

FTOWDGD Commercial Fisheries Working Group: Meeting Note

Monday 25th November 2013

Mercure Edinburgh City Hotel

Facilitator: Rebecca Radford (Brown and May Marine Ltd)

Attendees: Nick Brockie (Seagreen), Stephen Kerr (Repsol), Colin Maciver (Repsol), Rosie Scurr (Mainstream), John Watt (Scottish Fishermen's Federation), Malcolm Morrison (Scottish Fishermen's Federation), Sandy Ritchie (Anglo Scottish Fishermen's Association), Neil Teviotdale (creel fisherman from Arbroath), John Hermse (Scallop Association), Bill Hughes (Fishermen's Mutual Pittenweem), Stephen Small (prawn fishermen from Pittenweem), Jamie Fairnie (Cockenzie and Port Seton Fishermen's Association), Gareth Jones (Marine Scotland Science), Bruce Buchanan (Marine Scotland)

Apologies: Colin Warwick (The Crown Estate), Noel Wight (prawn fisherman from Dunbar), Billy Thompson (prawn fisherman from Port Seton), Edwin Todd (Cockenzie and Port Seton Fishermen's Association), Alan Donaldson (scallop fishermen from Montrose)

Meeting Notes: Rebecca Radford

Meeting Objective

To discuss:

- Fishermen's register update
- Monitoring meeting update
- Trip to a windfarm update
- Scallop gear trials update
- Over-trawlability surveys
- Marine mammals and ornithology mitigation/monitoring
- Community benefit

Agenda

1. Apologies
2. Sign off 1st February 'Note of Meeting'
3. Actions from 1st February
4. Fishermen's register update
5. Monitoring meeting update
6. Trip to a windfarm update
7. Scallop gear trials update
8. Over-trawlability surveys (presentation by John Watt)
9. Marine mammals and ornithology mitigation/monitoring
10. Community benefit
11. AOB
12. Date of next meeting

Item 2: Sign off 1st February 'Notes of Meeting'

- Notes of meeting passed and signed off
- MM requested that paper copies of the previous meetings minutes be provided at the next

meeting

Actions

- RR to ensure paper copies of the minutes are provided at the next meeting

Item 3: Actions from 1st February

- Actions from the previous meeting as follows:
 - SR to send RR expenses form
 - RR to distribute forms to attendees and organise reimbursement
 - RR to quality check the register against the raw data to ensure there are no errors
 - RR to disseminate information to FIRs to be checked to ensure the register is up to date. The register will be split into the three regions covered by each FIR
 - Marine Scotland to check with compliance what information can be disclosed. Data will be sent to RR to distribute as necessary
 - Marine Scotland to investigate monitoring already undertaken in the region and to report back once review of monitoring concluded
 - Developers and RR to progress sub-group
 - RR to look at logistics of organising a trip to an operational wind farm and discuss with developers
 - Developers to undertake a joint review of their standards for vessels undertaking guard vessel work and what work may be available
 - Developers to outline specific requirements for FLO work with regards to wind farm developments
 - Marine Scotland to discuss scallop gear trials on a national scale internally and report to the group
 - Developers to discuss scallop gear trials internally, if this work is agreed, it will be undertaken by commercial fishermen
 - RR to obtain more information from the representative of the HVDC cable and report to the group
 - BMM to confirm location of meeting and distribute agenda
- RR stated that expenses from the previous meeting had been forwarded to the SFF for payment. RR asked whether members had received payment, all confirmed that they had. SS stated that he had not received payment for his attendance at the monitoring meeting in October. RR said that she would follow this up.
- RR stated that the fishermen's register updates would be covered in item 4.
- RR stated that the monitoring sub-group would be covered in item 5.
- RR stated that a trip to a windfarm update would be covered in item 7.
- RR highlighted that the developers are waiting for the publication of the RenewableUK guidelines regarding guard vessel work standards. MM stated that the original guidelines indicated that fishing vessels were not suitable for guard vessel work due to issues with certification. The SFF have put forward suggestions that would allow fishing vessels to participate in potential work. It was agreed that the group would wait for publication of the new guidelines before any standards for guard vessels were agreed in the group.
- RS highlighted the potential for FLO work for the Mainstream surveys going forward, however survey work will not be confirmed for next year until the project has achieved consent.
- SK indicated that Inch Cape are starting a tender process for survey works for next year but the exact timings are not currently clear, although it is likely that this work will be during the summer.
- SR indicated that it is useful to have continuity with regards to offshore FLOs and the developers should aim to use the same FLO for their survey works.
- RS highlighted that Mainstream also use onshore FLOs which do not require a FLO

qualification, but need to be familiar with the local fishing industry.

