

BTO Research Report No. 267

Effects of Reductions in Organic and Nutrient Loading on Bird Populations in Estuaries and Coastal Waters of England and Wales Phase 1 Report ANNEX

Authors

N.H.K. Burton, E. Paipai, M.J.S. Armitage, J.M. Maskell, E.T. Jones, J. Struve, C.J. Hutchings & M.M. Rehfisch

Final report of work carried out by
The British Trust for Ornithology
in conjunction with HR Wallingford
under contract to
English Nature,
Countryside Council for Wales
and the Environment Agency

April 2002

© British Trust for Ornithology

CONTENTS

	Paş	ge No.
SUMMARY	,	3
References .		5
Table 1	An assessment of the risk to waterbird and seabird species within coastal SPAs within England and Wales from past and current improvements to waste water treatment implemented as a result of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive	7
Notes to Tal	ola 1	14

SUMMARY

This report forms an Annex to the report of Burton *et al.* (2002) investigating the effects of reductions in organic and nutrient loading on bird populations in estuaries and coastal waters of England and Wales and should be read in conjunction with that report.

Data collected in part for the Geographical Information System (GIS) Project component of that report are summarised in Table 1 below in order to provide an assessment of the risk to waterbird (grebe, cormorant, heron, wildfowl and wader) and seabird (petrel, tern, gull and auk) species within coastal Special Protection Areas (SPAs) within England and Wales from past and current improvements to waste water treatment implemented as a result of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive (UWWTD).

The assessment of risk to birds was made for two periods: 1990-2000 and 2000-2005. The first period covered the implementation of Asset Management Plans (AMP) 1 and 2 by Water and Sewerage Companies, which defined the sewerage /sewage treatment improvements which would be provided during the periods 1990-1994 and 1995 to 1999 respectively (see Burton *et al.* 2002). The second period covers the implementation of AMP3.

The table provides information on the waterbird population of each SPA and the species amongst those for which the SPA is designated which are potentially at risk from the implementation of the UWWTD (as defined in Burton *et al.* 2002).

Four categories of risk are defined. Firstly, 'NONE' – either there are no changes to the Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) load from discharges within the SPA, or there are no known discharges within the SPA, or those species for which the SPA is designated are not included amongst those potentially at risk from the implementation of the UWWTD. 'LOWER' – the estimate of the change in the BOD load from discharges into the SPA over the period is less than 1 t/day (i.e. a relative low change in BOD load) and the species for which the SPA is designated are amongst those potentially at risk from the implementation of the UWWTD. 'HIGHER' – the estimate of the change in BOD load over the period is equal to or greater than 1 t/day and the species for which the SPA is designated are amongst those potentially at risk from the implementation of the UWWTD. 'UNKNOWN' – there are discharges within the SPA, but the change in BOD load is not known and the species for which the SPA is designated are amongst those potentially at risk from the implementation of the UWWTD. As a result of the crudity of BOD estimates (see note 4 below), it was not possible to define the risk to waterbirds in any greater detail.

For the first period, there was a 'higher' risk to birds in 13 SPAs: Exe Estuary, Hamford Water, Humber Flats, Marshes & Coast, Medway Estuary & Marshes, Mersey Estuary, Morecambe Bay, Ribble & Alt Estuaries, Severn Estuary, Solent & Southampton Water, Stour & Orwell Estuaries, Tamar Estuaries Complex, Thames Estuary & Marshes and Thanet Coast & Sandwich Bay. There was a lower risk in two SPAs: Duddon Estuary and The Dee Estuary and an unknown risk in 14 SPAs: Blackwater Estuary, Burry Inlet, Chichester & Langstone Harbours, Colne Estuary, Lindisfarne, Mersey Narrows & North Wirral Foreshore, North Norfolk Coast, Northumbria Coast, Pagham Harbour, Poole Harbour, Teesmouth & Cleveland Coast, The Wash, Traeth Lafan and Upper Solway Flats and Marshes.

