

**STRATEGIC REGIONAL COASTAL MONITORING PROGRAMME FOR THE  
SOUTH WEST (SWRSCMP) – PHASE 2**

**Notes of Project Board Meeting No 9 of the Project Board, held at 1030 hrs on  
Friday 16 May 2014, at TDC Offices, Old Forde House, Brunel Road, Newton  
Abbot, Devon**

Present:

John Cocker [JC] (Chair)  
Gordon Trapmore [GT]  
Nick Lyness [NL]  
Phil Rees [PR]  
Andy Bradbury [AB]  
Simon Humphry [SH]  
Keith Cole [KC]

Teignbridge DC  
EA Area FCRM Manager (Devon & Cornwall)  
EA Area FCRM Manager (Wessex)  
Chair SW Coastal Group  
New Forest DC (CCO Partners)  
Teignbridge DC  
Project Technical Secretary (CCPL)

<p>1.</p>	<p><b><u>Apologies for Absence</u></b></p> <p>1.1 Dave Harris [DH] Monmouthshire CC (Chair Severn Estuary CAG) Neil Baglow [NB] Teignbridge DC</p>	
<p>2.</p>	<p><b><u>Approval of Notes of the Previous Meeting No 8 – (Any Corrections?)</u></b></p> <p>2.1 It should be noted that in <b>BAR27</b> it should read “2014 Autumn Topo Survey” (not Spring Topo Survey).</p> <p>2.2 There were no other corrections and the notes of the previous meeting were approved.</p> <p>2.3 It was noted that Jim Hutchison had now left the EA and that the Notes should no longer be sent to him for information. (It was agreed that Alison Baptiste should be asked (by KC) as to whether she wished to now become the silent attendee for EA National and receive the Notes, for information.)</p>	<p>KC</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b><u>Notes of the Previous Meeting No 8 – Matters Arising and Actions Log Outcomes</u></b></p> <p>3.1 The following action outcomes were noted:</p> <p><b>BAR23</b> – Action Complete. As per paper to be tabled by SH later in the meeting. (Need to ensure that this is also sent out electronically.)</p> <p><b>BAR24</b> – Action Complete. See reference in heading under Progress Report.</p> <p><b>BAR26</b> – Action Complete. GT has noted and will now take the wording of <i>Resolution BR11</i> to open discussions with the EA Midlands Region by the commencement of Phase 3 contents build up.</p>	<p>SH/KC</p>

<i>Item</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Action By</i>
	<p><b>BAR27</b> – Complete.</p> <p><b>BAR28</b> – Ongoing. The Project Team still intends to look into how a 20% reduction in the SW Programme might be achieved for Phase 3, in consultation with its partners (SDADCAG, CISCAG, NDASCAG and SECAG), but discussions were frustrated by partners needing to deal with outcomes of this winter’s weather.</p> <p><b>BAR29</b> – Complete. KC did trawl around and establish what other coastal meetings had already been arranged in the SW for 2014 and, as requested, produced a calendar of meeting dates for the SWRSCMP2 Project Board and Project Team for 2014. (The Itinerary of Dates produced from the trawling exercise had also been typed up by KC and sent around to a number of colleagues. (JC and PR thanked Keith for sending the Itinerary out, as they were sure that it would prove to be a useful reference.)</p> <p><u>Deferred Matter Arising – Refreshing of ToR (now complete).</u></p> <p>3.2 KC advised that, following recent structural changes in partner organisations, he had now drawn up revisions to refresh the ToR and Governance (personnel) docs. The Revised Drafts are included in Agenda Item 4 for discussion and/or endorsement at this meeting.</p> <p>3.3 The Board reps had read through the suggested changes. NL said that he would like to see a reference to “Incident Management” included within the ToR. With the agreement that this be added, the ToR were approved and JC asked KC to circulate the revised ToR to all the Project Board and the Project Team representatives, for information.</p> <p><b>New Action Request BAR30</b> – KC to circulate a copy of the revised Terms of Reference to all the Project Board and Project Team reps, for information.</p>	PT
<p>4.</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p>	<p><b><u>Current Status of SW Monitoring Programme</u></b></p> <p><u>Resolutions Log</u></p> <p>The Board noted that no new Resolutions were raised at the last meeting to be added to the log.</p> <p><u>Actions Request Log</u></p> <p>KC explained that 4 No new actions (BAR26 to 29) had been added to the log, the outcomes/status of which are detailed above and noted in the Actions Request Log.</p>	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Action By</i>
5.	<p><b><u>TDC/PCO Progress Reports to the Project Board</u></b></p> <p><i>SH (explained that NB had already booked his holiday when this date was chosen, so sends his apologies for not being present on this occasion) and SH then presented the progress report on tasks carried out since the last Board Meeting (see paper attached with the Agenda papers) – the highlights of which are as follows:</i></p>	
5.1	<p><b><u>1. Overview</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The South West Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme is currently on target to complete all this years work packages within the time frames and within budget.</li> <li>• Only one contractor is being closely monitored for performance and a decision point will be reached next week which will incorporate options for improved working.</li> </ul>	
5.2	<p><b><u>2. Topo Contracts</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spring interim surveys for TSW03 (Land’s End to Hartland Point) and TSW04 (Hartland Point to Beachley) have been completed, accepted by PCO and sent for upload to the website.</li> <li>• All data for TSW01 (Portland Bill to Start Point) and TSW02 (Gribbin Head to Land’s End) has been collected.</li> <li>• All spring interim surveys have been completed in TSWPCO (Start Point to Gribbin Head) and sent for upload to the website</li> </ul>	
5.3	<p><b><u>3. Bathy Contracts</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas for this year’s Bathy work are currently being reviewed with the possibility of using Aerial Bathy to survey the Isles of Scilly.</li> </ul>	
5.4	<p><b><u>4. LiDAR Contracts</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LiDAR season started slowly due to poor weather conditions but in recent weeks both contractors Blom and Geomatics have made good progress. The high priority area requested from Land’s End to Harland Point was completed first where weather conditions allowed.</li> </ul>	
5.5	<p><b><u>5. Aerial Photography Contracts</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The capture of the outstanding areas is now underway for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Isles of Scilly</li> <li>- Weston Super Mare to Beachley</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
5.6	<p><b><u>6. Waves and Tides</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recent storms caused a number of buoys and sites to be</li> </ul>	

