

#### 4. SPECIAL PROJECTS AND REPORTS

##### A. Dredged Material Management (NDT)

The U.S. National Dredging Team (NDT) recently issued its new action plan titled *Dredged Material Management: Action Agenda for the Next Decade*, which is based on an NDT-sponsored workshop in Jacksonville, Florida, in January 2001. The workshop was held to discuss and develop an action agenda with specific recommendations to address issues currently facing dredging and sediment managers. The workshop focused on the following themes: beneficial use of dredged material, sediment management, emerging issues, and strengthening Regional Dredging Teams (RDTs). The workshop recommendations for dredged material management succeed those in the December 1994 Interagency Report to the Secretary of Transportation, *The Dredging Process in the United States: An Action Plan for Improvement*. Participating U.S. agencies on the NDT are the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Army Corps of Engineers (ACE or Corps), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Maritime Administration (MARAD), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and Coast Guard (USCG).

Among the Action Agenda's 22 recommendations are the following:

1. Develop a national guidance document that presents a framework for identifying, planning, and financing beneficial use projects, and provides a summary of beneficial use authorities and processes, including cost sharing.
2. Develop a national guidance document that explains the role of the Federal Standard in implementing beneficial uses of dredged material from ACE new and maintenance navigation projects.
3. Encourage and endorse implementation of section 215 of the Water Sources Development Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-541), which directs the Secretary of the Army to establish a program to allow the direct marketing of dredged material to public agencies and private entities.
4. Encourage research and development on beneficial uses of dredged material, including habitat creation and restoration, and make available information on beneficial use demonstration projects.
5. Improve and advertise the Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material Web Site (<http://www.wes.army.mil/el/dots/budm/budm.html>) and other information sources, such as the Great Lakes Dredging Team Beneficial Use Web Site (<http://www.glc.org/dredging>), that encourage the use of dredged material as a resource and highlight technological improvements and/or innovations in beneficial uses.
6. Identify existing and ongoing Local Planning/Project Groups (LPGs) and identify completed Dredged Material Management Plans (DMMPs). Encourage the formation of new LPGs to develop DMMPs that address sediment management in the context of overall watershed

management, as well as project-level sediment management techniques. A key element will be to provide a mechanism for the transfer of information, processes, and technologies.

7. Identify the key elements of sediment management and incorporate them into the LPG guidance as appropriate.
8. Analyze and evaluate State Coastal Zone Management Plan requirements with the objective of increasing timely, predictable, effective, and environmentally sound dredging. Encourage states to clearly identify enforceable policies that would pertain to the management and beneficial use of dredged material. Develop guidance about what is required for a dredging project to be consistent with the enforceable state policies under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA).
9. Clarify how Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) requirements relate to dredging and dredged material management.
10. Increase coordination and communication between the EPA Clean Water Act Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Program and the navigational dredging programs to facilitate an understanding of the applicability of each program and the possible implications they may have on each other.
11. Continue to evaluate the impact of environmental windows on dredging and dredged material management, and how establishment of environmental windows should be changed to ensure that they are meeting their objectives.

For further information on the new NDT action agenda and charter, refer to the NDT Internet Web Site: <http://www.epa.gov/owow/oceans/ndt> or contact Dr. Elizabeth Kim, Office of Oceans and Coastal Protection (4504T), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20460, telephone: (202) 566-1270, electronic mail: [kim.elizabeth@epa.gov](mailto:kim.elizabeth@epa.gov).

#### B. Climate Policy Framework (Aspen Institute)

The Aspen Institute, in cooperation with the Pew Center on Global climate Change, has issued a report titled *A Climate Policy Framework: Balancing Policy and Politics*. According to the report, the United States remains divided about the necessity of action on climate change, whether any action should be voluntary or mandatory, the depth and timing of needed cuts in emissions of greenhouse gases, and the structure of a national policy to reduce such emissions. This division has to date resulted in the absence of significant action at the national level. Nevertheless, many participants in this debate, whether supporters or opponents of mandatory action, believe that such action will be taken sooner or later and that advance work to design effective policies is in the interest of all. This report focuses, not on whether mandatory action should be taken, but rather on what policies would be preferable if the U.S. Congress were to decide such action is necessary.

