



# Strategic Environmental Assessment Statement

Shannon Upper & Lower

2018

# Strategic Environmental Assessment Statement

For

## River Basin (25/26) Shannon Upper & Lower Flood Risk Management Plan

Areas for Further Assessment included in the Plan:

<i>Cill Dalua / Béal an Átha</i>	<i>Killaloe / Ballina</i>
<i>Maothail</i>	<i>Mohill</i>
<i>Áth Eascrach</i>	<i>Ahascragh</i>
<i>Baile Átha Luain</i>	<i>Athlone</i>
<i>Droichead Uí Bhriain &amp; Montpelier</i>	<i>O'Briens Bridge &amp; Montpelier</i>
<i>An Muileann gCearr</i>	<i>Mullingar</i>
<i>An tAonach</i>	<i>Nenagh</i>
<i>Mainistir Shruthla</i>	<i>Abbeysrule</i>
<i>An Port Nua</i>	<i>Newport</i>
<i>Baile Uí Mhatháin</i>	<i>Ballymahon</i>
<i>Áth Liag</i>	<i>Athleague</i>
<i>An Caisleán Riabhach</i>	<i>Castlerea</i>
<i>Cathair Luimnigh &amp; máguaird</i>	<i>Limerick City &amp; Environs</i>
<i>Béal Átha na Sluaighe</i>	<i>Ballinasloe</i>
<i>An Longfort</i>	<i>Longford</i>
<i>Biorra</i>	<i>Birr</i>
<i>Buiríos Uí Chéin</i>	<i>Borrisokane</i>
<i>Mainistir na Búille</i>	<i>Boyle</i>
<i>An Cheapach Mhór</i>	<i>Cappamore</i>
<i>Cora Droma Rúisc</i>	<i>Carrick on Shannon</i>
<i>Caisleán Uí Chonaill</i>	<i>Castleconnell</i>
<i>Clóirtheach</i>	<i>Clara</i>
<i>Cluain na Slí</i>	<i>Clonaslee</i>
<i>Cluain Dá Ráth</i>	<i>Cloondara</i>
<i>Port Omna</i>	<i>Portumna</i>
<i>Dromad</i>	<i>Dromod</i>
<i>Droim Seanbhó</i>	<i>Drumshanbo</i>
<i>Droichead na Sionainne (Stáisiún Cumhachta)</i>	<i>Shannonbridge (Power Station)</i>
<i>Meathas Troim</i>	<i>Edgeworthstown</i>
<i>Caladh na Sionainne</i>	<i>Shannon Harbour</i>
<i>Cill Bheagáin</i>	<i>Kilbeggan</i>
<i>Béal Átha Liag (Stáisiún Cumhachta)</i>	<i>Lanesborough (Power Station)</i>
<i>Sráidbhaile Liatroma</i>	<i>Leitrim Village</i>
<i>Raithean</i>	<i>Rahan</i>
<i>Gort an Tobair - Cluain Lárach</i>	<i>Springfield</i>
<i>Pollach</i>	<i>Pollagh</i>
<i>Ros Comáin</i>	<i>Roscommon</i>
<i>Ros Cré</i>	<i>Roscrea</i>
<i>Tulach Mhór</i>	<i>Tullamore</i>

Flood Risk Management Plans prepared by the Office of Public Works 2018

In accordance with

European Communities (Assessment and Management of Flood Risks) Regulations 2010 and 2015

## Purpose of this Report

As part of the National Catchment-based Flood Risk Assessment & Management (CFRAM) programme, the Commissioners of Public Works have commissioned expert consultants to prepare Strategic Environmental Assessments, Appropriate Assessment Screening Reports and, where deemed necessary by the Commissioners of Public Works, Natura Impacts Assessments, associated with the national suite of Flood Risk Management Plans.

This is necessary to meet the requirements of both S.I. No. 435 of 2004 European Communities (Environmental Assessment of Certain Plans and Programmes) Regulations 2004 (as amended by S.I. No. 200/2011), and S.I. No. 477/2011 European Communities (Birds and Natural Habitats) Regulations 2011.

Expert Consultants have prepared these Reports on behalf of the Commissioners of Public Works to inform the Commissioners' determination as to whether the Plans are likely to have significant effects on the environment and whether an Appropriate Assessment of a plan or project is required and, if required, whether or not the plans shall adversely affect the integrity of any European site.

The Report contained in this document is specific to the Flood Risk Management Plan as indicated on the front cover.

## Copyright

Copyright - Office of Public Works. All rights reserved. No part of this report may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from the Office of Public Works.

Maps in the Statement include Ordnance Survey of Ireland (OSI) data reproduced under licence.

## Acknowledgements

The Office of Public Works (OPW) gratefully acknowledges the assistance, input and provision of data by a large number of organisations towards the implementation of the National CFRAM Programme. In particular, the OPW acknowledges the assistance of Jacobs Consulting Engineers and the valuable input and support of the Local Authorities at project level in each of the study areas.

The OPW also acknowledges the participation of members of the public, representative organisations and other groups throughout each stage of consultation.



**Shannon Catchment-based Flood Risk  
Assessment and Management (CFRAM) Study**

**Office of Public Works**

**Strategic Environmental Assessment Statement  
Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin**

Rev 1: Final Report

08 September 2017

## Shannon CFRAM Study

Project No: 32103000  
Document Title: SEA Statement UoM 25/26  
Document No.: 0461  
Revision: 1  
Date: 08 September 2017  
Client Name: Office of Public Works  
Project Manager: Peter Smyth  
File Name: \\BABTIE\\Environment\\Environment Management\\PROJECTS\\CFRAMS\\4 - Documents\\4.3 - Draft Documents\\MCA\_AA\_SEA\\SEA\\4\_SEA Statement\\SEA Statement\_UoM 25\_26\\Rev 1\\TD\_ENVT\_0461\_V1\_JAC\_SEAStatement\_UoM2526\_170908.docx

Jacobs Engineering Ireland Limited  
Merrion House  
Merrion Road  
Dublin D04  
Ireland  
T +353 1 269 5666  
www.jacobs.com

### Document History

Revision	Date	Description	By	Review	Approved
Rev 0.1	August 2017	Internal revision	Rebecca Dunlea	Denise Meade / Mairead Conlon	Peter Smyth
Rev 0	September 2017	Draft Issued to OPW	Wai Wong	Denise Meade / Mairead Conlon	Peter Smyth
Rev 1	September 2017	Final	Patrick Forte	Denise Meade / Mairead Conlon	Peter Smyth

### Copyright

Copyright Office of Public Works. All rights reserved.

No part of this report may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from the Office of Public Works. If you have received this report in error, please destroy all copies in your possession or control and notify the Office of Public Works.

### Legal Disclaimer

This report is subject to the limitations and warranties contained in the contract between the commissioning party (Office of Public Works) and Jacobs Engineering Ireland Limited.

## Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Legislative Context.....	1
1.3	Content and Structure of SEA Statement .....	1
2.	The Catchment Flood Risk Management Plan .....	3
3.	Overview of the SEA Process .....	8
3.1	Introduction.....	8
3.1.1	Screening .....	8
3.1.2	Scoping .....	9
3.1.3	Incorporation of Environmental Considerations: Environmental Assessment and Evaluation .....	10
3.1.4	Consultation, revision and adoption activities .....	11
3.1.5	Post-adoption activities .....	11
3.2	Appropriate Assessment .....	11
4.	Integration of Consultation into the Final Plan .....	13
4.1	Stakeholder Engagement Activities .....	14
4.2	Public Consultation Activities.....	15
4.2.1	Draft Flood Map Preparation Consultation.....	15
4.2.2	Consultation on Options to Manage Flood Risk .....	16
4.2.3	Draft Plans Consultation.....	17
4.2.4	Other Consultation Initiatives under the Shannon CFRAM Study .....	18
4.3	Summary of Submissions .....	18
4.4	Key Themes Raised in the General Submissions Relating to the Shannon CFRAM Study .....	19
4.4.1	Technical Consultation Themes .....	19
4.4.2	Environmental Consultation Themes.....	20
4.5	Key Themes Raised in the Specific Submissions Relating to Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin .....	22
4.5.1	Technical Consultation Themes .....	22
4.5.2	Environmental Consultation Themes.....	24
5.	Influence of Environmental Considerations in the Final Plan .....	26
5.1	Environmental Objectives .....	26
5.2	Summary of Assessment .....	27
5.3	Summary of Changes to the Final Plan.....	27
5.3.1	General Change: Layout and level of detail.....	27
5.3.2	Changes to Measures: River Basin Scale.....	28
5.3.3	Changes to Measures: AFA Scale .....	30

5.3.4 Changes to Mitigation Measures: All Scales .....33

5.4 Mitigation Measures .....34

5.5 Reasons for Selection of the Final Plan (over other reasonable alternatives) .....35

6. Measures to Monitor Significant Environmental Effects.....38

7. Conclusion .....45

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background

This is the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Statement prepared in relation to the Flood Risk Management Plan (the Plan) for the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin in accordance with national and European Union (EU) legislation. This document provides information on the decision-making process and documents how environmental considerations, the views of consultees and the recommendations of the Environmental Report (ER) (and the assessment carried out under Article 6 of the Habitats Directive) have influenced the final revision of the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin Plan.

### 1.2 Legislative Context

SEA is required under EU Council Directive 2001/42/EC on the Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment (the SEA Directive) and transposing Irish Regulations (the European Communities (Environmental Assessment of Certain Plans and Programmes) Regulations 2004 (SI No. 435 of 2004)) as amended by SI 200 of 2011 (hereafter referred to as simply the SEA Regulations); and the Planning and Development (Strategic Environmental Assessment) Regulations 2004 (SI 436 of 2004), as amended by SI 201 of 2011. Its purpose is to enable plan-making authorities to incorporate environmental considerations into decision-making at an early stage and in an integrated way throughout the plan-making process.

The overall aim of the SEA Directive is to:

*‘provide a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to promoting sustainable development.’*

The SEA of the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin Plan has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the directive and regulations and, where relevant, has sought to meet the requirements of the associated best practice guidance.

This SEA Statement has been prepared in accordance with Section 16(2) of the SEA Regulations. The Plan and SEA Statement for Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin are available to download at [www.opw.ie/FloodPlans/](http://www.opw.ie/FloodPlans/).

### 1.3 Content and Structure of SEA Statement

The main purpose of the SEA Statement is to provide information on the decision-making process for the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin Plan in order to illustrate how decisions were taken, thereby making the process more transparent.

In accordance with Section 16(2) of the SEA Regulations, this SEA Statement documents the following;

- How environmental considerations have been integrated into the Plan;
- How the ER has been taken into account during the preparation of the Plan;
- How consultations, submissions and observations have been taken into account during the preparation of the Plan;
- Reasons for choosing the final Plan, in light of other reasonable alternatives (where available) considered; and
- Measures were decided upon to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Plan.

The SEA Statement has been prepared to outline “information on the decisions” as required by the SEA Regulations and is available to the public, along with the ER, the Natura Impact Statement, flood maps and the Final Plan.



The SEA Statement consists of 7 chapters as detailed in Table 1.1.