- JW explained how to get FLO qualifications. The qualifications are funded by the SFF. Interested individuals need to contact the SFF services.
- RR indicated that an update on scallop gear trials would be provided in item 8.

Actions

- RR to chase the SFF for SS expenses for attendance at monitoring meeting

Item 4: Fishermen's register update

- RR explained that she had distributed the register to members of the Working Group over the summer for feedback regarding the individuals on the list. RR then forwarded the refined list to GJ who checked it against the Marine Scotland database.
- GJ explained that there are some issues with the list as there are more vessels in the Marine Scotland database than on the register. GJ asked if the group were interested in contacting all fishermen in the area or just keep the locals who have voiced an interest and are on the register. GJ explained that he had included vessels recorded as fishing in four ICES rectangles in the Forth and Tay area and included vessels that had landed their catch into ports between Aberdeen and Eyemouth.
- SR asked how GJ had identified vessels fishing.
- GJ explained that information from logbooks is inputted into the FIN system, which GJ can then run queries on.
- GJ highlighted that the data includes information on nomadic vessels that are landing into Forth and Tay ports and includes landings from 2013 only. GJ queried whether he needs to extract data from a longer time period.
- JH indicated that scallop vessels fishing the area will vary year on year and requested that 3 years of data are extracted.
- BH highlighted that the register may not include vessels from smaller ports, the members of which are not necessarily represented on the Working Group e.g. potters in Creel or St. Andrews.
- SR stated that he aims to represent all small harbours and fishermen not within Associations within Berwick / East Lothian.
- GJ mentioned that it was decided at the Moray Firth Working Group not to update the register using the Marine Scotland database as it was considered that the members represent the majority of areas, however in the Forth and Tay area, the Working Group members do not necessarily represent all fishing interests as it's a much larger area.
- SK asked if there would be an issue of disclosure by Marine Scotland providing information to the group.
- GJ replied that there are no issues as neither value nor weight data have been extracted along with the names and therefore it does not go against any data confidentiality. GJ did state however that Marine Scotland could not provide the addresses of individuals.
- SR stated that the names of vessels can be downloaded from the internet, but it is the contact details that are required.
- GJ highlighted that the point of the exercise was to agree whether the register is a representative list of fishing activity in the Forth and Tay area. Once this has been agreed, Marine Scotland could send letters to individuals, although there would be a cost associated with this. GJ went on to say that Marine Scotland cannot give out the contact details as they would need to obtain permission from individuals to do so. There are over 4,000 vessels in Marine Scotland's database and it is likely that the group is only interested in a proportion of those individuals who may be impacted by the three developments. Marine Scotland are introducing a new system that can select individuals off the database and send letters from headquarters without the need to send the letters from the local offices.
- It was agreed that GJ would send a refined list to RR and RR would pass this list on to group

members to be refined further.

- JH indicated that he had a scallop vessel master list and would therefore be able to easily check the vessels on the list.
- GJ asked if a buffer is required to filter the data and to only include fishermen actively fishing the area.
- CM indicated that the list is useful in starting communication with other fishermen, however those that are not interested will not reply to any letters sent out via Marine Scotland.
- GJ mentioned that nationalities can be included in the list (i.e. Scottish, English, Northern Irish, etc.).
- SK asked if the list could be filtered by value.
- GJ stated that the data could be filtered by value, effort or weight.
- SR stated that days at sea (effort) would be the most useful.
- GJ highlighted that he would need to check to see if the effort could be shown in the database or just used as a filter.
- SK asked what the threshold would be.
- SR stated that vessels fishing over 10 days in the 3 year period should be included in the list.
- MM asked that a letter be sent to individuals on the list asking them if they would like to be included on the register.
- GJ highlighted that the group would need to draft a letter. Something similar was undertaken for the ScotMap project.
- GJ asked the group to check the PLN and vessel names in detail as sometimes they do not match what is registered.
- GJ summarised that he will extract the data to include vessels name, RSS number, PLN, nationality, days at sea, area fished and vessel length over a 3 year period. This will be sent to RR by the end of next week/beginning of the following week.
- BH asked if it was necessary to include every boat.
- NB stated that it would be useful to have all vessels fishing the area to best represent the current baseline.
- BH stated that not every vessel needs to be represented on the group.
- SK indicated that the register is useful as a guide and simply needs to be cross-checked with the Marine Scotland database to ensure nothing major has been missed. It is likely that the representation of the group will not need to be changed.

