CYNGOR GWYNEDD
GWYNEDD COUNCIL

Draft minutes of the 8th Pen Llŷn a'r Sarnau cSAC Liaison Group meeting held on 7th September 2004 (starting 7pm) at Plas Tan y Bwlch, Maentwrog.

Present:

Alf Bowen	Aberdyfi Partnership
Bill Bracewell	Aberdyfi Partnership
Gruff Jones	Keep Wales Tidy
Cllr Caerwyn Roberts	Snowdonia National Park Authority (chairman)
Cllr Geraint George	Snowdonia National Park Authority
Jill Whipp	CPRW
Dr Peter Lloyd	Welsh Yachting Association / RYA
Andy Hall	Arthog Outdoor Education Centre
Rowland Sharp	Sea anglers
Cllr Ray Quant	Cardigan County Council
Mike Bowyer	Marine Archaeology
Lucy Kay	Countryside Council for Wales (minutes)
Rod Gritten	Snowdonia National Park Authority
Rhys Jones	Gwynedd Council
Peter White	Gwynedd Council
David Archer	Snowdonia National Park Authority
Helen Clay	Environment Agency
Siân Shakespear	Facilitator

Introduction

Caerwyn Roberts welcomed everyone to the meeting. He welcomed Cllr Geraint George who had taken Cllr Owain Edwards' place on the Liaison Group. Cllr Owain Edwards was wished well in his retirement. Unfortunately Alison Edwards was unable to attend the meeting due to illness.

1. Apologies:

Iwan Edgar	
Robbie Gorman	
Andy Jeffrey	
Mike Parry	
Iain Roberts	
Mike Thrussell	
Liz Allen	Cardigan County Council
Jamie Davies	Cardigan County Council
Alison Edwards	SAC Officer
Craig Rockcliff	Environment Agency

2. Minutes of the last meeting

2.1 The minutes were accepted as an accurate record of the meeting

3. Matters arising

3.1.1 Items 3.1, 3,3, 7,1 and 8.1: Alison had met about half the Liaison Group members and had discussed these issues with them. The issues that had arisen were on the agenda for the meeting.

Caerwyn Roberts handed over to Siân Shakespear who was facilitating the meeting for agenda items 4-9. Siân clarified the different stages of the facilitated discussion and explained that the two main aims of these discussions were to (i) help create a prioritised work programme for all members of the group that is easy to monitor and manage (agenda items 6-8); and (ii) reach agreement on how the issues raised by

members of the Liaison Group in discussion with Alison were going to be addressed (agenda item 9). Siân explained that the seating arrangements for the evening (people round tables in groups of 4 or more) was to help the facilitated discussions.

4. Work undertaken by the SAC Officer (Sept 03 – March 04).

This summary had been circulated prior to the meeting. There was an opportunity to read the summary and raise questions / comments.

4.1 Alf Bowen raised the fact that there was a lack of awareness amongst visitors and local people about the importance of the area, and that there was a lack of information for people in the areas about the SAC and other interests to inform people that it is a unique area.

4.2 Rowland Sharp asked if Alison had been able to identify all the different organisations and groups who have management plans and strategies that cover the area of the SAC? Lucy responded that this had been identified as a short coming in the Action Plan and would need to be addressed.
ACTION: RAs and others to address issue of links to plans and strategies of other groups and organisations.

4.3 Alison and Tywyn school were congratulated for the project they had been running. It was asked if this could be extended to other schools. Lucy explained that the opportunity had arisen to undertake this work thanks to a teacher at the school (Mrs Heather Hall) who had put in a lot of work to secure funding to run the project. There was no reason something similar couldn't be undertaken with other schools, but such a project did require a lot of work. It was certainly an excellent example of how school children of different abilities could be engaged in practical fieldwork and the environment.

4.4 Ray Quant asked if Ysgol Craig y Wylfa had been included on the contact list to receiving information from Alison about the SAC.
ACTION: Alison to confirm if school is on the list.

4.5 Peter Lloyd commented that the summary showed that a lot of work had been undertaken and that Alison should be congratulated on achieving this.

5. Background to the review of the Action Plan

5.1 Lucy presented the background to the review of the Action Plan starting with a reminder as to where the Action Plan had originally come from and explaining how the review had been undertaken, the summary results and the work still to be undertaken. An important part of the work still to be undertaken was to be started by the discussions in the meeting to prioritise actions.