**Table 1.1: SEA Statement Chapters**

No.	Chapter
1	Introduction
2	The Catchment Flood Risk Management Plan
3	Overview of the SEA Process
4	Integration of Consultation into the Final Plan
5	Influence of Environmental Considerations in the Final Plan
6	Measures to Monitor Significant Environmental Effects
7	Conclusion

## 2. The Catchment Flood Risk Management Plan

The Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin is shown in its wider context within the Shannon RBD in Figure 2.1 and in more detail in Figure 2.2. It encompasses areas of fifteen counties; Limerick, Clare, Tipperary, Offaly, Meath, Westmeath, Longford, Roscommon, Galway, Leitrim, Cavan, Sligo, Mayo, Laois, and Fermanagh. The total area of the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin is approximately 11,600 km<sup>2</sup>. The Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin comprises 11 sub-catchments, 37 AFAs and 2 IRRs, which are set out in Table 2.1 below.

The main source of flood risk to the River Basin is fluvial. Limerick City is the only AFA where coastal flood risk is considered.

**Table 2.1: Areas for Further Assessment in the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin (2011 Census)**

Sub-Catchment	Areas for Further Assessment (AFAs) and Individual Risk Receptors (IRRs)	Town Population in 2011
Upper Shannon Catchment	Drumshanbo	665
	Leitrim Village	258
	Carrick on Shannon	3,163
	Dromod	-
	Cloondara	575
	Lanesborough Power Station	-
	Boyle	1,599
	Mohill	931
	Longford	7,622
Middle Shannon Catchment	Athlone	14,347
	Shannonbridge Power Station	-
	Shannon Harbour	-
Lower Shannon Catchment	Portumna	1,377
	Killaloe/Ballina	1,035
	O'Brien's Bridge and Montpelier	378
	Castleconnell	1,330
	Springfield	-
	Limerick City	52, 539
Suck Catchment	Castlerea	1, 873
	Athleague	900
	Ahascragh	221
	Ballinasloe	6, 049
Hind Catchment	Roscommon	5,017
Inny Catchment	Edgeworthstown	1,221
	Abbeyshrule	-
	Ballymahon	963

Bronsa Catchment	Mullingar	8,940
	Kilbeggan	822
	Clara	3,001
	Pollagh	229
	Clonaslee	501
	Rahan	696
	Tullamore <sup>1</sup>	N/A
Little Bronsa Catchment	Birr	4,091
	Roscrea	4,910
Ballyfinboy Catchment	Borrisokane	832
Nenagh Catchment	Nenagh	7, 415
Mulkear Catchment	Newport	1,286
	Cappamore	669

<sup>1</sup> Tullamore is considered a CFRAM Study AFA, but the SEA considerations have been undertaken separately and are therefore not reported within this Statement.

The River Shannon rises in the Cuilcagh Mountains, at a location known as the Shannon Pot in the counties of Cavan and Fermanagh. Lough Allen is near this source, from where the Shannon flows south through a series of navigation locks to Lough Ree, as far as Athlone. This reach covers the Upper and Middle Shannon sub-catchments which also receive flows from major tributaries including the Rivers Boyle and Inny.

From Athlone, the Lower Shannon sub-catchment commences. Between Athlone and Lough Derg, the Shannon passes through an extensive peat bog which forms a natural flood plain. As the Shannon flows through this reach it passes through a central lowland, known as the “Shannon Callows”, and it is also joined by the River Suck, River Brosna and Little Brosna. Between Lough Derg and the tidal limit at Limerick, the Shannon is joined by the Mulkear River on the left bank.

There are documented records of tidal and fluvial flooding along the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin from the early 1920s through to 2016.

Tidal flooding may be caused by a number of mechanisms including:

- Seasonal high tides such as those driven by the spring neap tide cycle;
- Storm surges caused by low-pressure weather systems which force the water level to rise higher than the normal sea level; and
- Storm-driven wave action.

Extreme conditions leading to tidal flooding are most commonly a result of a combination of two or more of these mechanisms.

Fluvial flooding occurs when the river channel system is unable to convey the quantity of rainfall draining into it from the surrounding catchment at a quick enough rate.

There are a number of notable flood events in the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin, including:

- January 1925. Low lying agricultural lands, numerous properties and roads.
- December 1954. Extensive flooding resulted in widespread damage throughout the catchment with thousands of acres of farmland being submerged and more than 70 residential properties seriously flooded in the Athlone area alone.

- February 1990. Over 3,000 farm families and 700 acres of land south of Athlone in the Middle Shannon Catchment were affected. The same event impacted many villages and roadways throughout the counties of Limerick, Clare and parts of Galway.
- November 2009. Extensive damage to properties and infrastructure throughout the catchment. Numerous major roadways were closed such as the R525 from Castleconnell to Montpelier / O'Briensbridge in the south of the catchment.
- February 2014. Residents had to be evacuated from their homes in Limerick City, while approximately 30km of the Limerick to Ennis Rail Line and large areas of agricultural lands were affected.
- December 2015 / January 2016. Significant flooding predominately throughout the Lower Shannon Catchment, with thousands of acres of agricultural land, roads and properties impacted.

There are a number of factors that can influence future changes in flooding in the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin, including climate change, land use change (e.g. afforestation) and urban growth. As these factors are likely to change over time, the Shannon CFRAM Study has considered how these factors could affect future flood risk within the Shannon catchment.

It is likely that climate change will have a considerable impact on flood risk in Ireland as a result of the following concerns:

- Sea level rise is already being observed and is projected to continue to rise in the future, increasing the risk to our coastal communities and assets, and threatening damage to, or elimination of, inter-tidal habitats where hard defences exist (referred to as 'coastal squeeze');
- It is projected that the number of heavy rainfall days per year may increase, which could lead to an increase in both fluvial and pluvial (urban storm water) flood risk, although there is considerable uncertainty associated with projections of short duration, intense rainfall changes due to climate model scale and temporal and spatial down-scaling issues; and
- The projected wetter winters, particularly in the west of the country, could give rise to increased groundwater flood risk associated with turloughs (a type of seasonally disappearing lake).

These potential impacts could have serious consequences for Ireland, where all of the main cities are on the coast and many of the main towns are on large rivers.

While there is considerable uncertainty associated with most aspects of the potential impacts of climate change on flood risk, it is prudent to take the potential for change into account in the development of Flood Risk Management policies and strategies and the design of flood risk management measures.

Other changes, such as in land use and future development could also have an impact on future flood risk through increased runoff and a greater number of people and number and value of assets within flood prone areas.

The Shannon CFRAM Study has identified likely large-scale changes in the catchment over the next 50 to 100 years which could significantly influence flood risk. Each of the above influences was examined individually and in-combination to judge their relative influences on flood risk, and based on best available data, a range of potential future catchment-scale scenarios was developed.

The CFRAM Study includes the assessment of risk for two potential future scenarios; the Mid-Range Future Scenario (MRFS) and the High-End Future Scenario (HEFS).

Using this information, the potential impact of flooding within Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin has been identified and mapped. These maps indicate that the most significant increase in flooding in the future is associated with the increase in mean sea levels attributed to climate change. Land use changes and urban growth also increase river flows, although the increase in flooding is predicted to be less extensive.

Figure 2.1 Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin in the wider context of Shannon RBD







Figure 2.2: Areas for Further Assessment in the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin





### 3. Overview of the SEA Process

#### 3.1 Introduction

SEA is a process for evaluating, at the earliest appropriate stage, the environmental effects of plans or programmes before they are adopted. It also gives the public and other interested parties an opportunity to comment and to be kept informed of decisions and how they were made. An early consideration of environmental concerns in the planning process creates an opportunity for environmental factors to be considered explicitly alongside other factors such as social, technical or economic aspects.

The key stages of the SEA process, and the associated outputs required are outlined in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1 : Overview of SEA Process**

SEA Stages	
<b>Screening</b>	To determine the need or otherwise for SEA of a specific plan or programme. <b>Output required:</b> Screening decision.
<b>Scoping</b>	To identify the aspects of the plan or programme that are relevant to the SEA and the related key environmental issues that need to be considered. <b>Output required:</b> Scoping Report and consultation with Statutory Authorities.
<b>Environmental assessment and evaluation</b>	Of the plan or programme: to identify, predict, evaluate and mitigate the potential impacts of the plan or programme and reasonable alternatives. <b>Output required:</b> Environmental Report.
<b>Consultation, revision and adoption activities</b>	To seek public opinion on the Draft plan or programme and outcome of the SEA process; influence the content of the final plan or programme and document the outcomes of the SEA process. <b>Output required:</b> Consultation with the public and Statutory Authorities on the ER accompanying the Draft plan or programme, and the SEA Post-Adoption Statement (i.e. this document), accompanying the final plan or programme.
<b>Post-adoption activities</b>	Subsequent monitoring of the impacts of the plan or programme during its implementation to inform the future revision and SEA of the plan or programme. <b>Output required:</b> Implementation of SEA monitoring regime.

##### 3.1.1 Screening

The need for an SEA on the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin was established prior to the commencement of the Shannon CFRAM Study when a screening assessment was undertaken by the OPW for the overall CFRAM Programme.

Flood Risk Management Plans (Plans), including the Plan for the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin, fall under Annex II of the SEA Directive and need to be 'screened' to determine whether they require SEA depending on the characteristics of the plan/programme, the magnitude of the potential effects and the vulnerability of the area(s) likely to be affected as set out in Schedule 2A of the SEA Regulations (DEHLG, 2004).

Screening was completed by the OPW and concluded that SEA was required for all Plans under the CFRAM programme as:

- The Plans will be carried out for areas typically greater than 1,000 km<sup>2</sup> and collectively they will cover the entire landmass of the Republic of Ireland. The outcomes of the Plans therefore have the potential to have a significant effect on the environment;
- Carrying out SEAs will allow for the early consideration of environmental issues and the incorporation of these issues into the formulation of the recommendations for flood risk management within the Plans;
- The Plans will form a framework for future projects and allocation of resources concerning reduction of flooding risk;
- The Plans will influence spatial plans at both regional and local level; and
- The Plans are likely to require an assessment under Article 6 of the EU Habitats Directive.

### **3.1.2 Scoping**

The primary objective of the scoping stage, was to establish a decision-making framework (the SEA objectives) that could be used to evaluate the impact of the Plan on the environment. It comprised:

- Identification of the baseline environmental conditions within the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin catchment for the following topics:
  - Population and human health;
  - Geology, Soils and Land Use;
  - Tourism and Recreation;
  - Material Assets (Economic), Development and Infrastructure;
  - Water;
  - Fisheries, Aquaculture and Angling;
  - Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna;
  - Landscape and Visual Amenity;
  - Archaeology and Cultural Heritage; and
  - Climate.
- Identification of the key environmental and social issues relevant to flooding and flood risk management, and those issues/topics not relevant to the SEA process.
- Identification of an initial suite of environmental objectives, sub-objectives, indicators and targets proposed to form the decision-making framework for the next stage of the SEA process and to be used to inform the assessment of flood risk management options.