<i>Item</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Action By</i>
	<p>damaged, also some of the buoys went AWOL which were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teignmouth Pier</li> <li>- Perranporth</li> <li>- Torbay</li> <li>- Porthleven</li> <li>- Chesil</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to the good coverage the remaining buoys in the network provided invaluable data for flood warning during the storms.</li> <li>• All buoys have been re-deployed, but we are still awaiting power to be restored to Teignmouth</li> </ul>	
5.7	<p><u>7. Ecological Mapping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues regarding copyright have been encountered and are being resolved in order to make the data freely available and avoid the issues faced with Phase 1's Ecological Mapping.</li> </ul>	
5.8	<p><u>8. PCO Office</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The team were busy at the start of the year along with the programme contractors completing post storm surveys in order to capture the data for/from the winter storm events.</li> <li>• Nathan Sykes was leaving PCO in June to emigrate to New Zealand and Emerald Siggery had been appointed to take over as Office Manager, with her post to be advertised in the near future.</li> </ul>	
5.9	<p><u>9. Finance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The financial management of the Programme is currently working within this year's approved budget (2014/15) see attached tables.</li> </ul>	
5.10	<p>There followed considerable discussion, prompted by the above reported items, of which the following points are of note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NL said that he was very impressed with the swiftly produced Summary Paper that CCO had provided to the EA following the winter storms. This had been useful in persuading decision makers to provide emergency budget allocations locally and wondered whether PCO planned to produce a similar paper. If not, it would be useful if there could be liaison with CCO to see if a similar paper could be produced.</li> <li>• GT said that, although he was aware that PCO had provided information to the EA as and when requested, he agreed that it would be useful if this could be a more proactive response – as had occurred at CCO. AB said he could speak with the PCO Team if required.</li> <li>• JC said that he had been made aware of the desires and needs of the EA in this regard (and specific assistance had been provided when requested - particularly at Dawlish/Dawlish Warren). He had already been in discussion with NB, SH and the PCO Team to look into how the CCO approach might be achieved for the recent storms</li> </ul>	

Item	Description	Action By
	<p>and in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC said that he was also aware that NB had advised that he was intending to have a fresh look at the PCO Team objectives, in consultation with local partners and no doubt a change to a more proactive approach would be one of those new objectives.</li> <li>• GT said he was pleased to hear of the plans by NB, which appeared to be a sensible way forward at this time in the Programme, as he would like to see PCO move from a “data gathering and comparison role” to a more proactive “interpretation, guidance and assistance role.” It would be useful if initial thoughts on this and the Summary Paper mentioned above could be brought back to the next Board Meeting, in July.</li> <li>• JC agreed and confirmed that he had already made tentative plans to meet with NB, SH and the PCO Team in the near future, to talk through some imposed changes on the PCO Team (e.g. Nathan Sykes leaving and Emerald Siggery taking over as Office Manager as per above) and this would be an appropriate time to also consider the above items.</li> <li>• With regard to the budget, JC said that it was good news and commendable that the Programme was still on target, with deliverables as envisaged and with £146K (unallocated) available, at present.</li> <li>• PR said that he would like to see a proportion of the “unallocated budget” used for more formal education/marketing of the “good news” story about the coastal data gathered/recorded - and the future benefit that this Monitoring Programme provides. AB said that he would like CCO to be involved in the PCO discussions in taking this idea forward, because he was also considering a similar exercise to demonstrate to the EA Board the benefits locally and to the Nation that are being received from the National Monitoring Programmes.</li> <li>• GT agreed and said that it would also be useful to receive feedback from the whole Project Team on what additional items of work any surplus budget could be used for within or without the current Programme.</li> </ul>	
5.11	<p>As a consequence of the above discussions, the following resolution/actions were agreed:</p> <p><b>New Resolution R12</b> – That the Project Board thanks Nathan Sykes for his valuable contribution to the PCO Team since its inception &amp; as its Office Manager. The Board endorses the appointment of Emerald Siggery, from within the PCO Team, as the new PCO Office Manager.</p> <p><b>New Action Request BAR31</b> – PCO, in discussion with CCO, consider producing a Paper summarising the outcomes from the 2013/14 storms on locations within the SW Programme, for presentation to the next Project Board.</p> <p><b>New Action Request BAR32</b> – PCO, in discussion with CCO, consider and report back to the Board on ways in which the monitoring data can be</p>	<p>PCO</p> <p>PCO</p>