5.2 For the purpose of prioritising the 114 actions in the plan, they had been divided into three groups:

i. Actions that can be seen as discrete pieces of work with an end point.
ii. Actions that will be ongoing for the foreseeable future.
iii. Actions that are part of the ongoing statutory duties of the relevant authorities and other statutory bodies to the management of the cSAC. These actions have to be undertaken and will form part of the work programme for the cSAC anyway.

5.3 Only the actions in groups i and ii were discussed and prioritised in the meeting. The prioritisation of these actions would provide a focus for the work programme for the cSAC for the next 18 months. Other actions will not be forgotten, but will be undertaken only when the priority actions have been addressed.

5.4 The intention is for each of the prioritised actions, together with the actions relating to ongoing statutory duties to be worked up to have more specific targets and timetable for the delivery. The aim is to complete this before the end of October. The relevant authorities will be meeting in early November when they will finalise the timetable of work for the next 18 months. This work programme will be included as part of the Action Plan Review.

5.5 Peter Lloyd said that there should be a formal opportunity for the Liaison Group members to comment on the review. He had hoped that there would be an opportunity during the meeting. Other Liaison Group members voiced a similar view. Peter Lloyd picked one example, the issue of possible offshore wind farm developments in Cardigan Bay, and said that this was a subject that would be of interest to other groups who may wish to support a particular standpoint. It was not possible to include a detailed session about the review at the meeting, but the review was only in a draft stage and comments on the document would be welcomed. It was agreed that Alison would contact Peter Lloyd to take note of the comments he had and that Liaison Group members should contact Alison individually if they wanted to raise any issues in relation to the draft review document. A further point was made that there should be more input from fishermen into the cSAC management.
ACTION: Alison to contact Peter Lloyd about the Action Plan Review
ACTION: All Liaison Group members to contact Alison if there are any issues they want to raise in relation to the Action Plan Review.

6. Prioritisation of groups of actions with a fixed end date

The actions with a fixed end date had been grouped into actions with similar themes. A list of these had been circulated to all members prior to the meeting. Each group was asked to agree their top 4 actions that they considered were most important for managing the cSAC and maintaining the features in favourable condition.

The results of the prioritisation are shown in the table below:

Grouped actions (theme)	**Action number (in Action Plan)**	**No. of votes**	**Priority (1=high)**
1. Construction of ports, harbours, marinas and slipways	3.2; 3.3; 3.4; 3.6	1	3
2. Shoreline defence structures	3.7; 3.8	2	2
3. Land reclamation	3.14; 3.15; 3.16	0	4
4. Dredging, dumping and depositing of material	3.18; 3.20; 3.22	4	1
5. Discharges from land and shipping	3.31; 3.33	2	2
6. Assess the implications of vehicle use on beaches	3.51	2	2
7. Survey impacts of afforestation on water quality	3.54	1	3
8. Assess impact of grazing on SAC	3.56	0	4
9. Clarify extent / nature of archaeological sites	3.58; 3.59	0	4
10. Review of consents, plans and projects	4.2; 4.4	2	2
11. Ensure all departments in relevant authorities are aware of their responsibilities	7.12	1	3

Additional comments:

- Groups 1 and 4 had clear links between them that should be recognised in putting together the work programme.

- Groups 10 and 11 also had clear links between them. It was thought that the actions in these groups should be considered as statutory responsibilities that would have to be undertaken.

7. Prioritisation of groups of ongoing actions

A similar process was undertaken for the groups of ongoing actions. The results of the prioritisation are shown in the table below:

Grouped actions (theme)	Action number (in Action Plan)	No. of votes	Priority (1=high)
12. Ensure oil spill emergency plans address SAC features	3.27	4	1
13. Update contingency plans and sensitivity maps in relation to discharges from land and shipping	3.35; 3.39	0	5
14. Watching brief and collate information about fisheries	3.40; 3.41; 3.42; 3.43; 3.44; 3.45; 3.46	3	2
15. Collate information on nature and scale of marine plan collection	3.48	0	5
16. Watching brief on scale and location of powered craft in estuaries	3.50	2	3
17. Watching brief on collection of non-commercial marine species by divers	3.53	0	5
18. Maintain surveillance of possible impacts of afforestation.	3.55	0	5
19. Maintain surveillance of invasive and non-native species	3.70; 3.71; 3.72	1	4
20. Collate information on removal of sand, gravel and rocks from foreshore	3.73	0	5
21. Monitoring programmes – prepare and maintain	3.60; 3.61; 3.62; 3.63; 3.64; 3.65; 5.1; 5.2; 5.4; 5.5	3	2
22. Raising awareness	3.11; 3.47; 3.47b; 3.49; 3.52; 3.66; 3.67; 3.68; 3.74; 6.1; 6.2; 6.3; 6.4; 6.5; 6.6; 6.7; 6.8; 6.9; 6.10; 6.11; 6.12; 6.13; 6.14; 6.15; 6.16; 6.17; 6.18	4	1

Additional comments:

- Action 3.35 ("clarify existing contingency plans and sensitivity maps and ensure that they are up to date") which is listed under Group 13 should be part of Group 12.
- It was thought that actions in Group 21 should be considered as statutory responsibilities that would have to be undertaken.