Actions

- GJ to refine list to include vessels name, RSS number, PLN, nationality, days at sea, area fished and vessel length over a 3 year period. GJ to send information to RR who will distribute to members for further feedback. Members to check data using local knowledge, in particular check the vessel names and PLNs.

Item 5: Monitoring meeting update

- RR explained the process BMM and the developers had gone through since the previous meeting. Meetings were held over the summer to agree a way forward with the monitoring sub-group. The first sub-group meeting was held in October with members who had expressed an interest at the previous Working Group meeting being invited to attend. MM was nominated as chair of the group. RR then asked MM to provide an update on what happened at the first meeting.
- MM provided an update on the monitoring meeting. The final outputs from the meeting were provided to members of the group in paper format. MM went on to say that from a fishing perspective, displacement is one of the biggest issues for fishermen. MM stated that, to date, not all potential impacts had been discussed, but the work is ongoing and another meeting is scheduled for the 5th December.

- SS stated that he felt the meeting was a bit vague, but pointed out that it was the first meeting he had attended.
- CM highlighted that the developers had spent a lot of time discussing the sub-group prior to the first meeting and the developers struggled to identify topics which could be monitored. It was decided at the meeting that fish stock monitoring cannot be dealt with by FTOWDG in isolation. The sub-group looked at work done by Marine Scotland and how they monitored fish stocks. The main output from the meeting was that monitoring needs to be focused on activities rather than stocks.
- MM stated that more work is required, however the group is getting somewhere.
- GJ highlighted that stocks are already assessed vigorously, however more work is required. Marine Scotland currently have a PhD student investigating the larval distribution of scallops, however the work will take 4 years to complete.
- JH questioned why Marine Scotland had not had any contact with the Scallop Association regarding scallop larval distribution and stated that PhD students had been working on something similar down south.
- GJ answered that the work has been through Mike Kaiser at Bangor University and GJ will check internally to see what the current status of the PhD work is. GJ will provide some feedback at the next monitoring meeting.
- GJ suggested that the group could be used to facilitate the study (i.e. use of scallop gear vessels for survey work), but there is no point in the group reassessing a full scallop stock assessment.
- CM highlighted that one of the issues of the discussion regarding displacement was how to measure any monitoring outputs. Further meetings will be needed to discuss this issue.
- SK indicated that there were only two worked through examples from the meeting and the plan for subsequent meetings is to work through further potential impacts. The group needs to agree what can be clearly identified and measured as potential monitoring options. It should be noted that the answer may be that certain issues cannot be monitored effectively. In some cases, even if it is possible to measure the outcome, it needs to be agreed how the data would be used.
- BM asked if renewable firms should be funding the collection of data additional to that collected by Marine Scotland.
- SK stated that this has been discussed. The issue with this is that data collected by wind farm companies around the UK tends to be limited to specific areas (i.e. those where the sites are located). This only provides snapshots of information whereas government agencies collect broader scale data over longer periods of time. There is a disconnect between the two due to the size of the areas covered. The cost associated with bringing these data sets together also needs to be considered. SK went on to discuss a conference that took place in Berlin which looked at the outcome of 5 years' worth of monitoring around offshore German windfarms. The conference highlighted that there were problems with addressing things that required a wider area of data (e.g. marine mammals).
- MM stated that the developers are expecting the projects to be in the area over a long period of time and therefore there is plenty of opportunity to collect data.
- SK stated that he agreed with this point and it is possible to monitor specific areas over longer periods of time, however attempting to monitor larger areas can lead to problems due to levels of uncertainty.
- SK stated that he would circulate the link to the German monitoring outcomes. The monitoring program tried to use control areas, however due to the natural variation between control sites it wasn't possible to finalise an answer.
- BH asked where it would leave the fishermen if it was deemed that the monitoring was not successful and didn't show anything.
- SK stated that it is possible that there may not be answers to questions, but it is better to be

upfront and to actually target things that can be done.

