

**RBMP National Advisory Group Meeting
Royal Botanical Gardens, Edinburgh**

**Draft Minutes
30/09/2014**

NAG Representative	Initials	Organisation
Janice Milne	JM	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
Katie Harper	KH	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
Julie Holmes	JHo	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
Jenny Davies	JD	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
Joyce Carr	JC	Scottish Government
Alan Wells	AW	Association of Salmon Fisheries Boards
Olivia Lassiere	OL	Scottish Canals
Sarah Hutcheon	SH	Scottish Natural Heritage
Sheila George	SG	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Anne Gray	AG	Scottish Land and Estates
Julia Garritt	JG	Forestry Commission Scotland
Olivia Burns	OB	National Parks Authority
Morag Garden	MG	Scottish Whisky Association
Mark Williams	MW	Scottish Water
Malcolm Muir	MM	South Lanarkshire Council
John Esslemont	JE	South Ayrshire Council
Fiona Simpson	FS	The Crown Estate
Susan Cooksley	SC	James Hutton Institute
John McDonald	JMc	Scottish and Southern Energy
Alan Hampson	AH	Scottish Natural Heritage

Apologies;

Andrew Bauer (NFUS), George Eckton (COSLA), Isabel Glasgow (SCF), David Harley (SEPA), Lynsay Ross (Marine Scotland)

Welcome and introduction. Janice Milne, Acting Chair

Janice Milne (JM) welcomed all to the meeting and presented the apologies. JM introduced the aims of the meeting - to discuss the development of the consultations and outline the engagement proposed as we progress to publication of the second plans.

Presentation 1: The consultation on the second river basin management plans

KH started the presentation by summarising the approach to developing the second plans, learning from the first cycle to review the balance between the second and third cycles, and ensure there is a firm base for setting objectives KH noted that the consultation will be focused on the significant water management issues and the step change required to achieve improvements based on different levels of effort applied to create different scenarios. The consultation will also outline the development of strategic approaches to tackle certain issues and a reprioritisation of work to address abstraction impacts. The consultation period will allow people to comment on the scenarios, refine prioritisation and further prepare for delivery.

Water Quality

For water quality KH described the distribution of pressures. The two pressures with the greatest impact are rural diffuse pollution and sewage. Pressures from sewage are addressed through Scottish Water's , Q&S programme and the CAR regulations so the consultation will focus on the scenarios for diffuse pollution.

SH asked if SEPA had costing's for the scenarios to tackle diffuse pollution. KH responded yes these will be presented in the consultation. AW asked about the progress of ecological recovery in the priority catchments? KH responded that because the measures were newly in place and due to the lag in ecological recovery we are still building the information regarding this. Increased monitoring and source apportionment work is underway to inform how this work is effecting the catchments. SC suggested that there is a task with this work to manage expectations so people realise there is a lag time between putting the improvements on the ground and the improvements being seen in the classification data. JM asked about a single definite ecological standard. KH stated that classification is based on ecological requirements and that there are various ecological tools for different pressures. JC commented that there are clearly defined standards to enable improvements to be identified but that we have to expect a lag time to have measurable ecological improvements. MW suggested SW approach with intense studies, source apportionment, scoping and cost benefit work that must be done before implementation of on the ground measures means we should maybe be explaining the long term journey.

KH described how the strategy is developing to tackle pressures from toxic substances, urban diffuse pollution and impacts from contaminated land with strengthened delivery framework, partnership approach for better coordination and monitoring to better understand the extent of these pressures.

MW suggested that this work will be more visible to people because the problem is centred around areas with high population density. He went on to say that SW have 15 surface water catchments that they are looking to address and we should hook them into RBMP2. KH agreed there is important links to be made with partners in this area of work.

Physical condition and barriers

JH gave a summary of the first cycle implementation, the supplementary plan, progress on the delivery of measures, WEF and the work that has been done to inform the data sets to date.

JC then outlined proposals to strengthen the delivery framework for tackling morphological pressures. This includes developments through asset management plans and notice provisions that will help to deliver the necessary improvements. This will be consulted upon alongside the RBMP consultations for 12 weeks from November.

MG asked about remediation powers? JC said that SEPA will be able to serve notices to get work carried out to improve structures impacting on the water environment. SH asked if SEPA will set up the partnerships to develop work. JC responded that it the responsibility of all responsible authorities to work in partnership. OL asked who would be expected to pay for works on structures. JC responded that if the asset is used then the owners will be responsible but if it is historic with no owner funding will be provided. JG asked about proportionality. JC responded that yes, this would be applied at the scoping stage when feasibility, cost benefit analysis and an assessment of the whole catchment would be undertaken; willingness and funding for projects will be assessed at that stage too. A strategic

group at director level was proposed to create synergies. JC said it is intended to be completed to influence the plan and have legislative powers in place for the publication of the second plans to support delivery.

