

M I N U T E S

PICKERING PROGRAMME BOARD

Thursday 17 December 2009 – 10.00-12.00 – Forestry Commission, Pickering

Attendees

Jeremy Walker	- Chairman of the Pickering Programme Board
Tom Nisbet	- Head of Changing Physical Environment Research Programme, Forest Research
Vince Carter	- Regional Development Manager, Forestry Commission
Cllr Brian Baker	- Town Mayor of Pickering
Simon Marrington	- Pickering Programme Manager, Forestry Commission
Crispin Thorn	- Regional Director, Forestry Commission
Peter Welsh	- Area Manager North, Natural England
Paul Murby	- Flood Management Programme, Defra
Nick Odoni	- Durham University
Jeff Pacey	- Ouse Catchment Project Manager, Environment Agency
Andy Wilson	- Chief Executive, North York Moors National Park Authority
Cllr Peter Sowray	- North Yorkshire County Council
Alan Eves	- Forest Management Director, Forestry Commission
Paul Cresswell	- Ryedale District Council

Apologies

Craig McGarvey	- Yorkshire Area Manager, Environment Agency
----------------	--

1 **Introductions**

Jeremy welcomed all partners to the second meeting of the Slowing the Flow at Pickering Programme Board.

2 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

These were agreed as being a correct record.

3 **Matters Arising / Action Points**

Development of success criteria – yet to be undertaken.

Action 1 – PDG to circulate draft success criteria for comment by end of January.

It was noted that all other actions from the July meeting had been completed.

4 **Overview of Progress to Date**

Tom Nisbet ran through progress to date based on the 2nd quarterly report to Defra (copy appended to the minutes). Key issues raised were the slight delays in completing the modelling work for both land management options and the bundled

storage option, and the delay in securing additional funding from Yorkshire Forward for woodland creation.

Key discussion points:

- Consideration to the creation of upstream storage at Hag Scar on the River Severn has proved unsuccessful due to the nature of the catchment. A clear narrative is needed to explain this in order to inform local people at the planned flooding workshop being held at Sinnington on January 12th

Action 2 – JP to develop a clear note to explain the issues around creation of the bunded storage option on the River Seven

- It was noted that the impracticality of creating bunded storage on the River Seven highlights the importance of exploring land management options to reduce flood risk at Sinnington.
- Yorkshire Forward match funding for woodland creation schemes has yet to be finally secured, but funding should be available from April 2010.
- Dredging of rivers to increase conveyance was also discussed. It was noted that EA are to set up some national pilots to demonstrate the benefits and limitations of dredging, and that a clear explanation is needed to explain why this option is not being actively considered at Pickering.

Action 3 – JP to develop briefing note to explain the issues around dredging of rivers and flood risk management

- The Chair enquired what impacts the delay in completing the modelling might have on the programme as a whole. TN explained that it was not anticipated that this would have a significant impact as implementation of options was always planned to take place in 2010/11 and modelling results should still be available in time to inform that process.
- It was noted that time would still be needed to consult and secure both permissions and funding for individual proposals, so there was pressure to complete and circulate the modelling outputs as soon as possible.

5. Catchment Riparian Intervention Measures (CRIMs)

Nick Odoni circulated a paper outlining the modelling work that Durham University has undertaken so far to evaluate and identify priorities for riparian tree planting and creation of large woody debris (LWD) dams. The Overflow model developed at Durham seeks to optimise both the reduction in height of the flood peak and the total volume of flood water. Both measures are effective but LWD dams exert a larger impact than the trees themselves. Preliminary results suggesting temporary storage capacity in the region of 100,000m³ might be created with a significant reduction in the flood peak. Potential sites for creating LWD dams within Cropton Forest have yet to be added to the model.