For the second period, there was a higher risk to birds in three SPAs: Mersey Narrows & North Wirral Foreshore, Morecambe Bay and Severn Estuary. There was also a lower risk in 15 SPAs: Burry Inlet, Duddon Estuary, Exe Estuary, Humber Flats, Marshes & Coast, Medway Estuary & Marshes, Northumbria Coast, Pagham Harbour, Ribble & Alt Estuaries, Solent & Southampton Water, Stour & Orwell Estuaries, Tamar Estuaries Complex, Thanet Coast & Sandwich Bay, The Dee Estuary, The Wash and Traeth Lafan.

References

Burton, N.H.K., Paipai, E., Armitage, M.J.S., Maskell, J.M., Jones, E.T., Struve, J., Hutchings, C.J. & Rehfisch, M.M. (2002) *Effects of Reductions in Organic and Nutrient Loading on Bird Populations in Estuaries and Coastal Waters of England and Wales. Phase 1 Report March 2002*. BTO Research Report No. 267. BTO, Thetford.

Musgrove, A.J., Pollitt, M.S., Hall, C., Hearn, R.D., Holloway, S.J., Marshall, P.E., Robinson, J.A. & Cranswick, P.A. (2001) *The Wetland Bird Survey 1999-2000: Wildfowl and Wader Counts*. BTO/WWT/RSPB/JNCC, Slimbridge.

SPA Name ¹	Waterbird Population ²	Species ³	BOD Change 1990-2000	BOD Change 2000-2005	Assessment of Risk ⁵	
	- o r		(t/day) ⁴	(t/day) ⁴	Past	Current
Alde-Ore Estuary	31,979	AV, BW, DN, L., RK EW, SU, SV, T., WN AF, BH, HG, LB, TE		charges within PA	NONE NONE NONE	NONE NONE NONE
Benacre-Easton Bavents	f	- - AF, BI		charges within PA	- - NONE	- NONE
Benfleet & Southend Marshes	156,425 ^a	DN, GV, KN, OC, RP DB		charges within PA	NONE NONE	NONE NONE
Blackwater Estuary (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 4)	80,574	AV , BW , CU , DN , GP, GV , L. , RK , RP, RU DB , GN , PT , RM, SU , SV, T. , WN AF, CA, GG	?	0	UNKNOWN UNKNOWN NONE	NONE NONE NONE
Breydon Water	58,557 ^b	AV, BW, DN, GP, L. EW, SV, BS, WN CA, CN		charges within PA	NONE NONE NONE	NONE NONE NONE
Burry Inlet	51,461	BW, CU, DN, KN, OC, WM PT, SU, SV	?	-0.50	UNKNOWN UNKNOWN	LOWER LOWER
Chesil Beach & The Fleet	12,499	- DB AF		charges within PA	NONE NONE	- NONE NONE
Chichester & Langstone Harbours	89,315	BA , BW , CU , DN , GV , KN , L. , OC , RK , RP, SS, WM DB , PT , RM, SU , SV, T. , WN AF, CA, ET, LG, TE	?	0	UNKNOWN UNKNOWN NONE	NONE NONE NONE

Table 1 An assessment of the risk to waterbird (grebe, cormorant, heron, wildfowl and wader) and seabird (petrel, gannet, tern, gull and auk) species within coastal SPAs within England and Wales from past and current improvements to waste water treatment implemented as a result of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive.

!	SPA Name ¹	Name ¹ Waterbird Species ³ Population ²		BOD Change 1990-2000	BOD Change 2000-2005	Assessment of Risk ⁵	
		- cP		(t/day) ⁴	(t/day) ⁴	Past	Current
	Colne Estuary (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 2)	35,579	AV , BW , DN , GP, GV , L. , RK , RP DB , SU AF, CA, GG	?	0	UNKNOWN UNKNOWN NONE	NONE NONE NONE
	Coquet Island	f	- AE, BH, CN, ET, PU, RS		charges within PA	- NONE	- NONE
	Crouch & Roach Estuaries (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 3)	22,490	- DB -		charges within PA	NONE	NONE
	Deben Estuary	16,796	AV		charges within PA	NONE - -	NONE - -
	Dengie (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 1)	34,442	BA, BW, DN, GV, KN, L., OC DB CA, GG		charges within PA	NONE NONE NONE	NONE NONE NONE
	Duddon Estuary	34,766	CU, DN, KN, OC, RK, RP, SS PT, RM, SU TE	-0.24	-0.03	LOWER LOWER NONE	LOWER LOWER NONE
	Dungeness-Pett Level	25,950	BS, SV AF, CN, MU		charges within PA	NONE NONE	- NONE NONE
	Dyfi Estuary	11,574	- EW -		charges within PA	NONE	NONE

Table 1Continued.

