



Monday 3rd April 2017, 10.30-12.30, Humberhead Peatlands, Natural England, Unit 1a, Green Tree Warehousing, Tudworth Road, Hatfield, DN7 6HD

Attendees: Helen Kirk (HK), Tim Kohler (TK), Melissa Masserella (MM), Paul Duncan (PD), Roger Mitchell (RM) and Matt Cox (MC)

Apologies: Tim Allen (TA), James Freeborough (JF), David Hinchliffe (DNH) and Cllr Sue Wilkinson (SW)

Support staff: David Hargreaves (DPH) and Amanda Lane (AJL)

Discussions/Key Points	For Action By
<p>1. Welcome and Introductions - PD</p> <p>PD welcomed members to the meeting and noted apologies.</p>	
<p>2. Minutes of Last Meeting and Matters Arising – PD</p> <p>PD took members through the actions from the previous meeting and the following was noted:</p> <p><u>Action 1 – Volunteer base to support the Project’s AfterLIFE monitoring works</u> – TK informed members that the Management Plan proposes a number of monitoring activities. He is currently focused on tying these in with the LIFE+ Project and Lucy Ryan’s work. TK stressed that this is an ongoing process.</p> <p><u>Action 2 – KPMG mid-term audit results</u> – DPH reported that this is ongoing between Natural England (NE) and the auditors, KPMG. Only three items from this LIFE+ Project had been audited. PD asked if DPH could find out where in the chain the holdup was and to notify him so that he could ask Adele Rowe, Area Manager to push for a resolution.</p> <p><u>Action 3 – Obtain VAT exemption letter from DE IDB to forward to the EU</u> – on the agenda under item 6.</p> <p><u>Action 4 - Management Plan</u> – on the agenda under item 3.</p> <p><u>Action 5 - Radio tracking nightjars</u> – TK reported that this is still ongoing. He has had further discussions with the University of York on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). It seems that there is no issue in releasing generalised information about Lucy Ryan’s work but it is the detail in the data that is causing concern. TK said that he would continue to pursue agreement on the level of data that can be released to suit all parties.</p> <p><u>Action 6 – Obtain the amount of scrub that the estate workers have cleared</u> – DPH asked members to refer to the maps supplied with the</p>	<p>Action 1: DPH to find out where in the chain the holdup on obtaining the audit results is and to report back to PD so that he can request Adele Rowe’s support to resolve.</p> <p>Action 2: TK to have further discussions with the University of York on the level of detail that can be released to suit all parties.</p>



meeting papers. The maps included scrub clearance carried out in Year 1 and 2 on Hatfield Moors (C1) and Year 1 and 2 on Thorne Moors (C2) by the contractors and estate worker team. He said that similar maps for Year 0 (2014/2015) were currently being prepared by the Assistant Project Managers but they were awaiting data from the NNR staff. HK asked the number of hectares cleared in 2016/17. DPH said that the contractors had cleared 46 Ha on Hatfield Moor and 137.7 on Thorne Moors. The estate team has cleared 45.5 Ha on Hatfield Moors and 48 on Thorne Moors. In terms of a price comparison he said that this was difficult as the estate workers offer flexibility in terms of being able to do other activities, for example, track repairs and community engagement whilst undertaking scrub works. DPH gave an example of price comparison for works carried on Peat Stakes - contractors had tendered £52,000 but estate workers had undertaken the work at an approximate cost of £36,000.

TK gave members an update on the break-in that had occurred at the shed on Thorne Moors last Monday night. He reported minor damage to vehicles but significant damage to the shed. This meant that the LIFE+ team cannot access the shed for the next 2/3 weeks. The damage to vehicles and the shed meant that the estate workers would spend more time getting to where they needed to work but he was hopefully that this was only for the next 2/3 weeks and would not have significant impact on the project. He went on to discuss the security options that were being considered. TK did say that the security measures put in place in recent weeks had been a deterrent and meant that the vehicles were not able to be moved off site.

Action 7 – Feasibility of film for End of Project Conference – on the agenda under item 4.

Action 8 – Source live music for End of Project Conference – on the agenda under item 4.