The scoping process was informed by consultation with stakeholders through two SEA scoping workshops held in July and October 2011. All SEA workshop attendees were directly informed of the publication of the SEA Scoping Report. Feedback was specifically sought from the SEA Environmental Authorities through formal issue of the SEA Scoping Report. A response was received from the DEHLG and the EPA who were closely involved in the preparation of the Scoping Report, including the review of draft outputs.

This scoping process also determined the extent and level of detailed environmental information to be included in the SEA and identified the need to collect any additional data during the next stage.

Given the time which elapsed between the SEA scoping process up to 2012 and the completion of the assessment tasks, a second data-gathering exercise was undertaken in 2014/2015 to inform the optioneering phase. In addition, a review of the current plans and programmes applicable to the Shannon CFRAM Study was undertaken.



### **3.1.3 Incorporation of Environmental Considerations: Environmental Assessment and Evaluation**

The SEA process requires that environmental considerations are accounted for in the preparation of the Plan. The sections below summarise the environmental assessment and evaluation process and how this process was taken into account in the preparation of the Plan and also in the detailed options assessment and Multi Criteria Assessment (MCA) processes.

The environmental assessment and evaluation process of the Draft Plan identified the potential significant effects of the Plan and the mitigation measures required to offset identified adverse effects. This stage of the SEA built upon the extensive and comprehensive option assessment process undertaken as part of the overall MCA process.

#### ***Identification of the Preferred Option***

Within this Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin, the full suite of flood risk management measures comprising both structural and non-structural measures, were considered during the initial evaluation stage of the option assessment process. The measures identified for each Spatial Scale of Assessment (UoM, Sub-catchment or coastal area, AFAs and IRR) within Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin were screened using the following criteria:

- Applicability;
- Technical feasibility;
- Economic feasibility;
- Social and Environmental effects.

This process identified a short-list of potential measures for each Spatial Scale of Assessment (SSA) which were subsequently developed into the flood risk management measures considered during the MCA. Relevant environmental constraints were taken into account, where possible, during the identification and development of these options.

The selection of the preferred measure for each SSA was based on the performance during the MCA process and the overall MCA score. The MCA score considered how each measure performed against the twelve SEA objectives and was influential in the selection of the preferred measure.

#### ***Assessment of measures / options under the SEA***

All the flood risk management measures considered during the MCA were also subject to SEA where environmental effects were characterised in terms of their quality, duration, permanence, scale and type. All assessments we presented in Appendix B of the SEA Environmental Report.

The main SEA Environmental Report presented detailed assessments that considered the potential effects of implementing the preferred measure at the relevant SSA and describes the mitigation measures envisaged to prevent, reduce, and as fully as possible, offset any identified significant negative effects and identifies the residual significance of these effects following mitigation proposed within this report.

#### ***Alternative measures / options***

The measure / option development process considered a broad range of possible flood risk management measures / options; all these were subject to SEA assessment, see above.

#### ***Monitoring***

A monitoring framework, to both monitor the predicted significant (moderate to major negative) residual effects of implementation of the flood risk management measures and to update the baseline in order to inform the six yearly review cycle of the CFRAM Study, was developed. The monitoring framework is based on the SEA objectives, targets and indicators. Monitoring will help to identify unforeseen effects of the CFRAM Study, and ensure that where these effects are adverse, action is taken to reduce or offset them. The proposed monitoring framework will commence as soon as the Plan for the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin is implemented

and will be revised periodically to take into account new monitoring methods and increased understanding of the environmental baseline.

### ***Cumulative effects of options***

The effect of the plan components in isolation were assessed as well as an additional qualitative assessment of potential cumulative effects. In addition, consideration of potential interactions with other plans and strategies external to the Draft Plan for the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin, was also undertaken.

### ***Assessing the strategic recommendations and policies***

This stage of the SEA required the assessment and evaluation of the Draft Plan for Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin to identify the potential significant effects of the Plan and identify the mitigation measures required to offset identified adverse effects. This stage of the SEA built upon the extensive and comprehensive option assessment process, as part of the overall Multi Criteria Assessment (MCA) process and at this stage the potential environmental impacts were characterised in terms of their quality, duration, permanence, scale and type.

#### **3.1.4 Consultation, revision and adoption activities**

The consultation process adopted for the Draft Plan and the SEA is documented in Chapter 4.

#### **3.1.5 Post-adoption activities**

The monitoring proposals for the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin Plan are documented in Chapter 6.

## **3.2 Appropriate Assessment**

The Habitats Directive provides legal protection for habitats and species of European importance. The main aim of the Habitats Directive is “to contribute towards ensuring biodiversity through the conservation of natural habitats of wild fauna and flora in the European territory of the Member States to which the treaty applies” (92/43/EEC). Actions taken in order to fulfil the Directive must be designed to “maintain or restore, at a favourable conservation status, natural habitats and species of wild fauna and flora of Community interest” (92/43/EEC).

The Directive provides for the creation of protected sites, SACs, for a number of habitat types and certain species of flora and fauna. The Directive also seeks to establish Natura 2000, a network of protected areas throughout Europe. SACs, together with SPAs designated under the Birds Directive (79/409/EEC), form the Natura 2000 network. The Directive was incorporated into Irish law by the European Communities (Natural Habitats) Regulations (SI No. 94 of 1997) under Regulation 31 (Annex 1.2).

An assessment is required under the Habitats Directive for any plan or project likely to have a significant effect on a Natura 2000 site. Article 6, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Habitats Directive state that:

*6(3) Any plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives. In the light of the conclusions of the assessment of the implications for the site and subject to the provisions of paragraph 4, the competent national authorities shall agree to the plan or project only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site concerned and, if appropriate, after having obtained the opinion of the general public.*

*6(4) If, in spite of a negative assessment of the implications for the site and in the absence of alternative solutions, a plan or project must nevertheless be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature, the Member State shall take all compensatory measures necessary to ensure that the overall coherence of Natura 2000 is protected. It shall inform the Commission of the compensatory measures adopted.*

*Where the site concerned hosts a priority natural habitat type and/or a priority species, the only considerations which may be raised are those relating to human health or public safety, to beneficial*

*consequences of primary importance for the environment or, further to an opinion from the Commission, to other imperative reasons of overriding public interest.*

This means that, where the implementation of the proposed development is likely to have a significant effect on a Natura 2000 site, the Local Authority must ensure that an appropriate assessment is carried out in view of that site's conservation objectives. The proposed development can only be approved if it has been ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the Natura 2000 sites concerned or, in the case of a negative assessment and where there are no alternative solutions, the scheme can only be approved for reasons of overriding public interest.

An 'Appropriate Assessment' of the impacts of the Draft Plan on the Natura 2000 sites within and adjacent to Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin, was undertaken. This assessment considers whether the recommendations of the Plan for Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin are likely to have an effect on the ecological integrity of the Natura 2000 sites within the catchment.

The Appropriate Assessment (AA) process has been integrated with the SEA process. The requirements and value/sensitivity of the Natura 2000 sites within Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin were established at the scoping stage and this information was used to inform the option assessment and SEA process. A key objective of the SEA requires the protection, and potential enhancement of these sites, and potential impacts on these sites have been considered within the decision-making process. The AA was undertaken in two stages:

- *Screening* – to identify whether the plan components are likely to give rise to significant adverse effects on Natura 2000 sites, based on an initial assessment and precautionary approach. The results of this assessment are fully documented within an AA Screening Report. The National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) were consulted throughout the undertaking of this assessment.
- *Appropriate Assessment* – following the screening stage, a detailed assessment of the plan components identified as likely to give rise to significant adverse impacts on the Natura 2000 sites within the catchment was undertaken. Following more detailed analysis, this stage concludes whether any of the plan components would have an adverse effect on the ecological integrity of Natura 2000 sites. The results of this assessment are fully documented within a detailed Natura Impact Statement. NPWS were consulted for their comments during the undertaking of this assessment.

## 4. Integration of Consultation into the Final Plan

In the SEA Regulations, consultation is specifically required at the Scoping stage with the nominated Environmental Authorities, and then with the wider public when the Environmental Report and the Draft Plans are put on public display. Finally, the SEA Statement and the adopted Plan must go on public display at the end of the Plan-making process. This section describes the statutory and non-statutory consultation that has taken place over the course of the planning process.

This section (Section 4), together with Section 5 describes the statutory and non-statutory consultation that has taken place over the course of the planning process and how this consultation, along with respective observations and submissions have been taken into account in the preparation of the Plan.

In 2009 the National CFRAM Steering Group was established to provide engagement of key Government Departments and other state stakeholders in guiding the direction and the process of the implementation of the 'Floods' Directive, including the National CFRAM Programme. The membership of this Group included:

- Office of Public Works (OPW);
- County and City Managers Association;
- Dept. Environment, Community and Local Government;
- Dept. Agriculture, Food and the Marine;
- Dept. of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht;
- Environmental Protection Agency;
- Electricity Supply Board;
- Geological Survey of Ireland (Dept. of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources);
- Irish Water;
- Met Éireann;
- Office of Emergency Planning;
- Rivers Agency (Northern Ireland); and
- Waterways Ireland.

In addition, the involvement of external parties (both stakeholders and the general public) has been essential to the development of the Plan for the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin and accompanying documents. It has been important to both meet statutory requirements for consultation with relevant parties and ensure that the knowledge, experience and views of stakeholders and the general public were taken into account throughout the process.

The objective of the stakeholder and public engagement process undertaken for the Shannon CFRAM Study was to:

- Meet regulatory requirements for consultation under the SEA (2001/42/EC) and Floods (2007/60/EC) Directives;
- Contribute to the success of the Shannon CFRAM Study by:
  - Raising public and stakeholder awareness and develop their knowledge of the Shannon CFRAM Study;
  - Promote and provide active engagement of the public and all stakeholders on the Shannon CFRAM Study; and
  - Provide opportunities for the public and all stakeholders to review and provide comments and submissions on the project outputs and to participate in the decision-making process.

It has been essential to ensure that information relating to the CFRAM Study was made available to stakeholders and the general public throughout its development. This has been achieved by ongoing activities as well as phase-specific activities, including:

- A website for the National CFRAM Programme;

- A dedicated website for the Shannon CFRAM Study; and
- The provision of a dedicated phone line and postal/email addresses.

#### 4.1 Stakeholder Engagement Activities

An SEA Pre-scoping Workshop was held in July 2011 and formed the first stage of a two-part series of SEA Scoping workshops designed to gather early input from statutory environmental authorities on the SEA.

The second SEA Scoping Workshop was held in October 2011 for a wider range of environmental and Local Authority stakeholders.

The SEA Scoping Report (including the Annex specific to Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin) was formally issued to the SEA Environmental Authorities in September 2012, namely:

- The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA);
- The Minister for the Environmental, Community and Local Government;
- The Minister for Agriculture, Food and the Marine;
- The Minister for Communications, Energy and Natural Resources; and
- The Minister for Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.

A digital copy was also provided to all SEA workshop attendees. Submissions on the SEA Scoping Report were received from the EPA and the NPWS which fall under the remit of the Department Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.

A list of the stakeholders involved in the Shannon CFRAM Study is included in Table 4.1.