Key discussion points:

- The possible biodiversity implications of LWDs were discussed but from studies elsewhere it was felt that these could well be positive.
- Possible liabilities associated with LWDs were raised, both in terms of potential increased flooding of adjacent land and of LWD becoming dislodged and causing problems downstream. Planning permission was not felt to be an issue but consent would be needed from the Environment Agency. The risk of 'wash out' is thought to be greater where the number of LWD dams is small – greater numbers

- TN reminded the meeting that the initial proposal was to create 100 LWD dams within Cropton Forest. The plan was to let dams develop naturally within newly planted riparian woodland but the modelling work by Durham suggests that it would be worthwhile accelerating their formation through dam creation. This would greatly increase the potential number of LWD dams across the catchment and necessitate additional funding if they are all to be realised.
- Durham University hopes to undertake a similar CRIM modelling exercise next spring in the Seven catchment using a research student. The original proposal was to create 50 LWD dams in the part of Cropton Forest that drains to this catchment.
- The structure of Ropery Bridge in Pickering was briefly discussed and a request made for discussions to be held with North Yorkshire County Council Highways Department to explore possible options for increasing its capacity to convey flood flows.

Action 4 – JP to contact NYCC Highways Dept to discuss Ropery Bridge.

Action 5 - NO to complete modelling of CRIM's, including those in Cropton Forest and report findings by end January

6. Bunded Storage Option

Jeff Pacey outlined the modelling work undertaken to date. The first computer analysis that sought to combine models dealing with both the hydrology of the channel and floodwater storage on the floodplain failed to work. A revised model is being built and should be ready by Christmas. This will seek to provide an optimised solution for both storage capacity and cost, taking into account the need to protect the railway.

It is probable that the final solution will involve two bunds the locations of which have yet to be agreed with landowners.

Constraints on the number, size and placement of the bunds means it is thought unlikely that this option will provide sufficient storage to prevent flooding for equivalent events to the 2007 flood, but protection would be possible for smaller, more frequent floods. The priority for unprotected properties would be to make them more flood resilient.

Key discussion points:

- There is a need to understand the trade-offs between costs, benefits and incentives for landowners.
- Discussions are on-going with the railway in terms of what they can offer to the project, the direct risks from flooding, and the potential downstream benefits in terms of reduced flooding at Pickering.
- Funding for the bunds – there is a need to continue discussions with possible funding partners. Any contribution from Ryedale Council would require a decision from the full Council.
- PM requested that the lessons learned from the modelling work for the bunds be disseminated to the wider water industry through EA nationally. PM also asked

- The Chair noted that the modelling work is taking the project forward but requested a full update by the next Board meeting so decisions can be made. If necessary, the next Board meeting could be brought forward, or opinions on options canvassed outside the formal meeting.

Action 6 – JP to keep the Chair informed on the modelling work around the bunded storage option, including any need to seek a quick decision on options or support for funding.

7. Communications and Media Engagement

Simon Marrington outlined the communications activity that had taken place since the July meeting of the Board. These included:

- Community Engagement event on September 28th - 84 attendees, generally very positive. Most people want to be kept informed but only two people expressed an interest in joining a Community Advisory Group. It was agreed to invite these two people to attend the quarterly Wider Delivery Group meetings. PM made the point that it was still essential to involve and seek the advice of the local community as the project develops but it was agreed to try and achieve this through the nominated community representatives.
- Landowner Engagement Event, 9 December – this was a joint Slowing the Flow and Catchment Sensitive Farming event. 100+ invitations sent out but only 4 landowners attended. It was agreed that future landowner engagement should be pursued by direct contact guided by the priorities generated by the computer modelling.
- Press coverage – recent coverage included an article in the Yorkshire Post, a wider piece on flood issues on Look North, and a radio interview for the Radio 4 'You and Yours' programme. An article describing the project had recently been published in the trade magazine for the UK forest industries, Forestry & Timber News, copies of which were circulated at the meeting.
- Website – new constraints on setting up independent websites means that this would now be developed on the Forest Research website by the end of January, with links set up to and from partner websites.
- PM requested that a log be kept of all press coverage.

Action 7 – SM & TN to develop the Slowing the Flow website, and keep a log of all media coverage achieved by the project.

8. Any Other Business

AW requested that the project should seek to quantify the flood risk benefit from the CRIMs, storage bunds, and other land management measures. It would be helpful if this could be related back to previous flood events to make it more understandable for the local community.

Action 8 – JP & TN to develop ideas on how the flood risk benefit of separate measures might be illustrated, and how this could be incorporated into the development of success criteria for the project.