- GJ explained the Marine Scotland displacement project currently being undertaken. It will take into considered the potential displacement impact on fishing activities from the cumulative implementation of wind farms and marine protected areas. The outputs from the project will include a figure of value/weight potentially lost from an area due to displacement. The results will be modelled to see what impacts different scenarios will result in. It is possible for the group to provide inputs to the model to ensure it is as accurate as possible (e.g. how much fuel is used per fishing trip, where vessels travel to and from, etc.).
- JH highlighted a study that looked at a pipeline that ran from southern Scotland to Ireland through Manx waters. This study assessed the impact of displacement due to the pipeline on local fishing vessels. JH will forward the study to GJ.
- SR indicated that a SeaFish survey is undertaken every year and asked if this would be useful to Marine Scotland.
- GJ indicated that this work could potentially feed into the Marine Scotland work.
- SR highlighted that SeaFish have a large budget and Marine Scotland cannot expect the Working Group to collect this sort of data.
- GJ indicated that it would be the PhD student that would do the leg work, but it may be useful for the group to provide feedback.
- SS stated that if he is unable to fish his fishing grounds then he will lose his income.
- GJ highlighted that other fishing grounds could be fished and the model would work out loss of income from displacement.
- SK indicated that it is current unclear when construction work will be undertaken.
- BH stated that it is likely to be when fishermen want to fish.
- SK indicated that there is potential for work to be done during peak fishing seasons, but it will become clearer once the projects are consented. If it is the case that construction works and peak fishing periods overlap, then the developers will need to look at minimising the impact.
- SR highlighted that it is vessel providers that generally cause the biggest disruption as they are often not available or delayed.
- SK stated that uncertainties will always be present, it is how these are uncertainties will be managed that will be important.
- BH asked what would happen if a survey vessel is delayed and cause fishermen to move gear when they are not prepared to do so. How would this be mitigated?
- SK indicated that this would need further discussion.
- SR highlighted that lessons had been learnt from the Neart na Gaiithe surveys that had been undertaken over the summer/autumn.
- SS stated that the communication between the survey vessel and fishing vessels had been good during the survey.
- BH asked if the group cannot get the appropriate information for a monitoring baseline, how can monitoring be undertaken.
- SK indicated that this would be a key discussion point for the group and the group would need to be realistic about what can be measured. It is possible for certain aspects to be monitored, but annual variation can lead to uncertainty.
- JH stated that monitoring was a twofold process. Firstly, loss of fishing would occur during a specific period, therefore the group needs to agree a reference period. The second is the loss of fishing area.
- JH stated that there will be a cumulative impact on fishing activities as the majority of wind farms are located on prolific fishing grounds. JH stated that no consideration had been given to a cumulative impact and all wind farm developers need to discuss this.
- SK stated that this could be done on a UK level, but the FTOWDG cover the cumulative

impact on a regional basis. Fundamentally, it is UK policies/government discussion that is required to discuss cumulative impacts on a UK scale.

- JH queried why Marine Scotland has not looked into cumulative impacts.
- SK stated that marine spatial planning is ongoing and will include all offshore development. SK also stated that although the wind farm zones are generally large, the actual ground lost to fishing activity is much smaller.
- JH stated that oil operators have set up a fund for impacts on fishing activities as a result of oil operations. JH stated that there are lessons to be learnt from the oil and gas industry and that the wind farm developers should aim to do something similar.
- SK stated that the developers are engaging with fishing interests early in the process and to date, no Scottish offshore wind farm developments have achieved consent and therefore the developers are also dealing with uncertainties.
- CM stated that disruption payments have worked well in the area and lessons have been learnt.
- BH asked what would happen to fishermen who lose grounds as they do not wish to fish operational wind farm sites due to them perceiving there to be a health and safety risk. What mitigation would be available?
- GJ highlighted that there are also benefits to fishermen from a decline in activity in operational wind farm sites as stocks in the site will move into surrounding areas. GJ went on to say that it is important the group discuss transiting routes to allow fishing outside of the site.
- GJ asked if the monitoring sub-group needs to include reference periods. It was agreed that this would be discussed at the next monitoring meeting.

Action:

- GJ to provide feedback on the Marine Scotland scallop larval surveys at the next monitoring meeting.
- SK to circulate the link to the German monitoring outcomes.
- RR to add reference periods to the monitoring meeting agenda.
- RR to distribute outcomes of the October monitoring meeting to the Working Group members.

