

**Seventeenth Diffuse Pollution Management Advisory Group Meeting
23 October 2014
SEPA Office, Edinburgh**

Draft Minutes

Present	Organisation
David Harley (DH)	SEPA (Chair)
Stephen Field (SF)	SEPA
Darrell Crothers (DC)	SEPA
Brian McCreadie (BMcC)	SEPA
Lisa Webb (LW)	SEPA (Coordinator)
Ian Speirs (IS)	Scottish Government
Joyce Carr (JC)	Scottish Government
Neil Henderson (NH)	SGRPID
David Lister (DL)	SGRPID
Sarah Hutcheon (SH)	SNH
Maida Ballarini (MB)	Forestry Commission Scotland
Zoë Frogbrook (ZF)	Scottish Water
Andrew Bauer (AB)	NFUS
Anne Gray (AG)	Scottish Land and Estates
Jannette MacDonald (JMacD)	CREW
Andy Vinten (AV)	The James Hutton Institute
Sheila George (SG)	RSPB Scotland
Rebecca Audsley (RA)	SAC Consulting
Chris Horrill (CH)	RAFTS
Olivia Burns (OB)	Loch Lomond & the Trossachs National Park/ Cairngorms National Park
Apologies	
Clive McKay	CONFOR
Brian Shaw	Scottish Tenant Farmers Association
Alan Wells	Association of Salmon Fishery Boards
Julia Garritt	Forestry Commission Scotland
Graham Kerr	SAC Consulting
Carolyn Hedley	Scottish Golf Environment Group
Paul Fotheringham	Forestry Contractors Association

Item	Discussion
1.	Introduction - David Harley (DH) DH welcomed all and introduced the seventeenth meeting of the Diffuse Pollution Management Advisory Group. He noted a number of new representatives on DPMAG: Sheila George, Maida Ballarini, David Lister and Lisa Webb for SEPA.
2.	Planning for the second cycle: consultation (LW) LW gave an update on the development of the second plans, and

	<p>summarised the approach to their development: learning from the first cycle to review the balance between the second and third cycles, and ensuring a firm base for setting objectives. LW outlined 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 in different scenarios (baseline, step change 1 and step change 2).</p> <p><u>Water Quality</u> For water quality, it was shown that the two pressures with the greatest impact are rural diffuse pollution and sewage. Pressures from sewage are addressed longer term through Scottish Water's Q&S programme and the CAR regulations. In the next cycles, approaches will involve improving our understanding of toxic substances and strengthening the regulatory framework for contaminated land impacts.</p> <p><u>Physical condition and barriers</u> LW summarised the measures established during the first cycle to address physical condition eg Water Environment Fund, the pilot catchments and the supplementary plan. It was highlighted that detailed proposals have been developed to strengthen the delivery framework for morphological pressures in the next cycles. These proposals will be the subject of a Scottish Government consultation to run alongside the RBMP consultations. It was highlighted that barriers to fish movement will be addressed through CAR license reviews, working with asset owners and scoping studies for historic barriers in the 2nd cycle.</p> <p><u>Flows and levels</u> The understanding about the impacts of flows and levels has increased since the first cycle. This information has been used to propose changes in approach for tackling these pressures, in particular for water abstraction for irrigation and hydropower.</p> <p><u>Engagement and consultation</u> LW summarised plans for engagement with responsible authorities, industry sectors and other organisations. The proposed consultation timescale (November – April) was presented, which will allow sufficient time to consider and incorporate stakeholder views into the 2nd plans.</p> <p>JMacD asked about SEPA's plans for engaging specifically with local communities on 2nd cycle plans – SEPA acknowledged this is important but challenging to do. AV asked about plans for achieving hydropower/ irrigation objectives and JC clarified that this work will be phased over the next two cycles.</p>
3.	<p>Update on the proposed second cycle priority catchments (BMcC) BMcC updated the group about the reprioritisation of the diffuse pollution catchments and why this had to happen. The primary drivers for reprioritisation were: (i) new standards bringing changes to the classification of ecological impacts as shown by the most recent (2013) classification data and (ii) the need to include new shellfish waters that arose from changes to shellfish water classification methodology. The opportunity was taken to refine the prioritisation eg removing catchments in NVZs and 'grouping' catchments to improve effectiveness and efficiencies in delivery.</p>