PM reminded the Board that the objective of the project was also to capture the wider benefits of land management measures implemented to reduce flood risk.

Action 9 – TN to consider how to capture information about the multiple benefits of the proposed land management measures and incorporate these within the success criteria.

JW raised the issue about communicating the project to a wider audience, and that this might include update reports to the RFDC and papers to the national Defra/EA conference on flooding in June. TN informed the meeting about a proposed poster to be developed for the River Restoration Centre conference in York in June.

Action 10 – JW to explore options for contributing to the national Defra/EA conference in June and to liaise with TN to take this forward.

JP raised the possibility of incorporating work to improve the resilience of properties in Pickering into the Slowing the Flow project.

Action 11 – JP to bring proposals to the next meeting about incorporating flood resilience work into the project

9. Date of Next Meeting

Dates in May to be circulated

Agreed Actions:

1. PDG to circulate draft success criteria for comment by end of January.
2. JP to develop a clear note to explain the issues around creation of the bunded storage option on the River Seven
3. JP to develop briefing note to explain the issues around dredging of rivers and flood risk management
4. JP to contact NYCC Highways Dept to discuss Ropery Bridge.
5. NO to complete modelling of CRIM's, including those in Cropton Forest and report findings by end January
6. JP to keep the Chair informed on the modelling work around the bunded storage option, including any need to seek a quick decision on options or support for funding.
7. SM & TN to develop the Slowing the Flow website, and develop a log of media coverage achieved by the project.
8. JP & TN to develop ideas on how the flood risk benefit of proposals might be illustrated, and how this might feed into the development of success criteria for the project.
9. TN to consider how to capture information about the multiple benefits of the proposed land management measures and incorporate within the success criteria.
10. JW to explore options for contributing to the national Defra/EA conference in June and to liaise with TN to take this forward.
11. JP to bring proposals to the next meeting about incorporating flood resilience work into the project

Multi-objective Flood Management Demo Project	Project Code	Project name	Date
	RMP5455	Slowing the Flow at Pickering	15/12/09

Project Delivery Status:		
	RAG Status*	Trend
Time	GREEN	↓
Resources	BLUE	→
Risks	BLUE	→
Issues	BLUE	→

Highlights	
<u>This Quarter (Sept-Nov 09):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commenced model evaluation of potential sites for planting riparian woodland and establishing large woody debris (LWD) dams (Milestone 4). Further modelling undertaken by JBA and preferred sites for bunded storage measure assessed. Investigated bund 	<u>Next Quarter (Dec 09 – Feb 10):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft list of success criteria for project, including multiple benefits. Complete model evaluation, agree preferred sites and finalise site selection for measurers (Milestones 4, 6 & 9). Model impact of planting floodplain woodland in River Seven catchment.

<p>Stakeholder relations</p>	<p>BLUE</p>	<p>→</p>	<p>design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Held further one-one meetings with partners, landowners and interest groups to discuss potential sites for demonstration measures. • Commenced survey of watercourses within Cropton Forest to establish location of existing LWD dams and potential sites for new dams • Held Community Engagement Event (28/09/09); decision made not to form a Community Advisory Group but instead invite representatives to sit on the PDG • Organised local 'Farm Measures' workshop with Yorkshire Derwent Catchment Sensitive Farming Officer to promote demonstration measures (to be held on 09/12/09). • Held third meeting of Programme Delivery Group (PDG) (27/11/09)(Milestone 5). • Presentation to Multiobjective Project Workshop in Peterborough (15/10/09) and FC Regional Advisory Committee (24/11/09). • Submitted 1200 word article on project to Forestry and Timber News (main trade magazine for private forestry sector). • Interviews with media to promote project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete survey of watercourses within Cropton Forest to assess potential sites for new LWD dams. • Undertake moorland drain survey and determine preferred method for blocking. • Install hydrologic gauging equipment and establish water quality sampling network (Milestone 7). • Hold local 'Farm Measures' workshop to promote demonstration measures (09/12/09). • Review responses to consultation on Cropton Forest Design Plan and consider measures to reduce flood risk. • Draft guidance on woodland planting design and management to reduce flood flows. • Contribute to BBC Radio 4 You and Yours programme on flood management. • Publish article on project in Forestry and Timber News. • Design and launch project website. • Hold second meeting of Programme Board (17/12/09) and fourth meeting of wider PDG (19/02/09)(Milestone 8).
-------------------------------------	-------------	----------	---	---