JH went on to discuss the scenarios for morphological pressures that have been outlined for the second plan consultation.

JM asked what standing SACs have in the decision making process. JH said that protected areas are considered through the prioritisation process. OL asked if the position within the catchment and other pressures were considered. JH answered yes, this was considered with the length of catchment improved and the relationship within the catchment. AW confirmed the work that has been undertaken with discussions regarding this work at the fish and fisheries advisory group, FFAG. SH stated SNH would prefer to look at the data and then to liaise with SEPA. KH confirmed this will be done through our engagement process to influence prioritisation and scoping will inform the feasibility and together will help direct spend. The measures outlined are an initial route map that is the first step in developing an implementation strategy. AG asked how much more information will be presented in the consultation? KH confirmed the consultation will contain what has been said today with supporting data and costs. SH stated that it is important for managing people's expectations that they understand that the list is a starting point and not everything will actually need to be delivered depending on the outcome of the scope. JH mentioned that scoping will also take place in catchments where we have uncertainties about the information. MM said that there are problems with prioritisation when you try to restore barriers that people want to develop for micro hydro – he suggested clear mapping would be useful.

Flows and levels

JH went on to outline the approach to tackle pressures associated with flows and levels in the second cycle.

JMc asked if the prioritisation was rebalanced for the second cycle. JC responded yes, the measures have been reprioritised for the consultation based on the improved information gathered. AW asked for details of the water scarcity plan – does it cover hydro as well as irrigation. JH responded yes, the water scarcity plan covers all abstractions. MG asked when we would bring the climate change model into the RBMP? KH responded that this has been looked at but as yet we're not in a position to forecast and because the data sets are not clear. Also to 2027 is relatively short term. It was expected that the directive will be reviewed to account for climate change is due course.

Summary

KH summarised the outcomes of the presentation, that the scenarios set out the proposed pace of implementation over the next couple of cycles and reinforced the need to work in partnership to achieve our goals.

OL suggested that maps with associated costs would be useful. KH said that level of detailed costing could not be accurately produced due to the site specific nature of the measures required. JMc asked if the costs incorporate the costs to the asset owners? JC responded that assets such as dams and weirs not in the scenarios because they will be dealt with by the CAR regs. KH stated that cost information specific to the scenarios proposed will be set out in the consultation document. SC asked if we were set on using the term "scenario" and felt option or choice may be

more appropriate. AH suggested that a balance needs to be struck, could be more descriptive. MG asked if the responses to the consultation would not just be influenced by the resource available. SC asked if all the scenarios are feasible? If so all will choose scenario 2 the most ambitious JC said this is an exercise to inform progress and the consultation informs the development of progress and informs the resource required to meet the objectives. Ultimately the Minister will decide which scenario to adopt. SC asked if we're presenting progress to date? KH responded no, this was covered in the CCCF report and we're trying to keep the plans small, useable and forward focused documents. MW asked when we will be able to put together the big picture with partnerships working together to progress measures and working across catchments to address multiple pressures. KH said we're setting out what's achievable and is being presented in the next 2 cycles. Engagement will develop our partnerships and this will be discussed at future NAG meetings in future.

Presentation 2: Refining the second plans

JD spoke to the group about the process of the consultation, wider engagement and the engagement proposed for NAG taking us to the publication of the second plans.

The consultation is a compressed focused consultation with specific questions directed to certain topics. It focuses on the major changes proposed since the first Plans. It will be published through the consultation tool which NAG members were encouraged to respond through. The consultation period of 4 months was discussed and members agreed this was sensible approach and could not foresee any logistical issues.

The wider engagement was outlined and the group were content with the suggested approach. JD then provided the meeting dates and topics for meetings for 2015. The group agreed these topics were a good idea.

The dates are 28 January, 26 May and 06 October.

AOB, summary and close.

JM summed up the outcomes of the meeting and thanked everyone for their useful and constructive contributions. They have come at a key stage and will influence the development of the consultations as they are being finalised. The action log from March was updated and can be found here.

No AOB

JM took the opportunity to inform the group that it would be Katie's last NAG in her role as RBMP unit manager and would be leaving to work for United Utilities in the next few weeks. The group thanked Katie for her contributions to the group over the years and wish her well in her future endeavours.

Proposed meeting dates for 2015: **28 January, 26 May and 6 October**