	<p>The reprioritisation did not bring many changes to the numbers of priority catchments but has resulted in many more Action Areas being added. These are the areas in which SEPA's 'catchment walking' approach will not be appropriate and where SEPA and others need to develop alternative approaches for addressing diffuse pollution issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AB expressed some concern with the use of the term 'Action Area' and that it may be quite off-putting for farmers and land managers. Action 17.1 – SEPA and Scottish Government to consider use of the term 'Action Area'. • CH asked about the resource implications of the different scenarios. JC explained that the consultation will inform discussions about the resource required to meet objectives. • CH asked whether the size of the amber part of the piechart (ie the water bodies not achieving objectives by 2027) would reduce with step change 2. It was explained that yes it would, as step change 2 would 'frontload' measures to the earlier part of the cycle thus allowing more time for recovery by 2027. • SH expressed some concern about the reprioritisation of catchments as some Natura sites have 'dropped down' the scenarios and had queries about inclusion of particular SSSIs within pc operational areas. Action 17.2 – SH and BMcC to further discuss SNH queries around catchment prioritisation, operational areas and Natura/ SSSIs. • There was discussion about the proposed review of the priority catchment approach, with agreement that the aim is to make the approach more efficient without compromising the aspects that are currently proving successful. • Discussion about the use of the pc maps for SRDP targeting. SEPA clarified that the catchment reprioritisation means that the targeting maps will be incorrect (with a 10% change in pc areas) as this did not happen in sufficient time to feed into the targeting process.
4.	<p>First cycle priority catchments update (SF)</p> <p>SF gave a progress update and reported that 1:1 inspections are now complete in eight priority catchment areas with a combined total of 1456 visits. In the remaining six, 1:1 inspections are ongoing and the aim is to complete these by December 2014 (weather permitting and assuming staff resources remain constant). To achieve this, SF has restructured his team to free up staff resource, with new officers based in Aberdeen, Edinburgh and Dumfries. Once these visits are complete, a total of 3184 inspections will have been carried out in the operational areas of the 14 priority catchments since this work began.</p> <p>To date, 501 first revisits to non-compliant farms have been undertaken and initial results show that 88% are now compliant or working towards compliance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AB asked if SEPA staff were being asked to undertake this work faster. SF replied no, they were still allocating a day per visit. • SH asked how SEPA prioritised where to visit first within the catchments. SF explained that this was broadly done by the farming calendar and to avoid particularly busy periods for a farm eg harvesting, lambing.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IS asked what was being done for non-compliant farms that had received a revisit but were not taking any steps to comply. SF explained they would receive a formal letter from SEPA advising that enforcement action will be taken if compliance is not met. • CH asked about the variation in compliance between catchments and reasons for this. Discussion followed about how this could be a reflection of different approaches/ practices and also that differences such as soil structure and geology could play a role. • ZF noted the extremely low compliance in the Deveron (5%), which is worrying given the extent of awareness-raising in the area. SF indicated that changes in behaviour often happen as a direct result of meeting the farmers 1:1. • There was a discussion on the lag in water body recovery once 100% compliance is reached. Science indicates this is relatively quick with faecal indicators but takes far longer with nutrients, perhaps as long as 20 years.
5.	<p>DPMAG forestry sub-group (MB)</p> <p>MB gave an overview of the issues relating to forestry and diffuse pollution and work in this area eg Forest Research trials on water quality pressures. MB reiterated that FCS is keen to increase compliance with the GBRs and adherence to the Forest and Water guidelines. There was mention of SEPA's work in the south of Scotland on forestry impacts on water quality and its finding of 30% GBR compliance among the forestry sector. Action 17.3 – LW to invite John Gorman of SEPA to the next DPMAG to present the findings from SEPA's forestry project.</p> <p>There followed a discussion about the role of a DPMAG forestry sub-group and that a valuable output would be guidance for practitioners. Potential members of the subgroup to include FCS, SEPA, Scottish Government, Tilhill, Confor, SLE, Forest Enterprise Scotland, UKFPA, Forestry Contractors Association.</p> <p>Action 17.4 – MB to arrange a meeting with FCS, SEPA and Scottish Government. That meeting will agree terms of reference for the subgroup and assign responsibility for setting up the first meeting of the subgroup.</p> <p>Action 17.5 – First DPMAG forestry subgroup meeting to be set up before the end of 2014.</p>
6.	<p>SRDP options update (IS and DC)</p> <p>IS indicated that Member States are being urged to ensure integration between WFD and the Rural Development Programmes but that there is no concern from Europe about the content of the SRDP options. IS and SF have been invited to Brussels to speak about Scotland's approach to tackling diffuse pollution and our bespoke regulations.</p> <p>DC summarised the water quality options that are being included in SRDP. Current state of play is that the options are finalised but the guidance is still being developed. A discussion followed about SRDP and the need to communicate to land managers so they are aware of the water quality options and what might be appropriate for them to apply to.</p>