BTO Researc April 2002	SPA Name ¹
TO Research Report No. 267 pril 2002	Exe Estuary
77	Farne Island
	Flamborougl Cliffs
9	Foulness (Mid-Essex (
	Gibraltar Poi
	Glannau Abe Aberdaron C

SPA Name ¹	Waterbird Species ³ Population ²	BOD Change 1990-2000	BOD Change 2000-2005	Assessment of Risk ⁵		
	- · · ·		(t/day) ⁴	(t/day) ⁴	Past	Current
Exe Estuary	23,506	AV , BW , DN , GV , L. , OC , WM DB , RM, WN CA, SZ	-15.39	-0.05	HIGHER HIGHER NONE	LOWER LOWER NONE
Farne Islands	f	- -		charges within	-	-
		AE, CA, CN, GU, KI, PU, RS, SA, TE	5.		NONE	NONE
Flamborough Head & Bempton Cliffs	f	-	?	?	-	-
		GU, GX, HG, KI, PU, RA			NONE	NONE
Foulness (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 5)	156,425 ^a	AV, BA, BW, CU, DN, GP, GV, KN, L., OC, RK DB, SU, WN		charges within	NONE NONE	NONE NONE
(Wild-Lissex Coast I hase 3)		AF, CN, LG, TE		A	NONE	NONE
Gibraltar Point	f	BA, GV, KN, OC		charges within	NONE	NONE
		AF			NONE	NONE
Glannau Aberdaron & Ynys Enlli / Aberdaron Coast & Bardsey Island	f	-		charges within	-	-
Aberdaron Coast & Bardsey Island		MX	31	A	NONE	NONE
Grassholm	f	-		charges within	-	-
		- GX	Si	PA	NONE	NONE
Great Yarmouth North Denes	f	-		charges within	-	-
		- AF	Si	PA	- NONE	- NONE

Table 1 Continued.

втов	SPA Name ¹	me ¹ Waterbird Species ³ Population ²		BOD Change 1990-2000	BOD Change 2000-2005	Assessmen	ent of Risk ⁵	
esearch		•		(t/day) ⁴	(t/day) ⁴	Past	Current	
BTO Research Report No. 267	Hamford Water	55,417	AV , BW , DN , GP, GV , L. , RK , RP, RU DB , SU , T. , WN AF	-1.71	0	HIGHER HIGHER NONE	NONE NONE NONE	
	Humber Flats, Marshes & Coast	151,009	BA , BW , CU , DN , GP , GV , KN , L. , OC , RK , RP, SS, WM DB , GN , MA, PO , SU , T. , WN AF, BI, CA	-32.40	-0.84	HIGHER HIGHER NONE	LOWER LOWER NONE	
	Isles of Scilly	f	- GB, LB, SA, TM		charges within PA	- NONE	- NONE	
10	Lindisfarne	41,912	BA , DN , GP, GV , KN , L. , RK , RP CX, E., GJ, PB , PG, RM, SU , WN , WS AF	?	0	UNKNOWN UNKNOWN NONE	NONE NONE NONE	
	Medway Estuary & Marshes	56,372	AV , BW , CU , DN , GV , L. , OC , RK , RP, WM DB , PT , SU , T. , WN AF, CA, GG, LG	-14.19	-0.14	HIGHER HIGHER NONE	LOWER LOWER NONE	
	Mersey Estuary	104,784 ^c	BW, CU, DN, GP, GV, L., RK, RP PT, SU, T., WN GG	-38.96	0	HIGHER HIGHER NONE	NONE NONE NONE	
	Mersey Narrows & North Wirral Foreshore	104,784 ^c	DN, GV, KN, OC, RK, TT	?	-2.44	UNKNOWN	HIGHER	
	Poreshore		CA			NONE	NONE	
A	Minsmere – Walberswick	f	AV		charges within	NONE	NONE	
ANNEX			AF, BI	Si	ın	NONE	NONE	

Table 1 Continued.