Action 9 – End of Project Conference, delegates accommodation costs covered – DPH clarified that after a discussion with the EU Monitor he had clarity that guest speakers and LIFE+ project staff accommodation could be covered. However, delegate’s accommodation costs could not be covered. AL asked if steering group member’s accommodation costs could be covered by the project. DPH said that he would seek further clarification.

Action 10 – End of project conference After Dinner speaker – on the agenda under item 4.

Action 11 – One-page Mid-Term workshop report synopsis – complete.

Action 12 – End of Project Conference venue availability and price – on

Action 3: DPH to seek clarity on whether steering group member’s accommodation costs can be covered by the project.



<p>the agenda under item 4.</p>	
<p>2. Science and Monitoring Sub Group – agreement of terms of reference – RS</p> <p>PD invited RS to take members through the terms of reference for the science and monitoring sub group. RS said that there were a number of queries and amendments that had been made to the ToR and he sought clarification from the members on the course of action.</p> <p>He started by asking whether the ‘sub’ should be dropped from the title. HK reminded the group that the LIFE+ Project had a commitment to make the monitoring aspects of the work sustainable. At this point she felt that ‘sub’ should stay in the title and that all aspects of LIFE+ science and monitoring should go through the group and referenced the Lepidoptera recorder’s meeting that had taken place on Thursday 30th March. HK stressed that the sub group should be focused on LIFE+ Project specific outcomes. She said she was unclear about the remit of the science and monitoring group and suggested that the Lepidoptera meeting should have gone through the sub group. She was clear that outcomes identified as part of the LIFE+ Project should be the focus for the sub group rather than LIFE+ getting involved in other unrelated LIFE+ Project science and monitoring activities.</p> <p>TK picked up on HK’s point about the distinction between the longer term science and monitoring objectives and what the LIFE+ Project has to achieve. He suggested that it was necessary to keep them distinct and saw no reason why at the end of the LIFE+ Project the group could morph into a Science and Monitoring Group for the Reserve. HK said that as long as it currently functions as a sub group. PD asked that ‘sub’ remains in the title of the group.</p> <p>RS asked about the membership of the group and whether a volunteer from Natural England or one of the naturalists groups should be asked to join. PD suggested that anyone whose work is relevant should be encouraged to join. RS said that he would approach Martin Warne and if he was unable to join he would seek another volunteer member.</p> <p>HK asked for clarity on the size of membership. RS said it would include seven members, excluding himself and DPH. MC asked what the commitment was for a representative from NE after the LIFE+ Project. TK reiterated that the sub group would morph into the NNR Science and Monitoring Group.</p> <p>HK asked how many further meetings were left until the end of the Project. TK said that there would be three meetings but if members wished further meetings could be arranged. He confirmed that the next</p>	



<p>meeting would take place in June/July 2017.</p> <p>PD thanked RS for attending the meeting and said that he was happy for the ToRs to be signed off.</p>	
<p>3. Management Plan - TK</p> <p>TK updated members on progress made on the Management Plan. He said that he had sent the latest copy to HK and he would send a copy to all members.</p> <p>TK gave an overview of the Plan format, explaining that it contains basic text, a list of objectives, projects and actions, along with timescales. He said that the features covered in the report included, raised mire, nightjar, archaeology, scientific use of site and public engagement, and explained that the projects set out how the objectives will be achieved. TK said that its broad intent and policy includes more information/actions on public engagement. HK asked if this meant that there were further monies for public engagement. TK explained that public engagement is a core part of the work of the Reserve and did not necessarily mean there would be further funding. HK expressed that the public engagement aspects of the Management Plan was were further funding could be drawn down from external sources.</p> <p>TK pointed out that the Management Plan does not cover the work being undertaken by MC and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust. He said he would need to make arrangements with MC to discuss this aspect of the Plan further. He went onto say that Thorne, in the context of the Moors is seen as lower intensity and needs to be viewed in terms of not compromising on the value of the site.</p> <p>TK explained that he was still to complete a set of maps as there are various maps from earlier iterations of the Plan that needed reviewing. He went on to state that formal consultation process will follow, potentially through the Planning for Real events, and he asked members if they could provide him with feedback on the Plan.</p> <p>RM asked about the role of volunteers and HK followed this up by asking how many volunteers were currently active with the Reserve. TK explained that the role of volunteers is critical and went on to say that there was a core of volunteers carrying out weekly maintenance, guided walks and monitoring e.g. Adders and birds, with others carrying out monthly and quarterly activities/tasks. RM said that he felt that this was sustainable and growing. TK said that there were in excess of 50 volunteers working on the Reserve but he would confirm numbers and get back to members.</p>	<p>Action 4: TK to send latest copy of Management Plan to all steering group members</p> <p>Action 5: Steering Group members to feedback to TK on the Management Plan.</p> <p>Action 6: TK to confirm with members the number of active volunteers on the Reserve.</p>



