

Irwell Catchment Pilot Steering Group Meeting No3 Minutes and Actions		DISTRIBUTION: Irwell Pilot Steering Group G. Whitaker EA James Farrell EA Andrew Rothwell BCU Colin Riley Woodland Trust Helen Waine	
DATE: Tuesday 27 th March 2012	VENUE: Red Rose Offices, Salford		
PRESENT: Will Horsfall (WH) AGMA Katherine Causer (KC) Environment Agency Tony Hothersall (TH) Red Rose Forest Mike Duddy (MD) Salford Friendly Anglers Alix Moore (AM) United Utilities, sub for Sarah Atkinson David Taylor (DT) GMWDA Matt Schofield (MS) Irwell Rivers Trust Helen Waine (HW) Keep Britain Tidy James Farrell (JF) EA National Pilot Manager Andrew Rothwell (AR) British Canoe Union Colin Riley (CR) Woodland Trust		Apologies: Sarah Atkinson United Utilities Richard McIlwain KBT Mick Weston LWT James Hall LWT	
General business		Who	When
1	Introductions from Andrew Rothwell (BCU) & Colin Riley (WT) Andrew is the representative for the British Canoe Union on the River Irwell. Burrs Country Park is the centre for canoeing on the Irwell and is popular with both canoeists and anglers who share the river amicably. Andrew works for the NFU and referred to the various Stewardship schemes that are open to farmers and that have benefits for wildlife and the wider environment. Information on where there are currently Stewardship schemes running can be found at http://magic.defra.gov.uk/ . Colin works for the Woodland Trust and discussed a number of Trust schemes that local groups can apply for in relation to tree planting. This included the 'more woods' scheme which the group saw as something that would be valuable when working with local communities or landowners during the delivery phase of the project. http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk CR said they had worked closely with Red Rose Forest in the past. TH confirmed that the Forest is the Trust's "agent" for More Woods in GM which is delivered alongside EWGS and Tony also mentioned the Greater Manchester Tree Audit. This could be of interest to some work the EA are doing on river shading. TH agreed to share the tree audit information with KC.	TH	Before next meeting (BNM)
2	Actions Outstanding actions carried over from previous meetings a) Define the role of the Chair - <i>To be completed</i> b) Location of GMWDA sites <i>Completed</i> DT circulated maps to Group. GIS data has been sent to KC c) Location of Local Authority brownfield sites - <i>Completed.</i> WH From a discussion with relevant officer at Salford, it appears that LA information on contaminated sites may not be published. Therefore it would be necessary for someone to gather / collate that information from all the LAs in the Catchment. d) Compile learning from other Upland initiatives <i>To be completed</i> e) What does success look like? All to consider what the Group should seek to achieve and what our Vision should be. <i>To be completed</i> f) What should the Group be called? <i>To be completed</i> g) Make contact with Natural England <i>To be completed</i> KC has spoken to Amanda Wright & Martin Moss but she said she has recently received a communication from Natural England Nationally with the point of contact for the NW.	All DT WH MW All All KC	ASAP ASAP ASAP BNM
	Actions from last meeting (27/02/12) Action 1 CRF – issues about timing of funding to be raised with the EA National Pilot Team. <i>Completed</i> JF The timing of the CRF launch was not ideal, particularly for Pilots that are still in the development stage. But going forward, the Pilots should be in a good position to bid for CRF in future as they will have a costed plan based on needs and benefits.	KC	

	<p>2 expressions of interest and one full bid have been submitted for the Irwell. KC explained the selection process. Full project bids submitted were initially screened for compliance and circulated to the relevant EA Area WFD teams for scrutiny against local WFD requirements. The bids were then were categorised into highly recommended, recommended, further development needed, not recommended. The projects were then sent to the NW Regional Liaison Panel for approval and then forward to the National EA WFD team for final prioritisation. WH asked what the role of the NW Regional Liaison Panel was and who was on the panel. KC & JF gave an overview of the role. The description that follows is taken from the Irwell Pilot Steering Groups' Governance and ToR document:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The liaison panel is a body of co-deliverers able to take the action required at the River Basin District level to meet the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. This includes enabling and encouraging action by others. 2. They help the implementation of the Directive by contributing River Basin District level knowledge, understanding and information. They add value, share the implementation of the River Basin Management Plan, scrutinise the required action and its delivery, and assist with stakeholder engagement at all levels. <p>KC gave details of some of the liaison panel members, which included representatives from United Utilities, the Chemical Industry, NFU, Natural England, Local Authorities, National Park and National Trust. KC said she would circulate a list of Liaison Panel members to the group.</p> <p>Action 2 activity/info list to be updated and circulated to Group. <i>To be completed</i></p> <p>Action 3 additional information to be added and returned to KC. <i>To be completed</i></p> <p>Action 4 Organise a sub-group to meet to determine the specification and scope of the Evidence T&F group and review our current evidence base. <i>Completed</i></p> <p>Action 5 - Put together an outline structure for the plan <i>Completed</i></p> <p>Action 6 – Send information to Steering Group on ‘the compact’ <i>Completed</i></p> <p>Action 7 – Refer Compact to the National Pilot Team <i>Completed</i></p> <p>Action 8 – Send out information on NEETS project <i>To be completed</i></p> <p>Action 9 – In relation to Peel being on Steering Group, EA to refer to senior manager <i>To be completed</i></p>	<p>KC</p> <p>KC</p> <p>All</p> <p>KC</p> <p>KC</p> <p>TH</p> <p>KC</p> <p>KC</p> <p>KC</p>	<p>BNM</p> <p>ASAP</p> <p>ASAP</p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>BNM</p> <p>BNM</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Matters arising None</p>		
<p>4</p>	<p>The National Perspective and updates on the Pilots JF gave an overview of the Pilots; The River Basin Management Plans were disappointing in their ambition and relied heavily on water company investment to deliver improvements. DEFRA have been challenged to achieve more by delivering with a greater range of stakeholders. The catchment approach is being trialled by the Pilots. There are 10 EA hosted Pilots & 15 externally hosted Pilots. The Pilots are about better engagement in order to get greater commitment to action for the water environment. They are about working together to agree what needs to take place and what can be done to influence and bring about delivery. The learning from the Pilots will help to inform the second cycle of water framework delivery. The issue of resources was raised. Third sector organisations are keen to be involved but have very little spare capacity and are losing staff as a result of local cut backs in public spending. Action 1 – JF to raise 3rd sector funding with DEFRA and report to Steering Group via KC WH asked what would happen after the Pilot phase. JF explained that the Water White Paper states that each catchment will have an integrated plan, the “how we will do it” and this will be shaped by the findings of the Pilots. After December 2012 (end of Pilot phase) the Groups should continue if they are working and achieving their aims, but they would no longer be evaluated as a Pilot as they currently are. There has already been a lot of learning from the Pilots and JF agreed to send case studies to KC for distribution to the Group Action 2 – Provide case studies</p>	<p>JF</p> <p>JF/KC</p>	<p>5 April</p> <p>BNM</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Evidence & activity mapping AH presented the findings of the Evidence sub-group meeting. The sub-group is proposing a scoring system to determine where we should prioritise our action. The process is as follows:-</p>		