<i>Item</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Action By</i>
	<p>developed educationally and/or marketed, so as to demonstrate the benefits of the Programme, both locally and to the Nation.</p> <p><b><i>New Action Request BAR33</i></b> – The Project Team consider and report back to the Board, on any worthwhile additional items of work that could be included within this Phase 2 Programme (should the unallocated budget continue to be available).</p>	PT
<p><b>6.</b></p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p> <p>6.5</p> <p>6.6</p>	<p><b><u>National Coastal Monitoring</u></b></p> <p>AB advised that he had been asked by the EA to carry out a Review of the current phases (for which the South’s phase ends next year – being one year in advance of the others).</p> <p>One of the Review’s aims is to attempt to get an idea of average or unit costs for the various elements, so as to be even more accurate when estimating for the future phases.</p> <p>For example, we now know how much the wavebuoys have cost, to purchase and to maintain - also, how many have been lost and how frequently. In truth, with only one or two exceptions, they have all exceeded their originally envisaged life and so we know that the cost per year for wavebuoys is probably less now than when the Programmes started.</p> <p>It was originally envisaged that he would be reporting back (after liaising locally), on whether there was an ongoing need for the current buoys in their current locations – or at all. Whereas, following the recent storms and the invaluable use that was made of the buoys for incident management, there did not now appear to be a desire to reduce the number of buoys - as their deployment was now considered to be crucial.</p> <p>With regard to Topo surveys, there are some justified questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “As we will soon have been surveying for 10 years, how much more topo do we need to do at the current beach locations?”</li> <li>• “Should we be considering topo at other beach locations?”</li> <li>• “Are there new needs to consider e.g. slope/cliff topos?”</li> <li>• “Are there new methods that could be used instead of conventional topo surveys?” (e.g. Horizontal LiDAR.)</li> </ul> <p>Similarly with Bathy surveys, we need to ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Have we got enough data now?”</li> <li>• “Are we happy with the quality/quantity? i.e. Are there any gaps?”</li> <li>• “Do we need more multi-beam?”</li> </ul>	



<i>Item</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Action By</i>
8.4	<p><i>“The 2013/14 Winter Storms and PCO Assistance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>What did we do right?</i></li> <li>- <i>What did we do wrong?</i></li> <li>- <i>How could we provide better assistance in the future?”</i></li> </ul> <p>KC said that, listening today to many of the discussions above and particularly with regard to flights often being hamstrung (or abandoned) due to season and weather windows needing to match (vegetation etc) needs for ecological mapping, prompted him to ask 2 simple questions.</p>	
8.5	<p>Firstly “Is there still an ongoing need for ecological mapping (have we now mapped what we needed to)?” and Secondly “Is the data being recovered actually being used by anybody at the EA? – as we were advised some time ago (by Lyn) that Lyn Jenkins is no longer to be emailed as part of the Project Team.</p>	
8.6	<p>These proved to be good questions, as nobody was able to answer them. NL agreed to take an action on this, enquire at the EA and report back to the next meeting – as follows:</p> <p><b><i>New Action Request BAR35</i></b> – NL to make general enquiries within his own Teams and at National, to establish whether there was still an ongoing need for ecological mapping (flights)? and, if so, who was using the data gathered? and for what?</p>	
8.7	<p>There were no other items of AOB.</p>	
9.	<p><b><u>Proposed Calendar of Meetings</u></b></p> <p>9.1 It appeared that the attempt to arrange for all future meetings to be held on Thursdays (rather than Tuesdays), may not suit all. However, it was agreed that this should continue to be the aim, but with flexibility as and when required.</p> <p>9.2 As a result, after consulting diaries, the original suggested date of Thursday 10 July 2014 was changed to Friday 11 July 2014 and so the following calendar of dates was established for 2014. (KC would distribute the dates by email).</p> <p><u>Project Board Meetings</u></p> <p>Friday 11 July 2014 Thursday 13 November 2014</p> <p><u>Project Team Meetings</u></p> <p>Thursday 12 June 2014 Thursday 25 Sept 2014</p>	<p>KC</p> <p>All to note in diaries</p>

*Item*

*Description*

*Action By*