In keeping with the desire to address as many sectors of the economy as possible, while recognizing that one size does not fit all, the preferred program design described in the report is a hybrid – combining elements of cap-and-trade with efficiency standards that allow for trading. A broad outline of the approach is as follows:

1. A cap-and-trade system covering large point sources of both CO<sub>2</sub> and non-CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse gas emissions, with an initially modest and subsequently declining cap.
2. Coverage of transportation-related emissions through two mechanisms: (a) inclusion of upstream suppliers of transportation fuels in the cap-and-trade program; and (b) fleet efficiency standards for automobile manufacturers, expressed in CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents that are also tradable.
3. Inclusion of appliances and other large energy-using products through efficiency standards and trading.
4. Use of carbon sinks and international trading as offsets to the fullest extent possible, considering monitoring and verification capabilities.
5. Programs to support technology development providing an assured source of long-term funding generated through taxes, auction revenues, or another mechanism with support going to both public and private research and development and deployment.

For further information, contact Ms. Katrin Thomas, Aspen Institute, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036-1193, telephone: (202) 736-5857, electronic mail: [katrin.thomas@aspennst.org](mailto:katrin.thomas@aspennst.org), or refer to the Aspen Institute Internet Web Page: <http://www.aspennst.org>.

### C. International Port Security Program (CG)

On April 15, 2004, the Coast Guard (CG), U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), announced the establishment of an International Port Security Program that will help the United States and its maritime trading partners better protect the global shipping industry by facilitating the implementation of security improvements in ports around the world. Under this effort, the Coast Guard and the host nations will work jointly to evaluate the countries' overall compliance with the International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) Code, an International Maritime Organization (IMO) agreement signed in December 2002 that will enter into force on July 1, 2004. In addition, the Coast Guard will provide assistance with interpretation of the ISPS Code, as it has already done through discussions with representatives from over 50 nations. The Coast Guard is working closely with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (CBP), U.S. Department of Homeland Security, to ensure that this program, the Container Security Initiative (CSI), and other programs are developed and executed in harmony.

Key elements of the International Port Security Program include: (1) a traveling team that will visit approximately 45 countries each year; and (2) international port security liaison officers that

will be stationed around the world to share information on best practices and to provide assistance to the traveling team. The traveling team and liaison officers will: (1) meet with appropriate national authorities to discuss the nation's maritime security program and its interpretation and implementation of the ISPS Code; (2) jointly visit representative ports within the country to view implementation; (3) jointly verify with the host nation the effectiveness of the country's approval process for port facility and vessel security assessments and plans required under the ISPS Code; (4) provide technical assistance as necessary to assist countries with compliance; and (5) share information about best practices, both within the country and around the world. The Coast Guard will use the information gained from these visits to improve U.S. security practices and to determine if additional security precautions will be required for vessels arriving in the United States from other countries. The Coast Guard invites officials from other nations for reciprocal visits to the United States and select ports to observe the Coast Guard's procedures for implementing the ISPS Code.

Vessels that make port calls at countries that are not participants or that are not in compliance with the requirements of the ISPS Code could be delayed when attempting to enter a U.S. port as a result of additional enforcement actions. The enforcement actions could include: (1) boarding the vessel at sea prior to entry into port; (2) controlling the vessel's movement with armed escorts; (3) conducting a comprehensive security inspection at the dock or at sea; and/or (4) denying entry into U.S. waters. These measures will remain in place until the country demonstrates compliance.

This program is part of efforts within the DHS to develop and enhance international partnerships in order to create a more secure global shipping community, including CBP's CSI. CSI and this new Coast Guard program will complement each other. Under CSI, CBP has stationed officers in 18 major foreign ports, and is working side-by-side with foreign customs authorities to identify and target cargo containers that could present a potential risk for terrorism. The foreign customs authorities then inspect those containers for possible terrorist weapons before the containers are placed on ships bound for the United States. CBP officers observe these inspections. The International Port Security Program will focus on improving the security of the vessels and port facilities that transport, stow, and handle cargo and people, including CSI containers.

For further information, contact Ms. Jolie Shifflet, Office of Public Affairs (IPA), U.S. Coast Guard, 2100 Second Street, SW, Washington, DC 20593, telephone: (202) 267-2304, electronic mail: [jshifflet@comdt.uscg.mil](mailto:jshifflet@comdt.uscg.mil).

#### D. Market and Non-Market Impacts from Climate Change (Pew Center)

The Pew Center on Global Climate Change published two reports during April 2004 that detail likely impacts of global climate change on the U.S. economy, its diverse natural resources, and the welfare of its citizens. The first report, *A Synthesis of Potential Climate Change Impacts on the United States*, concludes a series of Pew Center reports examining the impacts of climate change on several economic sectors and natural resources in the United States. The companion

report, *U.S. Market Consequences of Global Climate Change*, uses results from the published literature to offer an in-depth analysis of the effects of climate change on the U.S. economy.