⊳	
_	
4	
7	
-	
X,	

SPA Name ¹	Waterbird Population ²	Species ³	BOD Change 1990-2000	BOD Change 2000-2005	Assessmen	Assessment of Risk ⁵	
			(t/day) ⁴	(t/day) ⁴	Past	Current	
Morecambe Bay	259,042	BA , BW , CU , DN , GP, GV , KN , L. , OC , RK , RP, SS, TT , WM E., GN , MA, PG, PT , RM, SU , T. , WN AF, CA, GG, HG, LB, TE	-48.71	-5.78	HIGHER HIGHER NONE	HIGHER HIGHER NONE	
North Norfolk Coast	141,975	AV , BA , DN , GP, GV , KN , L. , OC , RK , RP, RU, SS, WM CX, DB , EW, GA, PG, PT , SU , SV, T. , VS, WN AF, BI, CA, CN, MU, RS, TE	?	0	UNKNOWN UNKNOWN NONE	NONE NONE NONE	
Northumbria Coast	f	PS, TT - AF	?	-0.22	UNKNOWN - NONE	LOWER - NONE	
Pagham Harbour	17,292	RU PT AF	?	-0.02	NONE UNKNOWN NONE	NONE LOWER NONE	
Poole Harbour	28,429	AV, BW, CU, DN, L., RK DB, GN, PO, RM, SU, SV CA, CN, ET, MU	?	0	UNKNOWN UNKNOWN NONE	NONE NONE NONE	
Portsmouth Harbour	11,251	- DB -		charges within PA	NONE	NONE	
Ribble & Alt Estuaries	316,296	BA , BW , CU , DN , GP, GV , KN , L. , OC , RK , RP, RU, SS BS, CX, PG, PT , SU , T. , WN , WS BH, CA, CN, LB,	-23.42	-0.03	HIGHER HIGHER NONE	LOWER LOWER NONE	
Severn Estuary	72,828	CU, DN, GV, L., RK, RP, WM BS, EW, GA, MA, PO, PT, SU, SV, T., TU, WN	-6.89	-17.41	HIGHER HIGHER	HIGHER HIGHER	

Table 1Continued.

SPA Name ¹	Waterbird Population ²	Species ³	BOD Change 1990-2000	BOD Change 2000-2005	Assessmen	t of Risk ⁵
	- op united		(t/day) ⁴	(t/day) ⁴	Past	Current
Skokholm & Skomer		- - - I.D. M.Y. T.M.		charges within PA	- NONE	- - NONE
Solent & Southampton Water	47,983 ^d	LB, MX, TM BW, CU, DN, GV, L., RK, RP DB, GA, PT, RM, SU, SV, T., WN AF, CA, CN, GG, LG, MU, RS, TE	-7.22	-0.04	NONE HIGHER HIGHER NONE	NONE LOWER LOWER NONE
Stour & Orwell Estuaries	68,111	BW, CU, DN, GV, KN, L., OC, RK, RP, TT DB, GN, PT, SU, WN CA, GG	-7.21	-0.03	HIGHER HIGHER NONE	LOWER LOWER NONE
Tamar Estuaries Complex	f	AV - ET	-6.10	-0.12	HIGHER - NONE	LOWER - NONE
Teesmouth & Cleveland Coast	33,483	KN, L., RK, RP, SS SU AF, CA, TE	?	0	UNKNOWN UNKNOWN NONE	NONE NONE NONE
Thames Estuary & Marshes	156,425 ^a	AV , BW , DN , GV , L. , RK , RP, WM EW, GA, PT , SU , SV LG	-4.74	0	HIGHER HIGHER NONE	NONE NONE NONE
Thanet Coast & Sandwich Bay	8,982 ^e	TT	-9.70	-0.54	HIGHER - -	LOWER - -
The Dee Estuary	121,954	BA , BW , CU , DN , GV , KN , L. , OC , RK , SS MA, PT , SU , T. , WN AF, CA, CN, TE	-0.18	-0.37	LOWER LOWER NONE	LOWER LOWER NONE

Table 1Continued.