**Table 4.1 CFRAM Steering Group Members**

National CFRAM Steering Group	Shannon CFRAM Study Advisory Group and Progress Group
Office of Public Works	Office of Public Works
County and City Managers Association	Jacobs
Dept. Environment, Community and Local Government	Cavan County Council
	Clare County Council
Dept. Agriculture, Food and the Marine	Galway County Council
Dept. of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht	Kerry County Council
Environmental Protection Agency	Laois County Council
Electricity Supply Board	Leitrim County Council
Geological Survey of Ireland (Dept. of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources)	Limerick City and County Council
	Longford County Council
	Mayo County Council
Irish Water	Meath County Council
Met Éireann	Offaly County Council
Office of Emergency Planning	Roscommon County Council
Rivers Agency (Northern Ireland)	Sligo County Council
Waterways Ireland	Tipperary County Council
	Cork County Council
	Westmeath County Council
	Regional Authorities / Assemblies (Midlands, Mid-West, South-West, Northern and Western, Eastern and Midlands)
	WFD Coordinator
	Rivers Agency Northern Ireland

Opportunities provided to interested stakeholders to participate in the development of the Plan included:

- Issue of an introductory information brief to all potentially interested parties seeking data and their views on the key issues within the Shannon catchment; and
- Individual meetings with stakeholders as needed throughout the study to discuss available data; identify key constraints, opportunities and relationships with other relevant plans and strategies; and review key outputs such as the draft flood maps.

All feedback, submissions and comments received from these stakeholders has contributed to the development of the final Plan.

## 4.2 Public Consultation Activities

The OPW decided at the beginning of the National CFRAM Programme that effective consultation and public engagement would require local engagement at a community level, and hence determined that Public Consultation Days (PCDs) would be held in each AFA (where possible and appropriate) to engage with the communities at various stages of the Projects, including during the production of the flood maps.

The PCDs were advertised locally in advance, and were held at a local venue in the community during the afternoon and early evening. OPW, Local Authority and Jacobs staff were present to explain the maps and information that were displayed in the venue and answer any questions on the maps and the CFRAM process.

While the number of attendees at the PCDs were variable, overall the PCDs were very useful in updating and validating the flood maps. The PCDs were also useful as a means to raise awareness of flooding and flood risk in the community, and to begin the discussion on potential measures to manage or reduce the risk.

### 4.2.1 Draft Flood Map Preparation Consultation

A dedicated Public Consultation Day (PCD) was held for each AFA to present the Draft Flood Maps relevant to that area. In addition to the PCD event a Councillor viewing session was offered to local elected members to ensure that these attendees were given the opportunity to understand the Draft Flood Maps and ask questions relevant to the communities they represent. These PCDs were organised to explain the Draft Flood Maps and to elicit the views of the public and stakeholders including information they may have in relation to their accuracy. Table 4.2 below summarises the public consultation days held at the Draft Flood Map Preparation Stage in Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin.

**Table 4.2 Public Consultation Days Held at the Flood Mapping Stage**

AFA	Date	Venue	Attendees
Drumshanbo	29/01/2015	Aras Padraig,	8
Leitrim Village	29/01/2015	St. Joseph's Community Centre	15
Carrick on Shannon	28/01/2015	Leitrim Co. Co. Chambers	33
Dromod	20/01/2015	The Copper Still Bar	45
Cloondara	21/01/2015	Waterways Ireland Meeting Room	18
Boyle	28/01/2015	Boyle Library	6
Mohill	20/01/2015	Mohill Family Support Centre	49
Longford	21/01/2015	Longford Library	29
Ballinasloe	26/02/2015	Ballinasloe Civic Office	134
Athlone	17/02/2015	Aidan Heavey Public Library	55
Shannon Harbour	17/02/2015	Shannon Harbour Community Hall	36
Portumna	16/12/2014	Portumna Town and Community Hall	45
Killaloe / Ballina	19/11/2014	Killaloe Library	12
O'Briens Bridge/Montpelier	19/11/2014	Clonlara Sports and Social Club	30

AFA	Date	Venue	Attendees
Springfield	19/11/2014		
Castleconnell	19/11/2014	Castle Oaks House Hotel	21
Limerick City	15/04/2015	Limerick City /County Council Offices	78
Castlerea	18/19/2014	Castlerea Library	4
Athleague	17/09/2014	Athleague Community Centre	29
Ahascragh	26/02/2015	Back Lounge, O'Donnell's Pub	3
Roscommon Town	24/04/2014	Roscommon County Library	8
Edgeworthstown	04/09/2014	St. Mary's Community Campus	19
Abbeyshrule	04/09/2014	The Rustic Inn	11
Ballymahon	04/09/2014	Ballymahon Library	6
Mullingar	24/10/2013	Mullingar Library	12
Kilbeggan	13/11/2014	Kilbeggan Library	3
Clara	13/11/2014	Scouts Den Clara	5
Pollagh	13/11/2014	Pollagh Community Hall	7
Clonaslee	11/11/2014	Clonaslee Heritage Centre	28
Rahan	23/04/2014	Rahan Parish Hall	7
Birr	12/11/2014	Birr Library	23
Roscrea	12/11/2014	Roscrea Library	17
Borrisokane	23/10/2013	Borrisokane Library	15
Nenagh	16/12/2014	Nenagh Library	10
Cappamore	04/02/2015	Cappamore Library Complex	23
Newport	04/02/2015	Newport Community Centre	9

The Government considered it appropriate to stipulate in SI No. 122 of 2010 that a national consultation exercise on the flood maps should be undertaken. The consultation on the flood maps for all areas was launched in November 2015. Observations and objections submitted through the consultation process have been assessed and the flood maps amended accordingly, where appropriate.

#### 4.2.2 Consultation on Options to Manage Flood Risk

The development of options to manage flood risk (optioneering) stage of the Shannon CFRAM Study identified a number of locations in Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin where flood risk management measures were being proposed. Between November 2015 and February 2016 a series of one-day, dedicated PCD events were organised and held in each of the identified AFAs. The aim of these PCDs was to elicit opinions on the developing options for each AFA and to record initial views on catchment-based solutions. Similar to the draft Flood Map consultation, a Councillor viewing session was arranged prior to opening the event to the public. Table 4.3 below summarises the public consultation days held at the optioneering stage in Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin.



**Table 4.3 Public Consultation Days Held at the Flood Risk Management Optioneering Stage**

AFA	Date	Venue	Attendees
Drumshanbo	19/11/2015	Aras Padraig	10
Leitrim Village	19/11/2015	St. Joseph's Community Centre	4
Carrick on Shannon	19/11/2015	Leitrim Co. Co. Chambers	12
Dromond	19/11/2015	Copper Still Bar	9
Cloondara	18/11/2015	Waterways Ireland Meeting Room	22
Boyle	19/11/2015	Boyle Library	9
Mohill	19/11/2015	Mohill Family Support Centre	8
Longford Town	18/11/2015	Longford Arms Hotel	14
Athlone	17/12/2015	Athlone Civic Centre	55
Athlone	11/02/2016	Athlone Civic Centre	48
Shannon Harbour	25/11/2015	Shannon Harbour Community Hall	1
Portumna	01/12/2015	Portumna Town and Community Hall	52
Killaloe / Ballina	02/12/2015	Killaloe Library	8
O'Briens Bridge / Monpelier Springfield	02/12/2015	Clonlara Sports and Social Club	17
Castleconnell	02/12/2015	Castle Oaks House Hotel	5
Limerick City	27/01/2016	Limerick City and County Council	48
Castlerea	8/12/2015	Castlerea Library	5
Athleague	20/01/2016	Athleague Community Hall	45
Ahascragh	11/01/2016	Clintons Pub,	14
Ballinasloe	11/01/2016	Ballinasloe Civic Office	101
Roscommon Town	8/12/2015	Roscommon Library	13
Edgeworthstown	18/11/2015	St. Mary's Community Campus	0
Abbeyshrule	18/11/2015	The Rustic Inn	5
Ballymahon	18/11/2015	Ballymahon Library	0
Pollagh	26/11/2015	Pollagh Community Hall	4
Clonaslee	26/11/2015	Clonaslee Heritage Centre	6
Rahan	26/11/2015	Rahan Parish Hall	15
Birr	25/11/2015	Birr Library	5
Roscrea	25/11/2015	Roscrea Library	1
Nenagh	01/12/2015	Abbey Court Hotel	6
Cappamore	02/12/2015	Cappamore Library Complex	0

#### 4.2.3 Draft Plans Consultation

The Draft Plan for the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin was published for the purposes of public consultation on the 15<sup>th</sup> July 2016. Observations from the public and from relevant Councils were to be submitted to the OPW by the 23<sup>rd</sup> September and the 17<sup>th</sup> October 2016 respectively. Presentations were made to Councils during the public consultation period.

In parallel and complementary to the formal public consultation process, a series of PCDs, similar to those held for the consultation on the flood maps were held to engage locally and directly with the community and provide people with opportunity to discuss and fully understand the Draft Plans. Table 4.4 below summarises the public consultation days held at the Draft Plan Stage in Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin.



**Table 4.4 Public Consultation Days held at the Draft Plan Stage**

AFA	Date	Venue	Attendees
Athlone	23/08/2016	Athlone Civic Centre	49
Nenagh	16/08/2016	Business Innovation Centre	2
Castleconnell	01/09/2016	Castle Oaks House Hotel	103
Killaloe/Ballina	01/09/2016	The Lakeside Hotel	0
Carrick on Shannon	06/09/2016	Leitrim Co. Co. Offices	59
Longford Town	06/09/2016	Longford Arms Hotel	49
Roscommon Town	07/09/2016	Abbey Hotel	33
Athleague	07/09/2016	Athleague Community Hall	30
Clonaslee	08/09/2016	Clonaslee Community Centre	7
Birr	08/09/2016	Birr Library	0
Roscrea	08/09/2016	Racket Hall Country House Hotel	3
Limerick City	13/09/2016	Limerick City and County Council	38
Ballinasloe	14/09/2016	Ballinasloe Civic Offices	38
Portumna	15/09/2016	Portumna Retirement Village	20

In addition, there were two additional PCDs held after these initial set of PCDs on the Draft Plan Stage. They were:

- The first to elicit views specifically on the preliminary catchment-wide options to manage flood risk; this event was held on Thursday 26th May 2016 in Athlone Civic Centre and 78 individuals attended the event.
- The second was held to obtain views from the public on the revised options for Castleconnell, Springfield & O'Brien's Bridge. The event was held in the Castle Oaks Hotel on the 23rd of March 2017 and 74 people attended.

#### **4.2.4 Other Consultation Initiatives under the Shannon CFRAM Study**

A number of on-going consultation initiatives are or have been rolled out for the Shannon CFRAM Study as follows:

- The Shannon CFRAM Study project launch event was held in Athlone in April 2012;
- A Project Advisory Group was established for the Shannon CFRAM Project in 2011 and acts as a forum for communication between the CFRAM Programme and senior management of key stakeholders, primarily Local Authority members. The Project Advisory Group typically met twice a year; and
- A Project Progress Group was established for the Shannon CFRAM Project in 2011. This was a working group that supports the Project Advisory Group and met approximately every six weeks. The Project Progress Group was established to ensure regular communication between key stakeholders and the CFRAM Project and to support the successful implementation of the Project.