8. Actioning the prioritised groups of actions

For each Group of prioritised actions, the aim was to work these up into a clearer set of measurable, timetabled tasks using the table outline shown below in order to implementation of the action and tracking progress. For example:

Group of actions 12: Ensure oil spill emergency plans address SAC features

Action 1	Task 1.1 Task 1.2	When? When?	Who? Who?
Action 2	Task 2.1	When?	Who?
Action 3	Task 3.1 Task 3.2 Task 3.3	When? When? When?	Who? Who? Who?

The meeting identified the lead statutory authority(s) for the priority actions highlighted

through discussions under items 6 and 7. Liaison Group members were asked to indicate which of the prioritised action they would like to be involved with to help work up the tasks and timetable. The lead statutory organisations and Liaison Group members for the prioritised groups of actions are shown below.

Top prioritised groups of actions:

Group of actions	Priority	Lead authority(s)	Liaison Group members
Actions with an end point			
4. Dredging, dumping & depositing of material	1	Gwynedd Council / Ceredigion County Council	Alf Bowen
2. Shoreline defence structures	2	Gwynedd Council / Ceredigion County Council	
5. Discharges from land and shipping	2	Environment Agency Wales/ Countryside Council for Wales	
6. Assess the implications of vehicle use on beaches	2	Gwynedd Council	
10. Review of consents, plans and projects	2		
Ongoing actions			
12. Ensure oil spill emergency plans address SAC features	1	Environment Agency Wales / Countryside Council for Wales	
22. Raising awareness	1	Alison Edwards	Andy Hall Gruff Jones
14. Watching brief and collate information about fisheries	2	North Western & North Wales Sea Fisheries Committee	
21. Monitoring programmes – prepare and maintain.	2	Countryside Council for Wales	Ray Quant

The intention is that the lead authority(s) will, by the end of October, have worked with the other organisations and individuals who need to be involved to establish more specific targets and timetable for delivery of their group of actions.

9. <u>Addressing issues raised by Liaison Group members in discussion with the SAC Officer</u>

A number of issues had arisen during Alison's discussions with individual members of the Liaison Group. These had been summarised in the Issues Paper circulated by Alison prior to the meeting. There was a discussion about how these issues may be best addressed by the Liaison Group and other points were also raised:

- There should be more direct input by Liaison Group members in discussions about specific issues, e.g. hold meeting specifically to talk about certain issues. It was hoped that the proposed approach to produce the work programme would be an opportunity to develop discussions between the relevant authorities and Liaison Group members about certain issues.
- It was important that the relevant authority representatives were present at Liaison Group meetings to answer any questions.
- Liaison Group meetings must be at least twice yearly in order to maintain some continuity between meetings.
- The facilitated participatory discussion process used at this meeting had been very constructive and a good way to get people's views.
- It was important to move forward to address the key issues.

- The Liaison Group had already agreed that it could co-opt members onto the group.
- The Liaison Group was originally established to have representatives for a range of different interests / user groups relevant to the cSAC. It was important to ensure that the membership of the Liaison Group continued to represent this full range of interests.
- A trip out to the site followed by a meeting of the Liaison Group, accepting that weather would always be an issue for any field trip.
- More slide shows to publicise the wildlife of the area were important.

In addition to the comments about the Review of the Action Plan earlier in the meeting (see 5.5 above) there was an opportunity for further comments about the Review:

- The new features of the SAC added through the moderation process are not yet covered by the management plan and Action Plan - they need to be. The current review is about reviewing the actions for the reefs and estuaries. It is important that the other features are addressed and this will need to be part of the work programme.

- Some of the new features have issues associated with them that are important and could be included now. Whilst the management of the SAC on a day to day basis is having to take account of the new features and issues associated with them, it was important to make sure that others had a chance to have a say in any revision of the management plan to incorporate the new features.

10. Close of meeting & date of next meeting

Caerwyn Roberts thanked the translator, Siân and Lucy for their work during the evening. He also thanked everyone for attending and participating in the meeting and also for maintaining their interest and involvement in the cSAC management.

The date for the next meeting is Tuesday 8th March 2005.