Exception Reporting Against Project Plan

Delay in completing modelling work to identify preferred sites for floodplain and riparian woodland, and constructing large woody debris dams and flood storage bunds: Floodplain woodland modelling delayed by licensing issue with EA over LiDAR data (now resolved) and by difficulty in securing land owner interest (needed before undertaking cross section surveys to facilitate modelling work – two sites/land owners now identified). Riparian woodland and LWD dam modelling delayed by need for further model development (completed) and extended analyses. Preferred sites now identified (Milestone 4), with land ownership and final selection to be completed in next quarter (Milestones 6 & 9). Modelling of flood storage bunds affected by software error (alternative model now run and results to be reported in next quarter) The delay in identifying sites has put back time scale for installing instrumentation to capture their effects (Milestone 7). Significant time and effort spent promoting project through media, including television, radio, press and trade magazine. List to date: Television: interviewed for local BBC TV

programme but material not used; Radio: interviewed for Radio 4 'You and Yours' programme (due for airing at end 2009); Press: articles in York Press on 12/06/09, Scarborough Evening Post on 07/08/09, and Yorkshire Post (31/07/09 & 08/12/09). Trade Magazine: article in December issue of 'Forestry and Timber News' (pp10-11) (main trade magazine for UK forest industries). Milestone summary: completed 1,2,3&5; partially completed 4&8; hope to complete in next quarter 4,6,7,8&9.

Current Risks

Description	Status (HML)	Consequence	Countermeasures	Trend
One or more partners default on supplementary funding. Main risks concern the application to Yorkshire Forward for top-up funding for woodland planting and the EA obtaining sufficient funding for the bunded storage option.	M	Insufficient funding for landowners to proceed with woodland planting; mainly affects planting of floodplain woodland in River Seven catchment. Insufficient funding to construct flood storage bunds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek alternative sources of funding or reduce proposed scale of planting Reduce number of bunds Update: Positive decision on Yorkshire Forward funding expected end Dec 09.	→
Complexity of potential constraints precludes agreement on siting some of flood reduction measures. Risk greatest for flood storage bunds and riparian and floodplain woodland planting.	L-M	Failure to implement certain flood reduction measures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PB and PDG established to try and resolve concerns and ensure support. Consider alternative sites within catchment; most measures have a wide range of potential sites. Reduce size or number of sites. 	→
Results of modelling show some measures to be ineffective or even enhance flood risk (e.g. due to washout of woody debris).	L	Case for implementing measures undermined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider alternative sites within catchment where measures are predicted to work better. Amend design of measure. LWD dams restricted to watercourses <5 m wide and consideration given to planting or managing downstream hedge/tree line to promote capture. 	→
Impacts of implemented measures not captured.	L	Effectiveness of measures remains uncertain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FR committed to long-term monitoring. 	→

Rag status [Red/Amber/Green]

RAG status indicators are intended to give the Project Manager and Steering Group a quick overview of the key aspects of your project (please see below for descriptions of status). For the purposes of this brief quarterly report we are not expecting supporting statements for each indicator (unless it is felt the Steering Group will require one), however the more detailed annual project report will. When assessing the status of each please use the following as a guide

RAG Status:	What it means:	What is required for this RAG:
RED	Highly Problematic	Requires urgent and decisive action needed if the project is to deliver
AMBER/RED	Problematic	Substantial attention, with some aspects needing urgent action to deliver
AMBER/GREEN	Mixed	Aspect(s) will require substantial attention, and some aspects are good
GREEN	Good	The project requires refinement and systematic implementation to deliver
BLUE	Excellent	No action, the project is performing above the acceptable level needed

Trend

The trend is linked to the RAG status and is there to indicate whether RAG status is improving (↑), stable (→) or worsening (↓) since the last quarterly report.