SPA Name ¹	Waterbird Population ²	Species ³	BOD Change 1990-2000	BOD Change 2000-2005		
	2 Spannon		(t/day) ⁴	(t/day) ⁴	Past	Current
The Swale	81,801	AV , BA , BW , CU , DN , GP , GV , KN , L. , OC , RK , RP DB , EW, GA, PT , SU , SV, T. , WN CA, LG, MU		scharges within SPA	NONE NONE NONE	NONE NONE NONE
The Wash	322,964	AV , BA , BW , CU , DN , GP , GV , KN , L. , OC , RK , RP , SS , TT , WM BS, DB , EW, GN , MA, PG, PT , SU , WN , WS AF, CA, CN, LG	?	-0.13	UNKNOWN UNKNOWN NONE	LOWER LOWER NONE
Traeth Lafan / Lavan Sands, Conway Bay	11,524	OC - -	?	-0.01	UNKNOWN - -	LOWER - -
Upper Solway Flats & Marshes	148,775	BA , CU , DN , GP , GV , KN , L. , OC , RK , RP BY, GN , MA, PG, PT , SP , SU , WS CA, GG	?	0	UNKNOWN UNKNOWN NONE	NONE NONE
Ynys Feurig, Cemlyn Bay & The Skerries	f	- - AF, CN, RS, TE		scharges within SPA	- - NONE	- - NONE
Ynys Seiriol / Puffin Island	f	- - CA		scharges within SPA	- - NONE	- NONE

Table 1Continued.

Notes to Table 1:

- 1. The table only includes coastal SPAs designated for waterbirds and seabirds.
- 2. Data on waterbird (grebe, cormorant, heron, wildfowl and wader) populations using SPAs are taken from the 1999-2000 report of the Wetland Bird Survey (WeBS) (Musgrove *et al.* 2001) and are averages of peak counts for the winters of 1995-96 to 1999-2000. Although the boundaries of the areas surveyed by the WeBS do not always precisely match those of the SPAs, these figures provide a good indication of the waterbird populations using most sites. The following exceptions should be noted, however:
 - a The waterbird population is given for the Thames Estuary as a whole, which includes the Benfleet & Southend Marshes SPA, Foulness SPA & Thames Estuary & Marshes SPA.
 - b The waterbird population given for the Breydon Water SPA also includes data from Berney Marshes.
 - c The waterbird population is given for the Mersey Estuary as a whole, which includes both the Mersey Estuary SPA and Mersey Narrows & North Wirral Foreshore SPA.
 - d The waterbird population given for the Solent & Southampton Water SPA excludes data for the Isle of Wight (as these are not provided in Musgrove *et al.* 2001).
 - e The waterbird population given for the Thanet Coast & Sandwich Bay SPA excludes data for Sandwich Bay (as these are not provided in Musgrove *et al.* 2001).
 - f These sites hold relatively small populations of waterbirds; no figures are provided in Musgrove *et al.* (2001).
- 3. Species are listed for each SPA in three groupings:

First Row – Waders Second Row – Wildfowl Third Row – Other Waterbirds and Seabirds

AE = Arctic Tern Sterna paradisaea, AF = Little Tern Sterna albifrons, AV = Avocet Recurvirostra avosetta, BA = Bar-tailed Godwit Limosa lapponica, BH = Black-headed Gull Larus ridibundus, BI = Bittern Botaurus stellaris, BS = Bewick's Swan Cygnus columbianus, BW = Black-tailed Godwit Limosa limosa, BY = Barnacle Goose Branta leucopsis, CA = Cormorant Phalacrocorax carbo, CN = Common Tern Sterna hirundo, CO = Coot Fulica atra, CU = Curlew Numenius arquata, CX = Common Scoter Melanitta nigra, DB = Dark-bellied Brent Goose Branta bernicla bernicla, DN = Dunlin Calidris alpina, E. = Eider Somateria mollissima, ET = Little Egret Egretta garzetta, EW = European White-fronted Goose Anser albifrons, GA = Gadwall Anas strepera, GB = Great Black-backed Gull Larus marinus, GD = Goosander Mergus merganser, GG = Great Crested Grebe Podiceps cristatus, GJ = Greylag Goose Anser anser, GN = Goldeneye Bucephala clangula, GP = Golden Plover Pluvialis apricaria, GU = Guillemot Uria aalge, GV = Grey Plover Pluvialis squatarola, GX = Gannet Morus bassanus, HG = Herring Gull Larus argentatus, KI = Kittiwake Rissa tridactyla, KN = Knot Calidris canutus, L. = Lapwing Vanellus vanellus, LB = Lesser Black-backed Gull Larus fuscus, LG = Little Grebe Tachybaptus ruficollis, MA= Mallard Anas platyrhynchos, MS = Mute Swan Cygnus olor, MU = Mediterranean Gull Larus melanocephalus, MX = Manx Shearwater Puffinus puffinus, OC = Oystercatcher Haematopus ostralegus, PB = Light-bellied Brent Goose Branta bernicla hrota, PG = Pink-footed Goose Anser brachyryhnchus, PO = Pochard Aythya ferina, PS = Purple Sandpiper Calidris maritima, PT = Pintail Anas acuta, PU = Puffin Fratercula artica, RA = Razorbill Alca torda, RK = Redshank Tringa totanus, RM = Red-breasted Merganser Mergus serrator, RP = Ringed Plover Charadrius hiaticula, RS = Roseate Tern Sterna dougallii, RU = Ruff Philomachus pugnax, SA = Shag Phalacrocorax aristotelis, SP =