### **4.3 Summary of Submissions**

As a result of the stakeholder engagement and public consultation activities, a number of submissions were received in relation to the SEA Environmental Report and Draft Plan. These submissions were categorised into 'Technical' and 'Environmental' submissions and include those relating to the overall Shannon CFRAM Study which can be taken to apply to each River Basin, along with submissions specific to Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin. A summary of the submissions received is provided in Table 4.5 below. As shown in Table 4.5, a number of submissions contained more than a single comment, which is why the total number of comments exceeds the submissions received.

Sections 4.4 and 4.5 outline the main themes of the Technical and Environmental submissions received for the Shannon CFRAM Study and for Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin. Each submission under these themes

was evaluated and in some instances influenced a change or update to the final Plan; these instances are outlined in Section 5 below.

**Table 4.5 Summary of Submissions and Comments**

Submission	Number of General Submissions relating to Shannon CFRAM Study	Numbers relating specifically to Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin	
		Submissions	Comments
Technical	67	116	387
Environmental	258	8	81

## 4.4 Key Themes Raised in the General Submissions Relating to the Shannon CFRAM Study

### 4.4.1 Technical Consultation Themes

A total of 67 'Technical' submissions, relating to the general Shannon CFRAM Study in general, were received from the following stakeholders: County Councils; members of the Public; Politicians; Organisations; and unknown contributors.

Analysing these 67 submissions identified that there were 4 Technical common themes, as follows:

- Information
- Policy
- Technical
- Non-Flood Risk

These overarching Technical themes encompass a range of topics raised in the submissions as a result of the consultation process. Table 4.6 below provides greater clarity on these 4 Technical themes by outlining the principal consultation topics covered by each.

**Table 4.6 Summary of Overarching Technical Themes**

Overarching Technical Theme	Total No. of Submissions	Breakdown of Key Topics Covered by Overarching Theme
Information	1	Submissions providing local knowledge or information in relation proposed measures.
Policy	30	<p>Submissions relating to, but not limited to, the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legislative requirements.</li> <li>• Cognisance of other existing plans / programmes / objectives / strategies / frameworks that may impact on flooding or be impacted by proposed measures in the Plans.</li> <li>• Proposed establishment of a 'Single Agency' to manage the River Shannon.</li> <li>• Programme of work / priority of works under the Shannon CFRAM Study.</li> <li>• Insurance, including the inability to obtain flood insurance.</li> <li>• Climate change and how this was considered in the preparation of the Plans.</li> <li>• Maintenance Programme of the River Shannon and its tributaries – both the requirement for a maintenance programme and the lack of execution of existing programmes.</li> <li>• The delineation of the AFA or flooding outside of AFA boundaries.</li> </ul>

Overarching Technical Theme	Total No. of Submissions	Breakdown of Key Topics Covered by Overarching Theme
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural Flooding – and that it is not addressed in Plans.</li> <li>General priorities – i.e. the prioritisation of environmental issues over people.</li> </ul>
Technical	27	Submissions relating to, but not limited to, the following key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodology and approach.</li> <li>Proposed measures and suggestions of alternatives / variations.</li> <li>Suggested maintenance or dredging.</li> <li>Potential impacts of proposed measures.</li> <li>Flooding occurring outside the AFA.</li> <li>Report format, including ease of understanding, use of acronyms, etc.</li> </ul>
Non-Flood Risk	9	Submissions relating to non-flooding issues, such as water supply, water quality issues, etc.

#### 4.4.2 Environmental Consultation Themes

A total of 258 'Environmental' submissions, relating to the general Shannon CFRAM Study were received from the following stakeholders: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); An Taisce; Birdwatch Ireland; the Development Applications Unit (DAU) of the National Parks and Wildlife Service; Forest Service; Inland Fisheries Ireland (IFI); Sustainable Water Network (SWAN); Members of the Public; and Other Organisations.

Analysing these 258 submissions identified that there were 9 Environmental themes. These Environmental themes encompass a range of topics raised in the submissions as a result of the consultation process. Table 4.7 below provides greater clarity on these 9 Environmental themes and outlines the principal consultation topics covered by each.

**Table 4.7 Summary of Overarching Environmental Themes**

Overarching Environmental Theme		Total No. of Submissions	Breakdown of Key Topics Covered by Overarching Theme
i.	Methodology and Approach	27	Submissions relating to, but not limited to, the following key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methodology and approach applied to the assessment process and to the measures considered.</li> <li>• Approach applied to the reports / reporting.</li> <li>• Approach to monitoring of the Plan.</li> <li>• The long term plan, beyond this cycle of the Shannon CFRAM Study.</li> </ul>
ii.	Other Plans and Programmes	24	Submission relating to cognisance of other existing plans / programmes / objectives / strategies / frameworks that may impact on flooding or be impacted by proposed measures in the Plans.
iii.	SEA related comments	46	Submissions relating to, but not limited to, the following key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The thoroughness / level of detail of the SEA report.</li> <li>• Specific queries on the content of the SEA and the approach (both positive and negative submissions).</li> <li>• Findings of SEA.</li> <li>• Incorporation of SEA into mitigation measures</li> <li>• Format and size of SEA report.</li> </ul>
iv.	Integration of SEA / Plan	30	Submissions relating to, but not limited to, the following key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integration / Coordination with the Water Framework Directive (WFD), Habitats Directive, or Floods Directive.</li> <li>• General legislative compliance.</li> </ul>
v.	Impact Assessment	35	Submissions relating to, but not limited to, the following key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of impacts to sites / stakeholders / environment.</li> <li>• Protection of critical infrastructure</li> <li>• Mitigation measures.</li> </ul>
vi.	Proposed Measures	64	Submissions relating to, but not limited to, the following key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability of recommendations / measures</li> <li>• Additional information in relation to measures and other considerations.</li> <li>• Management of flood risk.</li> </ul>
vii.	Consultation	10	Submissions relating to the consultation activities or consultation requirements.
viii.	Information	4	Submissions providing local knowledge or information.
ix.	Governance	18	Submissions relating to governance or implementation or the regulatory context.

## 4.5 Key Themes Raised in the Specific Comments / Submissions Relating to Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin

### 4.5.1 Technical Consultation Themes

A total of 387 'Technical' comments were received through a total of 116 submissions, specifically relating to the SEA Environmental Report and draft Plan for the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin. These were received from the following groupings of stakeholders: the relevant County Council, members of the Public and Others (including Environmental Groups and those identified as Unknown).

As a result of analysis of these 387 comments, 4 Technical themes, specific to Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin, were identified, comprising:

- Information
- Policy
- Technical
- Non-Flood Risk

Table 4.8 below provides a breakdown of the themes in relation of the number of submissions and the relevant Stakeholders.

**Table 4.8 Shannon Upper and Lower Comments Summary - Technical Themes and Stakeholders**

Consultation Theme	Summary of topics covered by Consultation theme	Total No. of Comments	Breakdown of Comments by Stakeholder		
			County Council	Members of the Public	Other (Environ group, unknown)
Information	Submissions providing local knowledge or information in relation to the following key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports of previous flooding.</li> <li>• Impacts of flooding.</li> <li>• Reports of factors contributing to flooding.</li> <li>• Reports on the condition of existing conditions.</li> <li>• Reports of inappropriate development / planning in the flood plain.</li> </ul>	84	15	53	16
Policy	Submissions relating to, but not limited to, the following key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consultation process and engagement with the community / stakeholders.</li> <li>• Cognisance of other existing plans / programmes / objectives / strategies / frameworks that may impact on flooding or be impacted by proposed measures in the Plans.</li> <li>• Proposed establishment of a 'Single Agency' to maintain and manage the River Shannon.</li> <li>• Programme of work / priority of works under the Shannon CFRAM Study.</li> <li>• Insurance, including the inability to obtain flood insurance.</li> </ul>	58	0	42	16

Consultation Theme	Summary of topics covered by Consultation theme	Total No. of Comments	Breakdown of Comments by Stakeholder		
			County Council	Members of the Public	Other (Environ group, unknown)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate change and how this was considered in the preparation of the Plans.</li> <li>Maintenance Programme of the River Shannon and its tributaries – both the requirement for a maintenance programme and the lack of execution of existing programmes.</li> <li>Flooding in rural areas, undefended areas and areas outside of the AFA and that is not addressed in Plans.</li> <li>Inappropriate Planning Development on Floodplain.</li> <li>General priorities – i.e. the prioritisation of people over environmental issues.</li> <li>Compensation</li> </ul>				
Technical	<p>Submissions relating to, but not limited to, the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodology and approach.</li> <li>Proposed measures and suggestions of alternatives / variations.</li> <li>Suggested maintenance or dredging.</li> <li>Potential impacts of proposed measures.</li> <li>Report format, including ease of understanding, use of acronyms, etc</li> <li>Flooding occurring in undefended areas.</li> <li>Properties not benefiting from proposed defences.</li> </ul>	240	5	150	85
Non-Flood Risk	Submissions relating to non-flooding issues such as coastal erosion / coastal zone management.	5	0	5	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>387</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>117</b>

#### 4.5.2 Environmental Consultation Themes

A total of 81 'Environmental' comments were received through 8 submissions, specifically relating to the SEA Environmental Report and draft Plan for Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin. These were received from the following groupings of stakeholders: An Taisce; the Development Applications Unit (DAU) of the National Parks and Wildlife Service; the Sustainable Water Network (SWAN); Bird Watch Ireland; and Others (including Inland Fisheries Ireland).

As a result of analysis of these 81 comments, 9 Environmental themes specific to Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin were identified, comprising:

- Consultation
- General
- Impact Assessment
- Matters Relating to the NIS
- Matters Relating to the SEA ER
- Mitigation Measures
- Natura Sites
- Policy
- Proposed Measures

Table 4.9 below provides a breakdown of the themes in relation of the number of comments and the relevant Stakeholders.

**Table 4.9 Shannon Upper and Lower Comments Summary - Environmental Themes and Stakeholders**

Consultation Theme	Summary of topics covered by Consultation theme	Total No. of Comments	Breakdown of Comments by Stakeholder				
			An Taisce	DAU	SWAN	Bird Watch Ireland	Other
Consultation	Inadequate consultation time	2				2	
General	General comments such as the definition of terms such as 'technically viable' and 'technically unviable'	2		1			1
Impact Assessment	Matters relating to the plan, Inadequate assessment of impacts on Birds and Data Gaps,	11		1		9	1
Matters relating to the NIS	Matters relating to the NIS	10		10			
Matters relating to the SEA ER	Specific comments relating to the SEA ER	5		4			1
Mitigation Measures	Comments on specific mitigation measures	12		10	1	1	
Natura Sites	Impacts / Impact assessment process for Natura Sites.	16	11	3	2		
Policy	Assessment in combination with	11	3			8	

Consultation Theme	Summary of topics covered by Consultation theme	Total No. of Comments	Breakdown of Comments by Stakeholder				
			An Taisce	DAU	SWAN	Bird Watch Ireland	Other
	other plans, programmes and frameworks						
Proposed Measures	Comments on measures proposed, including reference to water quality status.	12	8	1		3	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>81</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>3</b>



## 5. Influence of Environmental Considerations in the Final Plan

The SEA process accompanied the preparation of the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin Plan and the NIS, to meet the requirements of the Irish Regulations transposing the EU SEA and Habitats Directive respectively<sup>1</sup> (European Commission, 2004) (European Commission, 2011). Therefore, from the outset, considerations of the environmental consequences during the development of the measures have been taken into account. At a formal level, the process involved a series of workshops, presentations, discussions and meetings between the SEA, NIS and Plan Teams as well as with statutory consultees, non-statutory stakeholders and the public.