These studies find that natural systems are more vulnerable to climate change than societal systems. Any species or ecosystem that is less able to adapt – for example, coral reefs, coastal wetlands, already endangered species, and alpine forests – is at the greatest risk. In contrast to natural systems, economic sectors that are managed – for example, forestry and agriculture, may be less vulnerable to the effects of climate change provided that timely and potentially substantial investments are made. The U.S. economy as a whole appears to be resilient to a gradual change in climate for a moderate increase in temperature (up to 2-4°C). For a range of scenarios of climate change and related impacts, the United States may experience a 0.7-1.0% gain (under optimistic assumptions), or a 0.6-3.0% loss (under pessimistic assumptions) in gross domestic product by the year 2100. However, the economic impact on individual sectors would be more pronounced.

A critical finding is that as climate change continues past critical thresholds, any benefits diminish and then reverse as the U.S. economy struggles to adapt to the changing climate. While some sectors may enjoy gains at low levels of warming (for example, improvements in agriculture), beyond critical temperature thresholds, benefits diminish and eventually become costs. Just as with individual sectors, different U.S. regions will experience different impacts. The Southeast and the Southern Great Plains are at most risk due to their low-lying coasts and the impacts of warmer conditions on agriculture. Sectors with long-lived infrastructure and investments, such as water resources and coastal communities, will have the most difficulty adjusting.

For further information, contact Ms. Katie Mendes, Director of Communications, Pew Center on Global Climate Change, 2101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 550, Arlington, VA 22201, telephone: (703) 516-4146, electronic mail: [mandes@pewclimate.org](mailto:mandes@pewclimate.org). Copies of these reports may be obtained from the Pew Center Internet Web Site: <http://www.pewclimate.org>.

#### E. Security in Ports (ILO/IMO)

The International Labor Organization (ILO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) have approved the ILO/IMO Code of Practice on Security in Ports. The practical recommendations contained in this Code have been designed to provide guidance to all those responsible for addressing the issue of security in ports. This Code will assist in the identification of the roles and responsibilities of governments, employers, and workers. It also provides a proactive approach to security in ports and follows, where practicable, the practice and principles identified in Chapter XI-2 of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS Convention) and the International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) Code.

Topics addressed by the ILO/IMO Code of Practice on Security in Ports include: aim of security measures, security policy, roles and tasks, security level, port security assessment, port security plan, physical security of the port, security awareness and training, and confidentiality and non-disclosure of information. The Code is not a legally binding instrument and is not intended to

replace national laws and regulations. It is not intended to affect the fundamental principles and rights of workers provided by ILO instruments or the facilitation of access to ports, terminals, and vessels by workers' organizations.

For further information, refer to the IMO Internet Web Site: <http://www.imo.org>.

#### F. Air Pollution from Ships (IMO)

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) has announced that Annex VI (regulations for the prevention of air pollution from ships) of the 1973 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, as modified by the Protocol of 1978, as amended, (MARPOL Convention) will enter into force on May 19, 2005, following ratification by the Independent State of Samoa. The 1997 Protocol to the MARPOL Convention, which includes Annex VI, enters into force 12 months after being accepted by 15 states with not less than 50% of world merchant shipping tonnage. Samoa, the 15<sup>th</sup> state to ratify the instrument, deposited its ratification on May 18, 2004. Annex VI has been ratified by states with 54.57% of world merchant shipping tonnage.

MARPOL Annex VI sets limits on emissions of sulfur oxides and nitrogen oxides from ship exhausts and prohibits deliberate emissions of ozone-depleting substances. It also prohibits the incineration on board ships of certain products. With the entry into force of Annex VI, the full set of MARPOL international regulations will be in force for the prevention of pollution from ships by oil, noxious liquid substances in bulk, harmful substances in packaged forms or in containers, sewage, garbage, and polluting air emissions.

For further information, refer to the IMO Internet Web Site: <http://www.imo.org>.

#### G. Maritime Security (IMO)

The Conference of Contracting Governments to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS Convention) of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), which was held at IMO Headquarters in London from December 9-12, 2002, adopted amendments to the annex to the SOLAS Convention, in particular the new chapter XI-2 on special measures to enhance maritime security, and the new International Code for the Security of Ships and Port Facilities (ISPS Code).

The IMO Maritime Safety Committee (MSC), at its 78<sup>th</sup> session, held from May 12-21, 2004, recognized and considered the need for additional information to assist contracting governments and industry with the implementation of and compliance with the new SOLAS chapter XI-2 and the ISPS Code. The Committee developed and approved such guidance, which was recently issued as an MSC circular (MSC/Circ.1111) dated June 7, 2004.

For further information, refer to the IMO Internet Web Site: <http://www.imo.org>.