Scaup Aythya marila, SS = Sanderling Calidris alba, SU = Shelduck Tadorna tadorna, SV = Shoveler Anas clypeata, SZ = Slavonian Grebe Podiceps auritus, T. = Teal Anas crecca, TE = Sandwich Tern Sterna sandvicensis, TM = Storm Petrel Hydrobates pelagicus, TT = Turnstone Arenaria interpres, TU = Tufted Duck Aythya fuligula, VS = Velvet Scoter Melanitta fusca, WM = Whimbrel Numenius phaeopus, WN = Wigeon Anas penelope, WS = Whooper Swan Cygnus cygnus.

Species highlighted in bold are those that studies have shown may benefit from the food resources associated with waste water discharges and that, therefore, are potentially at risk from the implementation of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive (UWWTD) (see Burton *et al.* 2002).

4. Changes in Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) loads between 2000 and 2005 were calculated from current (2000) and future (2005) consented flows and the current and future BOD consent. In many cases no numerical BOD consent was available. In those cases a value was assumed that is related to the current and future level of treatment. For crude discharges a value of 400 mg/l was assumed, while for primary and secondary treatment, respective discharge BOD concentrations of 260 and 100 mg/l were assumed. These values correspond to the percent reductions during different treatment stages quoted in Table 3.1 of Burton *et al.* (2002). The crude discharge concentration is based on an assumed BOD mass load of 82 g/head/day (see Table 3.1 of Burton *et al.* 2002) and an average water consumption of 180 l/day. In many cases, consented flows were only specified for the new consent. In those cases, it was assumed that the future consented flow is equal to the past consented flow. The changes in BOD loads between 1990 and 2000 were calculated in a similar way. However, population equivalents and an assumed daily consumption of 180 l were used to estimate flows.

It should be noted that these load estimates are mostly crude guesses and that there were large gaps in the data available for this exercise, especially for the load estimates relating to the period 1990-2000. Also, consents do not necessarily reflect the actual loads that come from an outfall, although they may be used as an indicator if, as in this case, performance data are unavailable. Population equivalents, too, are a crude measure of the discharge. They are based on short-term measurements of the inflow and an assumed daily consumption per head of 180 l. Generally, load estimates are capable of indicating major changes, but individual values should not be over-interpreted.

5. Assessment of Past (1990-2000) and Current (2000-2005) Risk to Waterbirds and Seabirds.

NONE – either there are no changes to the BOD load from discharges within the SPA, or there are no known discharges within the SPA, or those species for which the SPA is designated are not included amongst those potentially at risk from the implementation of the UWWTD.

LOWER – change in BOD load of less than 1 t/day (i.e. a relative low change in BOD load) and the species for which the SPA is designated are amongst those potentially at risk from the implementation of the UWWTD.

HIGHER – change in BOD load equal to or greater than 1 t/day (i.e. a relative high change in BOD load) and the species for which the SPA is designated are amongst those potentially at risk from the implementation of the UWWTD.

UNKNOWN – there are discharges within the SPA, but the change in BOD load is not known and species for which the SPA is designated are amongst those potentially at risk from the implementation of the UWWTD.