The SEA and NIS processes have ensured that potential environmental impacts (both negative and positive) associated with the implementation of the Plan have been given consideration during its preparation.

### 5.1 Environmental Objectives

The SEA process was integrated with the development of flood risk management measures which included the comprehensive multi-criteria analysis process. The SEA objectives forming part of this multi-criteria analysis provide the means by which the potential environmental effects of proposed flood risk management measures can be tested. These SEA objectives comprise 12 of the 15 CFRAM Study objectives and have been used during the measure assessment process to determine the preferred flood risk management strategy. The SEA objectives are comprised of the economic, social and environmental objectives (i.e. no technical objectives are considered under SEA). The other objectives were social, economic and technical.

The 12 SEA objectives are outlined in Table 5.1. Details of the associated indicators and targets are presented in the SEA Environmental Report.

**Table 5.1 SEA Objectives**

Criteria	Objective	Sub-Objective
Economic	i) Minimise economic risk	Minimise economic risk
	ii) Minimise risk to transport infrastructure	Minimise risk to transport infrastructure
	iii) Minimise risk to utility infrastructure	Minimise risk to utility infrastructure
	iv) Minimise risk to agriculture	Minimise risk to agriculture
Social	v) Minimise risk to human health and life	Minimise risk to human health and life
		Minimise risk to high vulnerability properties
	vi) Minimise risk to community	Minimise risk to social infrastructure
		Minimise risk to local employment
Environmental	vii) Support the objectives of the WFD	Provide no impediment to the achievement of water body objectives and, if possible, contribute to the achievement of water body objectives.
	viii) Support the objectives of the Habitats Directive	Avoid detrimental effects to, and where possible enhance, Natura 2000 network, protected species and their key habitats, recognising relevant landscape features and stepping stones.
	ix) Avoid damage to, and where possible enhance, the flora and	Avoid damage to or loss of, and where possible enhance, nature conservation sites and protected

<sup>1</sup> SI No. 435 of 2004 (SEA Directive) and SI No. 477 of 2011 (Habitats Directive)

Criteria	Objective	Sub-Objective
	fauna of the catchment	species or other know species of conservation concern.
	x) Protect, and where possible enhance, fisheries resource within the catchment	Maintain existing, and where possible create new, fisheries habitat including the maintenance or improvement of conditions that allow upstream migration for fish species.
	xi) Protect, and where possible enhance, landscape character and visual amenity within the river corridor	Protect, and where possible enhance, visual amenity, landscape protection zones and views into/from designated scenic areas within the river corridor.
	xii) Avoid damage to or loss of features of cultural heritage importance and their setting	Avoid damage to or loss of features of architectural value and their setting.
		Avoid damage to or loss of features of archaeological value and their setting.

## 5.2 Summary of Assessment

The integration of the SEA process within the development of the Plan ensured that, where possible, the proposed flood risk management measures met the requirements of the SEA objectives set out in Table 5.1. Where possible, measures that could give rise to significant negative environmental effects (i.e. failing to meet the minimum targets set out for each of the SEA objectives) were not favoured during the measure selection process.

The SEA identified that there were also proposed flood risk management measures could give risk to a number of positive environmental effects. However, there were some negative environmental effects arising from the proposed flood risk management measures that could not be avoided through the selection of alternative measures.

## 5.3 Summary of Changes to the Final Plan

As a result of the consultation on the Draft Plan, which is summarised in Chapter 4, a number of changes were made to the Final Plan. This Chapter outlines these changes, which are categorised as follows:

- General change: Layout and level of detail;
- Changes to Measures: River Basin Scale;
- Changes to Measures: AFA Scale, and;
- Changes to Mitigation Measures: All Scales.

The following sections summarise the changes under each of the above respective headings, with the relevant comment 'theme' identified in Chapter 4 that has contributed to the change.

### 5.3.1 General Change: Layout and level of detail

There have been general changes to the overall layout and detail of the Final Plan, including:

- Details presented in Section 6 of the Draft Plan on Flood Risk Management Objectives, is provided in Section 1 of the Final Plan;
- Details presented in Section 2 of the Draft Plan, is provided in Appendix B of the Final Plan;
- The information and content of the Appendices has been rearranged in the Final Plan, and
- Details of the screening of measures and alternative measures considered for each AFA has been removed.

Along with these changes in overall layout, more detailed information has been included in the Final Plan on the implementation routes for measures once the Plan is adopted. This information is provided in Section 6 of the

Plan, 'Environmental Considerations', and highlights that the adoption of the Plan does not constitute approval or permission for the installation / construction of any measure.

Section 6 in the Plan now states that the progression of any measure towards the implementation of flood relief works, or a 'Scheme', must include an EIA and/or AA Screening. Where this screening concludes the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment and / or Appropriate Assessment, it must be delivered in accordance with the relevant legislation and must take into account any new information available at that time. More details on the measures, or Schemes requiring planning consent is also included.

Additional details on the implementation of the Plan are provided in Section 8 'Implementation, Monitoring and Review of the Plan'. Within this Section, details of the different routes for promoting a Measure, or Scheme, are discussed and include:

- OPW Lead Scheme;
- Local Authority Lead Major Scheme;
- Local Authority Lead Minor Scheme.

The Consultation theme's (refer to Chapter 4), that have contributed to these changes in the Final Plan are as presented in Table 5.2.

**Table 5.2 Consultation Themes influencing 'General Change'.**

Technical Theme		Environmental Theme	
Theme Title	Resulted in Change	Theme Title	Resulted in Change
Information	✗	Consultation	✗
Policy	✓	General	✗
Technical	✗	Impact Assessment	✗
Non-Flood Risk	✗	Matters relating to the NIS	✗
		Matters relating to the SEA ER	✗
		Mitigation Measures	✗
		Natura Sites	✗
		Policy	✗
		Proposed Measures	✗

### 5.3.2 Changes to Measures: River Basin Scale

Table 5.3, summarises the recommended measures for the River Basin Spatial Scale, identifying those that have changed in the Final Plan.

**Table 5.3 Changes to River Basin Measures in the Plan**

Measure	Change to the Final Plan
<b>Prevention</b>	
<b>Sustainable Planning and Development Management</b>	No Change
<b>Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems</b>	No Change

Measure	Change to the Final Plan
<b>Voluntary Home Relocation Scheme</b>	<p>The Draft Plan noted that the Inter-Departmental Flood Policy Review Group was considering the policy options around voluntary home relocation for consideration by Government.</p> <p>The Final Plan notes the response to the floods of Winter 2015/2016, and the Government has agreed to the administrative arrangements for a voluntary homeowner relocation scheme, to provide humanitarian assistance for those primary residences worst affected by these floods. At present, there is no Scheme to provide financial assistance to other homeowners choosing to relocate due to their flood risk.</p> <p>The recommended measure is qualifying home owners affected by the flood event in Winter 2015/16 that may avail of a Voluntary Homeowner Relocation Scheme that has been put in place by Government.</p>
<b>Local Adaptation Planning</b>	No Change
<b>Land Use Management and Natural Flood Risk Management Measures</b>	<p>In the Draft Plan it was noted the OPW will continue to work with the EPA and other agencies implementing the WFD to identify, where possible, measures that will have benefits for both WFD and flood risk management objectives, such as natural water retention measures.</p> <p>While in the Final Plan this was clarified and the OPW will work with the EPA, local authorities and other agencies during the project-level assessments of physical works and more broadly at a catchment-level to identify, where possible, measures that will have benefits for both WFD and flood risk management objectives, such as natural water retention measures, and also for biodiversity and potentially other objectives, including the use of pilot studies and applications, where possible.</p>
<b>Protection</b>	
<b>Minor Works Scheme</b>	The threshold for the Minor Works Scheme has increased from €500k to €750k. The BCR was also changed from 1.5 to 1.35.
<b>Maintenance of Arterial Drainage Schemes and Existing Flood Relief Schemes</b>	<p>In the Final Plan ongoing maintenance of arterial drainage schemes is not recommended as a measure, having been removed since the publication of the Draft Plan. It is noted that the OPW has a statutory duty under the Arterial Drainage Act, 1945, and the Amendment of the Act, 1995, to maintain the Arterial Drainage and the flood relief Schemes.</p> <p>In the Final Plan there is also reference to existing Flood Relief Scheme's and that the Local Authorities should also maintain those Schemes for which they have maintenance responsibility. The plan does not amend these responsibilities to include additional flood relief.</p>
<b>Maintenance of Drainage Districts</b>	The Final Plan does not recommend maintenance of drainage districts as a measure, having been removed since the publication of the Draft Plan. It is noted that Local Authorities have a statutory duty to maintain the Drainage Districts, and this Plan does not amend these responsibilities to provide new Flood Relief Schemes.
<b>Maintenance of Channels Not Part of a Scheme</b>	In the Final Plan, there is no recommended measure but it is noted that outside of the Arterial Drainage and Drainage District Schemes, landowners who have watercourses on their lands have a responsibility for their maintenance. Work to develop guidance to clarify the rights and responsibilities of landowners in relation to the maintenance of water courses on or near their lands is being developed through the Inter-Departmental Flood Policy Review Group.

Measure	Change to the Final Plan
<b>Preparedness</b>	
<b>Flood Forecasting</b>	No Change
<b>Review of Emergency Response Plans for Severe Weather</b>	No Change
<b>Individual and Community Resilience</b>	No Change
<b>Individual Property Protection</b>	In the Final Plan “Individual Property Protection” is the recommended measure for consideration by home owners (and also funded by the homeowner), along with consideration by the Inter-departmental Flood Policy Coordination Group of policy options, for consideration by Government, around installation of Individual Property Protection measures; this measure has been expanded since the Draft Plan. In the Draft Plan the measure was just “Assessment of Potential for Individual Property Protection Scheme” to be implemented by the Interdepartmental Flood Policy Coordination Group

The Consultation theme’s (refer to Chapter 4), that have contributed to these changes in the Final Plan are as presented in Table 5.4.

**Table 5.4 Consultation Themes influencing ‘Changes to Measures at River Basin Scale’.**

Technical Theme		Environmental Theme	
Theme Title	Resulted in Change	Theme Title	Resulted in Change
Information	✗	Consultation	✗
Policy	✓	General	✗
Technical	✗	Impact Assessment	✗
Non-Flood Risk	✗	Matters relating to the NIS	✗
		Matters relating to the SEA ER	✗
		Mitigation Measures	✗
		Natura Sites	✗
		Policy	✗
		Proposed Measures	✗

### 5.3.3 Changes to Measures: AFA Scale

In general, there are changes to the way in which the measures are reported in the Plan. The description of the other viable options considered provided in the Draft Plan are not outlined in the Final Plan. Also, every measure now includes specific requirements for further Environmental Assessment and public consultation when the preferred measure is taken forward to the project-level development stage.