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determine which data sets are relevant to each Outcome. 2. For each waterbody review each data set and allocate a score 1 to 5 (1 being good, 5 being bad) 3. Scores for datasets may need to be given a higher weighting if they have more relevance on the Outcome 4. Once scores have been determined for all Outcomes and each waterbody, an overall score can be calculated for each waterbody by summing the scores for the Outcomes. Some Outcome may need to be given a higher weighting if they have more relevance to the aims of the Pilot. The higher the final score the greater the priority for action. <p>One of the Outcomes is going to be trialled by a small group and then rolled out to the whole sub-group. Each member of the sub-group has agreed to lead on Outcomes that are relevant to their business/expertise.</p> <p>Action 3 – Present the conclusions of the trialled Outcome to the Group The Steering Group will then need to determine weighting (in relation to importance) for each Outcome</p>	AH	Next meeting
6	<p>Community participation</p> <p>MS presented an example of community participation from a project known as RIPPLE. RIPPLE is a community-led river management project, managed by the Ballinderry Fish Hatchery – Northern Ireland’s first River Trust. The project aims to demonstrate best practice in how a river should be managed with the full involvement of the local community. In recognition of how it is succeeding in doing this, RIPPLE is now being shown as the exemplar for the rest of the country.</p> <p>http://ni.wwf.org.uk/what_we_do/safeguarding_the_natural_world/rivers_and_lakes/ripple/about_ripple/</p> <p>There was a general discussion on when and how we should involve local communities. MS thought that we could tap into the lessons learnt from RIPPLE and possibly use the tool kit that had been developed to create a community lead action plan.</p> <p>http://www.acre.org.uk/our-work/community-led-planning http://www.planlocal.org.uk/</p> <p>TH said that ‘scale’ was a problem for us and that geographic focus was important. A suggestion was made to trial community engagement on particular river or waterbody (sub-section of river as defined by WFD). It was noted that there were already some well-established local groups such as at Prestwich Park or Kersal Dale and that we could tap into these existing networks to find out more about the rivers and what people want from them. We have already started mapping out community activity but we need to make sure this is up to date. It was suggested that we needed to do the prioritisation process before the decision could be made on where we would focus community engagement. It was recognized that we could start planning on how we should go about the engagement and it was agreed to have a sub-group to look at this. HW said that monitoring and evaluation of community groups was important and should be taken in to consideration in the planning.</p> <p>Action 4 – Organise a sub-group to look at Community engagement</p> <p>A suggestion was made to involve the local universities. This could include a number of specialists from a range of interest areas but should include those who specialise in social sciences.</p> <p>Action 5 – Tony to discuss with Vice Chancellor of Salford Uni and James Rothwell from Manchester Uni.</p> <p>JF also suggested contacting Salford University’s Centre for Sustainable Urban and Regional Features (SURF). KC said she would look into this.</p> <p>The issue of funding community engagement was mentioned such as running workshops. JF said there could be government funding through BIS</p> <p>http://www.bis.gov.uk/</p> <p>Action 6 – Look into BIS funding to run a community workshops</p>	<p>ASAP BNM</p> <p>BNM</p> <p>BNM</p> <p>MS, HW, LWT?</p> <p>TH</p> <p>KC</p>	<p>ASAP BNM</p> <p>BNM</p> <p>ASAP</p> <p>BNM</p> <p>BNM</p>
7	<p>Catchment Plan</p> <p>KC provided a draft outline of what a Catchment plan might look like for discussion. The question was asked again as to who will own the Catchment Plan. Defra require each Pilot to develop a Catchment Plan (although they are not intended to be a statutory document like the River Basin Management Plan). KC thought the plan would belong to</p>		

