing position as at 30 November 2007 showing a total of 133 staff.

4 Port Operations

4.1 Sullom Voe

4.1.1 Appendix D shows the exports and imports at the Port of Sullom Voe.

4.1.2 Appendix E is an abstract of weather delays for September and the cumulative totals for 2007.

4.2 Scalloway

4.2.1 Appendix F shows the fish landing statistics for Scalloway.

4.2.2 Appendix G shows the cargo statistics for Scalloway.

4.2.3 Appendix H shows the summary management accounts for Scalloway.

4.3 Small Piers and Harbours

4.3.1 Appendix I shows the summary management accounts for other small piers and harbours.

5 Shipping Standards

The following incidents have occurred since the last report.

5.1 Ship Incidents

5.1.1 On 10 November 2007, the main engine of the Greek tanker Amalthea failed to start when sailing from Jetty 3. Master reported the main engine governor was slow to respond due to rapid RPM changes. The Pilot reported the situation was controlled throughout.

5.2 Pollution Incidents

5.2.1 There were no incidents during this period.

6 The Met Office

6.1 The General Manager met with Pat Boyle of the Met Office to discuss the possibility of a weather radar to be based in Shetland. It was agreed that the General Manager would give a written submission to the Scottish Parliament Flooding and Flood Management Inquiry in that a Shetland based weather radar would enhance weather forecasting throughout Scotland. This has been done.

7 Policy and Delegated Authority

- 7.1 The Harbour Board has full delegated authority for oversight and decision making in respect of the management and operation of the Council's harbour undertaking in accordance with overall Council policy and the requirements of the Port Marine Safety Code as described in Section 16 of the Council's Scheme of Delegation. The purpose of this report is to inform members on port operations which fall within the responsibility of the General Manager of Ports & Harbours Operations and does not seek any decision. However, this report is for information only and there are no Policy and Delegated Authority issues to address.

8 Financial Implications

- 8.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

9 Recommendation

- 9.1 This report is for noting.

Staffing Position – 30 November 2007

<u>Post</u>	<u>Established Posts</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Comments</u>
General Manager	1	1	
Marine Officer/Pilots	12	12	
Operations Manager – Ports	1	1	
Operations Manager – Marine	1	1	
Port Safety Officers	2	2	
Launch Crew Skippers	9	9	
Launch Crew Deckhands	13	13	
Tug - Masters	12	12	
Tug - Chief Engineers	12	12	
Tug - 2 nd Engineers	9	9	
Tug - Mates	12	12	2 Temporary contract
Tug - GPRs'	3	3	1 Temporary contract
Assistant Pier Masters (Scalloway)	2	2	
Engineering Assistant (Scalloway)	1	1	
Full Time Harbour Assistant	1	1	
Part Time Harbour Assistants	9	8	
Administration Manager	1	1	
Finance Assistants	4	4	
Clerical Assistant	4	4	
Cook	1	1	

Superintendent Engineer – Marine	1	1
Superintendent Engineer – Ports	1	1
Maintenance Planning Engineer	1	0
Engineering Supervisor	1	1
Electrical Engineer	3	2
Marine Engineer	3	3
Welder/Fabricator	2	2
Maintenance Engineer	1	1
Engineering Assistant	4	4
Apprentice – Electrical	1	0
Apprentice – Mechanical	1	0
General Assistant	2	2
Store Keeper	1	1
Storeman	1	1
Senior Stores Assistant	1	1
Stores Assistant	1	1
Driver	1	1
Total	136	131

Ports & Harbours Operations

Abstract of Weather Caused Delays at 30 November 2007

	Monthly Totals			Cumulative Totals		
	Days	Hours	Mins	Days	Hours	Mins
Berthing Suspension	07	06	36	39	11	30
Unberthing Suspension	00	00	00	00	00	00
Loading Suspension	00	20	42	01	16	42
Boatwork Suspension	03	02	48	09	12	24
Pilotage Suspension	00	00	00	00	00	00
Helicopter Usage	00	00	00	00	00	00
Tug/Pilot Standby	00	00	00	00	00	00
Total Disruption - all Causes	08	00	36	49	07	36
Actual Delays Due to Weather	01	08	06	05	13	00



REPORT

To: Harbour Board

10 January 2008

From: Service Manager – Waste Services
Environment and Building Services
Infrastructure Services Department

SULLOM VOE STRATEGIC PLAN

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Harbour Board of the current status of the project to develop a Strategic Plan for Sullom Voe.

2 Links to Corporate Priorities

- 2.1 Economic diversification is a key element in the sustainable economic development priority of the Council's corporate plan. The objective of this report is to provide direction for the Council as it seeks to replace in value the economic prosperity provided by the oil industry as throughput at the Sullom Voe Terminal declines.

3 Tendering

- 3.1 We originally tendered the project to develop a Strategic Plan taking full consideration of both the Port and the Terminal together with forecasts for Oil and Gas production and transshipment opportunities over the next 30 years.
- 3.2 A selective tendering process was adopted and tender documents were sent out to 5 contractors. Unfortunately only one tender document was returned, and following interview the contractor was deemed to be unsuitable to deliver the full range of service required for the Strategic Plan.
- 3.3 As a result of the poor response to the original tender we split the work for the project to allow the more specialist work relating to Oil and Gas and the Terminal to be undertaken by one consultant, and the more general work relating to the development of the Port to be undertaken as a separate contract.
- 3.4 Professor A. Kemp has been appointed to carry out the study relating to the Terminal and Oil and Gas with a final report due at the beginning of April 2008. Tender documents have been sent out to four consultants for the remaining work with a tender return date of the 9 of January 2008.

- 3.5 The timetable for completion of the work is for a final report to be presented in May 2008, which allows the consultants to consider the results of Professor Kemp's Oil and Gas study in the final presentation for the strategic development of Sullom Voe.

4 Financial Implications

- 4.1 Provision of £45,000 has been set aside in Economic Development budget RRD15201760. Of this sum £25,825 has been allocated to the work being done by professor Kemp's team for the oil related part of the survey. The remainder will be allocated to the second phase of the survey once that cost is known. In the event of the cost of the second phase being above the agreed budget then the Council will be asked to consider the additional requirement.

5 Policy and Delegated Authority

- 5.1 This project is in line with the Council's priority for economic diversification. The Executive Committee approved the Council's Economic Policy Statement, which contains all the current economic development policies, on 9 December 2003 (Min Ref 34/03) and by the Council on 17 December 2003 (Min Ref: 161/03).
- 5.2 The Harbour Board has full delegated authority for the oversight and decision making in respect of the management and operation of the Council's harbour undertakings in accordance with the overall Council policy and the requirements of the Port Marine Safety Code as described in section 16 of the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

6 Conclusion

- 6.1 As throughput at the Sullom Voe Terminal declines there is a need for the Council to find ways to diversify activity at the Port and maintain employment in the area. This study will identify investment requirements and opportunities for new developments to assist in the diversification process.

7 Recommendation

- 7.1 I recommend the Harbour Board:
- i) Notes the content of this report

Report No: ES-01-08-F