Table 5.5 summarises the AFA’s within the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin, and identifies those whose recommended measures have changed in the Final Plan.

Table 5.5 AFA Scale Changes.

Sub-Catchment	Areas for Further Assessment (AFAs) and Individual Risk Receptors (IRRs)	Changes to Measures in Final Plan
Upper Shannon Catchment	Drumshanbo	No
	Leitrim Village	No
	Carrick on Shannon	No
	Dromod	No
	Cloondara	No
	Lanesborough Power Station	No
	Boyle	No
	Mohill	No
	Longford	Yes
Middle Shannon Catchment	Athlone	No
	Shannonbridge Power Station	No
	Shannon Harbour	No
Lower Shannon Catchment	Portumna	Yes
	Killaloe/Ballina	No
	O'Brien's Bridge and Montpelier	Yes
	Castleconnell	Yes
	Springfield	Yes
	Limerick City	No
Suck Catchment	Castlerea	No
	Athleague	Yes
	Ahascragh	Yes
	Ballinasloe	No
Hind Catchment	Roscommon	No
Inny Catchment	Edgeworthstown	Yes
	Abbeyshrule	No
	Ballymahon	No
Bronsa Catchment	Mullingar	No
	Kilbeggan	No
	Clara	No
	Pollagh	No
	Clonaslee	No
	Rahan	No
	Tullamore	No
Little Bronsa Catchment	Birr	No

Sub-Catchment	Areas for Further Assessment (AFAs) and Individual Risk Receptors (IRRs)	Changes to Measures in Final Plan
	Roscrea	No
Ballyfinboy Catchment	Borrisokane	No
Nenagh Catchment	Nenagh	No
Mulkear Catchment	Newport	No
	Cappamore	No

Details of the changes to measures made at this AFA Scale, include:

- Since the issue of the draft Plan there was significant flooding in “The Mall” area of Longford. This flooding is not reflected by the CFRAM predicted flood extents and there is no measure proposed for this area. The final Plan has been updated to include a recommendation that a Minor Works funded Flood Risk Management application is to be considered for this area, using the flood extents witnessed in December 2016 and January 2017 as the economic business case.
- In Longford during the PCD consultations process, concerns were raised in relation to a potential conflict between the location of one of the proposed walls and two existing security gates. It is noted in the Plan that the exact location of the wall in relation to the gates will be considered at detailed design stage.
- The flood maps for Portumna have been updated between the draft and final Plan. There are now less properties predicted at risk of flooding in the AFA. While the proposed measures have not change the cost and resulting multi criteria scores have changed.
- In the draft Plan there were no AFA specific measures recommended for the AFAs of O'Brien's Bridge and Montpelier, Castleconnell and Springfield. Since the draft Plan these AFAs have been reassessed and further to this, measures are now recommended for these AFAs. Addendums to the SEA have been completed for Castleconnell and Springfield where potential structural measures are now proposed.
- For the AFA of Athleague the following is noted post consultation “In light of feedback at the PCD, analysis was undertaken on the bypass channel and the Silver Stream bridge but it was shown that these two measures would not alleviate the flooding in the AFA sufficiently to protect the properties at risk in a 1% AEP event. The exact routing of the wall and embankment can be reviewed at the detailed design phase to minimise any disruption to the Famine Trail and the Suck Valley Way, which it has been noted are of cultural significance to the area.”
- In the draft Plan there was no AFA specific measure recommended for Ahascragh. Anecdotal evidence from flood events in November/December 2015 and hydrometric gauge 26120 suggest that the Shannon CFRAM predicted flood maps may, however, under-predict the flood extent for less frequent (i.e. greater magnitude) flood events, and that there are areas of Ahascragh at risk of flooding that are not represented in the CFRAM predicted flood maps. Given this, it is a recommendation of the Plan for a Minor Works funded Flood Risk Management application to be considered, using the flood extents witnessed in November/December 2015 as the economic business case.
- The recommended measure in Edgeworthstown to protect a public utility, has been amended along with the inclusion of property owners at flood risk to consider Individual Property Protection;

The Consultation theme's (refer to Chapter 4), that have contributed to these changes in the Final Plan are as presented in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6 Consultation Themes influencing 'Changes to Measures at AFA Scale'.

Technical Theme		Environmental Theme	
Theme Title	Resulted in Change	Theme Title	Resulted in Change
Information	✓	Consultation	✗
Policy	✓	General	✗
Technical	✓	Impact Assessment	✗
Non-Flood Risk	✗	Matters relating to the NIS	✗
		Matters relating to the SEA ER	✗
		Mitigation Measures	✗
		Natura Sites	✗
		Policy	✗
		Proposed Measures	✗

#### 5.3.4 Changes to Mitigation Measures: All Scales

The recommended mitigation is presented in Section 6.6.3 of the Plan. Projects stemming from the Plan will apply a range of standard processes and measures that will mitigate potential environmental impacts. While the applicability of processes and particular measures will be dependent on the nature and scale of each project, examples of typical processes and measures that will be implemented where applicable at the different stages of project implementation are set out below.

##### ***Project Mitigation: Consenting Process***

The consenting process for the progression of measures involving physical works will require the applicable environmental assessments. Also, the consenting authorities may set out specific environmental conditions as part of the project approval.

##### ***Project Mitigation: Pre-Construction / Detailed Design***

For the detailed design of projects, where options are available, the design uses a hierarchy to mitigation measures along the following principles:

- Avoidance: avoid creating the potential impact where feasible.
- Mitigation: minimise the potential impact through mitigating measures.
- Enhancement: Enhance the environment to better than pre-project conditions, where reasonably possible.

##### ***Project Mitigation: Construction Stage***

For large and complex projects and sites, where environmental management may entail multiple aspects, a project specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) may be developed. This will form a framework for all environmental management processes, mitigation measures and monitoring.

A designated environmental officer, project ecologist and project archaeologist will be appointed, as appropriate for the project.

##### ***Project Monitoring***

The Plan, with its associated SEA and plan-level AA, sets out a series of monitoring requirements, in connection with the SEA objectives and the predicted effects of the Plan. For measures involving physical works, the project-level EIA and AA, where conducted, will set out the specific monitoring required for each measure.



The Consultation theme's (refer to Chapter 4), that have contributed to these changes in the Final Plan are as presented in Table 5.7.

**Table 5.7 Consultation Themes influencing 'Changes to Mitigation Measures at all Scales'.**

Technical Theme		Environmental Theme	
Theme Title	Resulted in Change	Theme Title	Resulted in Change
Information	✗	Consultation	✗
Policy	✗	General	✗
Technical	✗	Impact Assessment	✗
Non-Flood Risk	✗	Matters relating to the NIS	✗
		Matters relating to the SEA ER	✗
		Mitigation Measures	✓
		Natura Sites	✗
		Policy	✗
		Proposed Measures	✗

## 5.4 Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are the initiatives which have been identified in the SEA ER to prevent or reduce any potential significant effects on the environment. The SEA Option Appraisal process identified that the proposed FRM options could give rise to a number of permanent positive environmental effects, but also some temporary and permanent significant negative environmental effects.

For all identified negative effects, mitigation measures were proposed in the SEA ER to be taken forward to the future detailed option development stage in order to avoid or reduce (e.g. through appropriate design) these predicted effects.

The principal mitigation recommendation was that the predicted negative effects should be considered further during the future stages of options development, when option proposals (e.g. visual appearance, alignment of flood defences, etc.) can be optimised through detailed design in order to limit identified impacts on sensitive receptors.

Mitigation measures were identified in Section 9.4 of the SEA ER and relate to three key areas, namely:

1. Mitigation through design: maximising the design process to minimise environmental impacts. At this stage of option development, the requirement of all planning and environmental consent processes will be applicable;
2. Implementation of construction mitigation: implementation of typical construction best practise by appointed contractors during the construction stages of future options relevant to the Plan; and
3. "Aspect" specific mitigation measures relevant to aspects including ecology, fisheries, water quality, landscape and visual and cultural heritage to minimise environmental impacts on these receptors.

## 5.5 Reasons for Selection of the Final Plan (over other reasonable alternatives)

Table 5.8 summarises the reasons for selecting the potential measures in the Final Plan, over other considered measures.

**Table 5.8 Reason for Selecting the potential measure**

Areas for Further Assessment (AFAs) and Individual Risk Receptors (IRRs)	Reason for selecting recommended measure in the Final Plan
Drumshanbo	The only viable measures identified are “Do Nothing”, “Public Awareness” and “Flood Forecasting”. These measures cannot form a measure that will provide the required 1% AEP event design standard. Promotion of Individual and Community Resilience/Public Awareness and Flood Forecasting are already set out as measures at River Basin scale.
Leitrim Village	The proposed measure was the only viable measure identified.
Carrick on Shannon	While the potential measure for Carrick On Shannon did not receive the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio, it was selected as it provided flood protection to more properties.
Dromod	While the potential measure for Dromod did not receive the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio, it was selected as it provided flood protection to more properties.
Cloondara	As there is no fluvial flood risk to any properties within Cloondara in the 1% AEP flood event there is no measure proposed for Cloondara.
Lanesborough Power Station (IRR)	No IRR specific measure recommend for Lanesborough Power Station.
Boyle	The proposed measure was the only viable measure identified.
Mohill	The proposed measure was the only viable measure identified.
Longford	The proposed measure was the only viable measure identified.
Athlone	The potential measure for Athlone was selected as it received the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio.
Shannonbridge Power Station (IRR)	No IRR specific measure recommend for Shannonbridge Power Station.
Shannon Harbour	The only viable measures identified are “Existing Regime”, “Public Awareness” and “Flood Forecasting”. These measures cannot form a measure that will provide the required 1% AEP event design standard. Therefore, no appraisal of measures or multi criteria analysis has been carried out for this AFA. Promotion of Individual and Community Resilience/Public Awareness, Flood Forecasting and Maintenance of existing Arterial Drainage Scheme are set out as measures at River Basin scale.
Portumna	While the potential measure for Portumna did not receive the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio, it was selected as it provided flood protection to more properties.
Killaloe/Ballina	The proposed measure was the only viable measure identified.
O’Brien’s Bridge and Montpelier	The proposed measure was the only viable measure identified.