Item 7: Trip to a windfarm update

- RR explained that a trip to the Beatrice demonstrator project had been arranged in October, however due to lack of interest the trip could not go ahead.
- SS stated that he felt it was not worth going to see a demonstrator project.
- RS asked if the members would be willing to go further afield to see a full operational wind farm site. The members agreed that this would be acceptable. It was agreed that a trip would be organised over a weekend in March or early April 2014.
- GJ stated that it would not be a good idea to visit the Solway wind farm as there is no fishing activity there.
- RS indicated that the selected wind farm does not necessarily have to be one of the developers own as, to date, only SSE have operational wind farms.
- SK highlighted that if a trip was arranged for March next year, then there will be potential for delays to occur and the group should be aware of this beforehand.

Action:

- RR to look at logistics of organising a trip to an operational wind farm and discuss with developers

Item 8: Scallop gear trials update

- RR mentioned that an action from the previous meeting was for Marine Scotland to discuss

national scallop gear trials internally.

- GJ indicated that there would be no national trials undertaken by Marine Scotland, although Marine Scotland are involved with helping MORL develop a methodology and funding is being provided, along with TCE. The trials that are taking place in the Moray Firth could be applied to other areas.
- NB asked what the timescales of the MORL trials are.
- GJ indicated that the timescales are currently unknown. A methodology has been sent through to Marine Scotland for review.
- JH stated that it was planned to have a methodology finalised by the end of the month and Mike Kaiser is looking for a PhD student to run the project. It is possible for the trials to start next year depending on weather (March to May).
- MM stated that as the Forth and Tay wind farm developments are located on scallop grounds it may be beneficial for the developers to look into the trials. The process is twofold, to look at the different types of gear available and to see how the gear interacts with cables.
- CM asked how gears are going to be trialled.
- JH indicated that there would be 3 to 4 different gear types.
- SK highlighted that Repsol is involved in the trials as they are a partner in MORL. SK asked if the trials are being progressed quickly enough.
- JH stated that the trials were originally planned for September 2012, however they were postponed until 2013 but still did not take place. JH then suggested to MORL that Mike Kaiser get involved with the methodology.
- JH stated that it makes sense to trial a range of sites as they will include a range of seabed types. The developers should discuss this internally once more information becomes available.
- CM has spoken to Peter Moore at MORL regarding the previous methodology. CM to speak to Peter and get an update to circulate to the developers and group.
- CM asked if there was an approach to encourage scallop fishermen to use the gear once the trials are concluded.
- JH stated that the trials may highlight the ecological benefits of the gear and if the gear is found to be suitable for the sites in question then grants could be made available.

Actions

- CM to speak to Peter Moore regarding scallop gear trials and circulate information to developers and group.

Item 9: Over-trawlability surveys

- JW presented the SFF over-trawlability surveys to the group.
- SK asked how long the method has been used for.
- JW stated that the first trials had taken place in 1997/1998 over pipelines.
- SK asked how the gates are designed. Did the SFF sit down with the developer? Was there a process the SFF went through to determine the location of the gates?
- JW stated that they looked at the area to be trawled relative to fishing activity and then showed the developer where the high levels of fishing activity were located along the pipeline. The developer then checked their survey data and how it corresponded to the proposed gate locations.
- SS asked if the gates were a short term solution and eventually fishing would be able to resume along the length of a pipeline/cable.
- JW indicated that this was the case.
- SS asked what would happen if cables run parallel to trawl patterns.
- JW said that there would not be any need for gates. In this instance, it would require a review of plotter tracks and a discussion of how to best work the area. The SFF attempted to

undertake trials along cable routes, but the survey vessel could not build up enough speed along the route to clear the ground.

- JW stated that once gates are opened, charts are issued to fishing associations to show the location of the gates, with the information eventually being available on plotter systems.

Actions

- RR to distribute presentation slides.