	<p>Action 17.6 – DC, AB, AG and RA to consider a joint communication on SRDP options to address diffuse pollution.</p> <p>Action 17.7 – All to include a link to the Farming & Water Scotland website in any relevant SRDP communications.</p> <p>Action 17.8 – DC to ensure the Farming & Water Scotland website is up to date with information on SRDP water quality options and with a map showing land managers if they are within a priority catchment.</p> <p>Action 17.9 – DC and LW to consider the scope for identifying diffuse pollution hotspots where the Co-op fund and SRDP could be targeted to delivery water quality benefits.</p>																														
7.	<p>Minutes/actions from the last meeting and AOB (LW and DH)</p> <p>DH thanked all for their contributions. Next meeting to be held in March so that the content of the RBMP consultations can be discussed before the consultation closes. LW will circulate a meeting date for March.</p> <p>The action log was reviewed and updated:</p> <table><tr><th>No.</th><th>Action</th><th>Progress</th></tr><tr><td>16.1</td><td>BMcC and MG to confirm why Luss Bay was not included</td><td>Complete</td></tr><tr><td>16.2</td><td>SF to assess the influence that SRDP is having on the priority catchment approach.</td><td>Ongoing</td></tr><tr><td>16.3</td><td>MG to organise a presentation on the ADAS report at the next meeting.</td><td>Ongoing</td></tr><tr><td>16.4</td><td>SEPA and Scottish Government to think about a name for catchments that are not suitable for the pc approach</td><td>Complete Note: superseded by new action (17.1)</td></tr><tr><td>16.5</td><td>MG to send link to the Farming & Water Scotland website.</td><td>Complete – LW circulated link 16/10/14</td></tr><tr><td>16.6</td><td>JG/SF to discuss forestry subgroup further with other relevant DPMAG members.</td><td>Complete – discussed and progressed at 23/10/14 meeting</td></tr><tr><td>13.5</td><td>MG to advise DPMAG members when the Tay opportunities mapping report is published.</td><td>Complete – LW circulated link to the report 16/10/14</td></tr><tr><td>11.6</td><td>SF to send to the group the standard paragraphs of the letter sent to farmers after the site visit.</td><td>Ongoing</td></tr><tr><td>10.6</td><td>SF to let the group know about the change to herbicide application (new registration)</td><td>Closed – Scottish Pesticides CoP is currently being revised and will contain changes/ updates on aerial spraying etc</td></tr></table>	No.	Action	Progress	16.1	BMcC and MG to confirm why Luss Bay was not included	Complete	16.2	SF to assess the influence that SRDP is having on the priority catchment approach.	Ongoing	16.3	MG to organise a presentation on the ADAS report at the next meeting.	Ongoing	16.4	SEPA and Scottish Government to think about a name for catchments that are not suitable for the pc approach	Complete Note: superseded by new action (17.1)	16.5	MG to send link to the Farming & Water Scotland website.	Complete – LW circulated link 16/10/14	16.6	JG/SF to discuss forestry subgroup further with other relevant DPMAG members.	Complete – discussed and progressed at 23/10/14 meeting	13.5	MG to advise DPMAG members when the Tay opportunities mapping report is published.	Complete – LW circulated link to the report 16/10/14	11.6	SF to send to the group the standard paragraphs of the letter sent to farmers after the site visit.	Ongoing	10.6	SF to let the group know about the change to herbicide application (new registration)	Closed – Scottish Pesticides CoP is currently being revised and will contain changes/ updates on aerial spraying etc
No.	Action	Progress																													
16.1	BMcC and MG to confirm why Luss Bay was not included	Complete																													
16.2	SF to assess the influence that SRDP is having on the priority catchment approach.	Ongoing																													
16.3	MG to organise a presentation on the ADAS report at the next meeting.	Ongoing																													
16.4	SEPA and Scottish Government to think about a name for catchments that are not suitable for the pc approach	Complete Note: superseded by new action (17.1)																													
16.5	MG to send link to the Farming & Water Scotland website.	Complete – LW circulated link 16/10/14																													
16.6	JG/SF to discuss forestry subgroup further with other relevant DPMAG members.	Complete – discussed and progressed at 23/10/14 meeting																													
13.5	MG to advise DPMAG members when the Tay opportunities mapping report is published.	Complete – LW circulated link to the report 16/10/14																													
11.6	SF to send to the group the standard paragraphs of the letter sent to farmers after the site visit.	Ongoing																													
10.6	SF to let the group know about the change to herbicide application (new registration)	Closed – Scottish Pesticides CoP is currently being revised and will contain changes/ updates on aerial spraying etc																													

Action Table

No.	Action
17.1	SEPA and Scottish Government to consider use of the term 'Action Area'.
17.2	SH and BMcC to further discuss SNH queries around catchment prioritisation, operational areas and Natura/ SSSIs.
17.3	LW to invite John Gorman of SEPA to the next DPMAG to update on SEPA's forestry project
17.4	MB to arrange a meeting with FCS, SEPA and Scottish Government. That meeting will agree terms of reference for the subgroup and assign responsibility for setting up the first meeting of the subgroup
17.5	First DPMAG forestry subgroup meeting to be set up before the end of 2014
17.6	DC, AB, AG and RA to consider a joint communication on SRDP options to address diffuse pollution
17.7	All to include link to the Farming & Water Scotland website in any relevant SRDP communications
17.8	DC to ensure the Farming & Water Scotland website is up to date with information on SRDP water quality options and with a map showing land managers if they are within a priority catchment
17.9	DC and LW to consider the scope for identifying diffuse pollution hotspots where the Co-op fund and SRDP could be targeted to delivery water quality benefits
16.2	SF to assess the influence that SRDP is having on the priority catchment approach.
16.3	MG to organise a presentation on the ADAS report at the next meeting.
11.6	SF to send to the group the standard paragraphs of the letter sent to farmers after the site visit.