Castleconnell	The potential measure for Castleconnell was selected as it received the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio.
Springfield	The proposed measure was the only viable measure identified.
Limerick City	The proposed measure was the only viable measure identified.
Castlerea	The only viable measures identified are “Do Nothing”, “Flood Forecasting” and “Public Awareness”. None of these measures can form a measure that will provide the required 1% AEP event design standard. Promotion of Individual and Community Resilience/Public Awareness has been set out as measures at River Basin scale.
Athleague	The potential measure for Athleague was selected as it received the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio.
Ahascragh	The only viable measures identified are “Do Nothing”, “Existing Regime”, “Public Awareness” and “Flood Forecasting”. These measures cannot form a measure that will provide the required 1% AEP event design standard. Public Awareness and maintenance of the existing arterial drainage scheme have been set out as measures at River Basin scale.
Ballinasloe	The potential measure for Ballinasloe was selected as it received the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio.
Roscommon	The potential measure for Roscommon was selected as it received the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio.
Edgeworthstown	Within Edgeworthstown, no viable measures have been identified to provide flood protection to properties within the AFA.
Abbeyshrule	As there is no fluvial flood risk to any properties within Abbeyshrule in the 1% AEP Event. Maintenance of the existing arterial drainage scheme is a measure at River Basin scale.
Ballymahon	As there is no fluvial flood risk to any properties within Ballymahon. Maintenance of the existing arterial drainage scheme is a measure at River Basin scale.
Mullingar	A flood relief scheme has been implemented for Mullingar. No additional measures specific to Mullingar are proposed.
Kilbeggan	There is no fluvial flood risk to any properties within Kilbeggan. Existing arterial drainage scheme and flood defence embankments must be monitored and maintained. Maintenance of the existing arterial drainage scheme is a measure at River Basin scale.
Clara	There is no fluvial flood risk to any properties within Clara. Existing arterial drainage scheme must be monitored and maintained. Maintenance of the existing arterial drainage scheme is a measure at River Basin scale.
Pollagh	The only viable measures identified are “Existing Regime”, “Public Awareness” and “Flood Forecasting”. These measures cannot form a measure that will provide the required 1% AEP event design standard. Maintenance of the existing arterial drainage scheme, public awareness and Flood Forecasting are measures at River Basin scale.
Clonaslee	The potential measure for Clonaslee was selected as it received the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio.
Rahan	The proposed measure was the only viable measure identified.

Tullamore	A flood relief scheme has been implemented for Tullamore. No additional measures specific to Tullamore are proposed.
Birr	While the potential measure for Birr did not receive the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio, it was selected as it provided flood protection to more properties.
Roscrea	While the potential measure for Roscrea did not receive the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio, it was selected as it provided flood protection to the most properties.
Borrisokane	There is no fluvial flood risk to any properties within Borrisokane.
Nenagh	The potential measure for Nenagh was selected as it received the highest MCA Score/Cost Ratio.
Newport	There is no fluvial flood risk to any properties within Newport. Maintenance of the existing arterial drainage scheme is a measure at River Basin scale
Cappamore	A flood relief scheme has been implemented for Cappamore. No additional measures specific to Cappamore are proposed.

## **6. Measures to Monitor Significant Environmental Effects**

The SEA Directive requires significant environmental effects resulting from the implementation of plans and programmes to be monitored, to identify at an early stage any unforeseen effects and to be able to take remedial action.

To address this requirement, a monitoring framework has been developed which is linked to the SEA objectives and their framework of indicators and targets. The monitoring proposals for the Shannon Upper and Lower Basin Plan are presented below in Table 6.1.

The monitoring framework will be reviewed during the 6-year review cycle for the Plan and the outcomes from it will be recorded.

**Table 6.1 The Proposed Monitoring Framework**

	Objective	Sub-objective	Indicator	Basic Requirement	Data set	Data Source Owner	Frequency of Update	Responsibility of relevant existing Monitoring
Economic	Minimise economic risk	Minimise economic risk	Annual Average Damage (AAD) expressed in Euro / year, calculated in accordance with the economic risk assessment methods, but with no allowance for social / intangible benefits	AAD is not increased	Residential properties (GIS dataset)	Geo Directory	Quarterly	N/A
	Minimise risk to transport infrastructure	Minimise risk to transport infrastructure	Number and type of transport routes at risk from flooding	No increase in risk to transport infrastructure	Road network (GIS Data)	Local Authorities /NRA	Unknown	Local Authorities
					Rail & Airport (GIS Data)	Local Authorities / Irish Rail	Unknown	Local Authorities
	Minimise risk to utility infrastructure	Minimise risk to utility infrastructure	Number and type of infrastructure assets at risk from flooding	No increase in risk to utility infrastructure	Power Station (GIS Data) Geo Directory	An Post	Quarterly	N/A
					HV Substations (GIS Data) - Geo Directory	An Post	Quarterly	N/A
					Gas Assets (GIS Data)	Bord Gáis	Unknown	N/A
					Water Treatment Plants & Pumping Facilities (GIS Data)	EPA	Every 2-5 years	N/A
					Waste Water Plants & Pumping Facilities (GIS Data)	EPA	Every 2-5 years	N/A

	Objective	Sub-objective	Indicator	Basic Requirement	Data set	Data Source Owner	Frequency of Update	Responsibility of relevant existing Monitoring
					Telecommunications	Various providers	Unknown	N/A
	Minimise risk to agriculture	Minimise risk to agriculture	Agricultural production	No increase in the negative impact of flooding on agricultural production	Agricultural Land (GIS Data) - Corine Land Cover	EPA	Every 6 years minimum	N/A
Social	Minimise risk to human health and life	Minimise risk to human health and life of residents	Annual Average Number of residential properties at risk from flooding	Number of properties at risk is not increased	Residential Property classification Geo Directory (GIS Data)	Geo Directory	Quarterly	N/A
		Minimise risk to high vulnerability properties	Number and type of high vulnerability properties at risk from flooding	Number of high vulnerability properties at risk not increased	Hospital, Nursing Homes (GIS Data)	HSE	Unknown	N/A
					Prisons	IPS	Unknown	N/A
					Camping, caravan Halting Sites - Geo Directory	An Post	Quarterly	N/A
					Schools (GIS Data)	Department of Education Higher Education Authority	Unknown	N/A
	Minimise risk to community	Minimise risk to social infrastructure	Number of social infrastructure assets at risk from flooding in a 0.1% AEP event	Number of social infrastructure assets at risk not increased	Social Amenity Assets (e.g. Libraries, Churches) (GIS Data) - Geo Directory	An Post	Quarterly	N/A

	Objective	Sub-objective	Indicator	Basic Requirement	Data set	Data Source Owner	Frequency of Update	Responsibility of relevant existing Monitoring
		Minimise risk to local employment	Number of non-residential (i.e., commercial) properties at risk from flooding in a 1% AEP Event	Number of non-residential properties at risk not increased	Commercial Properties (GIS Data) - Geo Directory	An Post	Quarterly	N/A
<b>Environmental</b>	Support the objectives of the WFD	Provide no impediment to the achievement of water body objectives and, if possible, contribute to the achievement of water body objectives.	Status of the water bodies	Provide no constraint to the achievement of water body objectives.	WFD Data (GIS data) Potential Pollution Sources (GIS data)	EPA	Every 6 years minimum	EPA – statutory authority responsible for on-going monitoring of surface water quality and trends in rivers, which are assessed with regard to ecological criteria and physico-chemical water quality standards. Annual survey of water quality of estuaries and near-shore coastal waters.  National WFD groundwater monitoring programme.



	Objective	Sub-objective	Indicator	Basic Requirement	Data set	Data Source Owner	Frequency of Update	Responsibility of relevant existing Monitoring
	Support the objectives of the Habitats Directive	Avoid detrimental effects to, and where possible enhance, Natura 2000 network, protected species and their key habitats, recognising relevant landscape features and stepping stones.	Conservation Status of qualifying habitats and Species	No deterioration in the conservation status of designated sites as a result of flood risk management measures	Article 17 Report	NWPS	Every 6 years minimum	NPWS - Under Article 11 of the Directive, each member state is obliged to undertake surveillance of the conservation status of the natural habitats and species in the Annexes and under Article 17, to report to the European Commission every six years on their status and on the implementation of the measures taken under the Directive.
	Avoid damage to, and where possible enhance, the flora and fauna of the catchment	Avoid damage to or loss of, and where possible enhance, nature conservation sites and protected species or other known species of conservation concern.	Conservation Status of qualifying habitats and Species	No deterioration of in condition of existing sites due to the implementation of flood risk management option	Article 17 Report	NWPS	Every 6 years minimum	NPWS – prepare conservation objectives and conservation management plans for the designated conservation sites. Local Authority Biodiversity Action Plans

	Objective	Sub-objective	Indicator	Basic Requirement	Data set	Data Source Owner	Frequency of Update	Responsibility of relevant existing Monitoring
	Protect, and where possible enhance, fisheries resource within the catchment	Maintain existing, and where possible create new, fisheries habitat including the maintenance or improvement of conditions that allow upstream migration for fish species.	Area of suitable habitat supporting salmonid and other fisheries	No loss of integrity of fisheries habitat Maintenance of upstream accessibility	Salmonid Water monitoring	IFI	Every 6 years minimum	Inland Fisheries Ireland  responsible for management of fisheries in rivers and streams and provide records of fishing activities.
	Protect, and where possible enhance, landscape character and visual amenity within the river corridor	Protect, and where possible enhance, visual amenity, landscape protection zones and views into / from designated scenic areas within the river corridor.	Area designated as scenic, etc.	No significant impact on landscape designation (protected site, scenic route/amenity, natural landscape form) within zone of visibility of measures No significant change in the quality of existing landscape characteristics of the receiving environment	Landscape character areas, scenic routes/area	Local Authorities	During Development Plan Review every 5 years	Local Authorities through the landscape character assessment and development plans

	Objective	Sub-objective	Indicator	Basic Requirement	Data set	Data Source Owner	Frequency of Update	Responsibility of relevant existing Monitoring
	Avoid damage to or loss of features of cultural heritage importance and their setting	Avoid damage to or loss of features of architectural value and their setting.	Number and types of internationally, nationally and locally designated areas and structures at risk from flooding	No increase in risk to architectural features at risk from flooding. No detrimental impacts from flood risk management measures on architectural features.	NIAH (GIS data)  RPS/ACA (GIS data)	NIAH of the DELG  Local Authorities	Periodically  During Development Plan Review every 5 years	N/A
		Avoid damage to or loss of features of archaeological value and their setting.	Number and types of internationally, nationally and locally designated areas and structures at risk from flooding	No increase in risk to archaeological features at risk from flooding. No detrimental impacts from flood risk management measures on archaeological features.	Record of Monuments and Places (RMP) National monuments subject to reservation orders/in state care	National Monuments Service of the DEHLG	Periodically	N/A

## 7. Conclusion

The purpose of this SEA Statement has been to demonstrate how the SEA process has influenced the development of the Flood Risk Management Plan (the Plan) for the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin. Full integration of the SEA with the Plan has ensured that the potential for adverse environmental effects will be subject to appropriate action as the measures recommended by the Plan are implemented.

Consultation comments have been taken into consideration throughout the development of the SEA and these have been incorporated where appropriate. These comments and concerns have contributed to the production of an assessment demonstrated through the Plan for the Shannon Upper and Lower River Basin and the accompanying SEA documentation.



The Office of Public Works  
Head Office  
Jonathan Swift Street  
Trim  
Co. Meath  
C15 NX36

Telephone: (0761) 106000, (046) 942 6000  
E-mail: [floodinfo@opw.ie](mailto:floodinfo@opw.ie)  
Website: [www.floodinfo.ie](http://www.floodinfo.ie)