Item 10: Marine mammals and ornithology mitigation/monitoring

- RR explained that MM had requested for marine mammal and ornithology mitigation/monitoring to be added to the agenda for discussion at the meeting.
- MM stated that fishing interests often feel left out of the funding made available to other aspects of an impact assessment.
- SK explained that there are generally three key areas which developers concentrate on, these being birds, mammals and fish. There is then the added distinction of the human element in fishing activities.
- SK stated that there are currently no specific definitions of monitoring/mitigation being considered for birds and mammals.
- BH stated that fishermen often feel they are not as important as birds or mammals.
- SK explained that some species have protected status and therefore they have to be addressed as part of the assessment.
- CM added that there are some fish species that have similar protection e.g. salmon and sea trout. The size of each ES chapter is as required by policies in place and it may therefore seem that some chapters have had more input than others, however this is only due to what is required and is not reflective of the funding available.
- NB added that the process up to consent is generally weighted towards environmental aspects. Once consented, the focus will change towards outputs from the Working Group.
- BH asked what is the most important aspect from Marine Scotland's point of view.
- BB stated that it is a combination of all elements.
- SK added that the assessment is a combination of over 20 topics that have to be addressed.
- SR stated that it is unlikely fishermen's perception of being swept aside will change.
- GJ noted that the assessment is heavily impacted by topics which have a human element to them. For example, the site layout is heavily influenced by the MCA. Mitigation can be discussed as part of the Working Group for fisheries.

Item 11: Community benefit

- RR explained that MM had requested for community benefit to be added to the agenda for discussion at the meeting.
- MM stated that community benefits had been mentioned at a meeting in Edinburgh.
- RS highlighted that this was an early stage Neart na Gaiithe consultation meeting for their Community Investment Fund and went on to describe why they had the meeting and what it was about.
- RS confirmed that nothing had been committed to or finalised regarding the fund.
- BH asked if there were outputs available from the meeting.
- RS indicated she would look into distributing these.
- MM indicated that it was important that fishing interests were invited to these meetings as the community is the fishermen impacted by the developments.
- RS stated that the FIRs were invited and that this is the first stage and the process will be ongoing.
- SR stated that Jim Evans had attended in his place.
- Both NB and SK stated that Seagreen and Repsol do not currently have a position on community benefit as the situation for offshore developments is different to that for

onshore developments where these benefits have been previously used.

- RS stated that Neart na Gaiithe are still in the consultation stage of the Community Investment Fund and it is not planned for the fund to go public until a later date.
- SK mentioned that community benefits come from the development of onshore wind farms and that the model used may not be suitable for offshore developments. SK went on to say that Repsol are happy to be involved in conversations regarding community benefits but it must be clear that what has been done onshore is not the same process as that being undertaken offshore. Repsol will continue this dialogue as part of the wider discussion.
- GJ highlighted a meeting in York which discussed commercial fisheries and offshore wind farms. The meeting included a discussion on community benefits. It has been used as mitigation for local fishermen who have experienced an increase in their steaming times due to offshore developments. The wind farm company paid to install a fuel berth in the harbour. Operation and maintenance vessels were able to use the fuel berth and the fishermen benefited from reduced fuel costs.
- MM suggested discussing community benefits on a strategic level as part of the Working Group.

Actions

- RS to look into distributing outputs from Community Investment Fund consultation event.

Item 12: AOB

- RS raised the issue of the Dunbar representation on the Working Group. The DFA have been in touch with both RS and RR as they do not feel they are represented on the group.
- Both NW (local fishermen) and SR (FIR) cover the area and it was agreed by all that each port should only have one representative.
- RR noted that minutes are forwarded to the DFA.

Actions

- RS to speak to DFA regarding outcome of the vote.

Item 13: Date of next meeting

- SK suggested a brief update on the projects to give an idea of when the developers expect to achieve consent and how this could impact on the date of the next meeting.
- Repsol are expecting to have a decision on the project by the end of March.
- Seagreen do not have a definite timescale, but their own expectation is similar to Repsol's. Marine Scotland are currently going through the consent process for the BOWL and MORL developments in the Moray Firth and the outcome from these developments will act as a guide for the Forth and Tay developments.
- MM requested that the Marine Scotland licensing team be present at the Working Group meetings.
- BB indicated that they can arrange for MSLOT to be present at the Fishing Focus meeting.
- MM indicated that from his point of view, MSLOT should be present at the Working Group meetings.
- GJ suggested that if there is a request specific to MSLOT then he can ask them to attend.
- CM indicated that past the determination stage it may become easier for MSLOT to attend the meetings.
- It was agreed that the next meeting will be confirmed at a later date, but could tie in with the trip to a wind farm. All members to send RR dates they cannot attend in March/April 2014.

Actions

- All to send dates to RR for next meeting.

- RR to confirm date, location and agenda for next meeting.