4. Project Performance Report – DPH

PD invited DPH to take members through the LIFE+ Project Performance Report for the period 1st January – 24th March 2017 by providing an update on progress.

Action A2 – Management Plan. DPH said that as TK had provided members with an overview of the Plan this action had now moved to amber.

Action A3 – Consents. DPH explained that Nottingham Environment Agency had yet to respond with regards to the requirement for Eels Regulations on weirs at Hatfield Moors. PD asked who he was dealing with at the EA and DPH explained it was Matt Buck. He said he would continue to pursue and PD asked that if he did not progress this then to pass on to him so that he could escalate with the EA.

Action C1-C2 – Scrub control. DPH explained the yellow shaded areas on the Performance Report stating that the final clearance would be dependent on the extension.

Action C4 – Install weirs on Hatfield Moors. DPH said that the investigation works were currently being tendered and that the typological tenders had gone out to quote. He explained that once these works had been tendered it would give an idea of the costs which could be released to fund the bunding, due to take place in the autumn.

HK asked if the structures were provided by different partner and did we have confidence that they are in the right places. TK explained that the structures being discussed were those on Hatfield Moors and were distinct from the Water Level Management Plan on Thorne Moors.

Action C5 – Peat plugs and bunds on Thorne Moors. DPH explained that the works were now completed and a final survey will be carried out to populate the information going to the European Commission.

Action C6 – Construction of pumping station. DPH said that the pumping station is due to be commissioned next week. He expressed that this is major milestone as it will provide clarity on the match funding and an understanding of what monies are left for additional works. He went on to explain that the IDB will be going out to tender for these works. DPH clarified that an ‘As Built’ survey would be carried out on the pumping station.

HK asked a question about the minutes of the last Water Level Management meeting and PD said that he would pick this up with her after today’s meeting.

Action D1 – Radio-tracking nightjars. DPH informed members that LR

Action 7: DPH to inform PD if no further progress made with EA on Eels Regs on Hatfield Moors.



<p>is due to start her 3rd Year of study.</p> <p><u>Action D4</u> – Socio-economic impact and ecosystem function investigation/report. DPH said that this action was on amber as the final carbon storage evaluation had yet to be commissioned.</p> <p><u>Action E1</u> – Community Engagement. DPH explained that he was currently in the process of working up a schools proposal with the Assistant Project Managers and Janet Canning. He informed members that minibus/coach hire could be paid for out of the project where schools were able to visit the Moors.</p> <p>TK reminded members that the Planning for Real events, now reduced and noted in the project extension request to the EU, would help support consultation on the Management Plan and that dates could now be arranged. HK suggested pulling together a similar event to the one that she had run last Friday.</p> <p>PD commented that he felt that the public engagement elements were too vague and suggested that a strategy for public engagement might be required to clarify how these activities would be actioned over the coming year.</p>	
<p>5. Project extension - update – DPH</p> <p>DPH informed members that he is still awaiting confirmation from the EU on the status of an extension to the project. He said that the Desk Officer, via Lynne Barratt, EU Monitor was positive on an extension being granted. He said he would chase again this week and explained that once the project extension has been seen by the Desk Officer it will be passed to the Finance Officer and then the Head of Environment. PD asked whether all the LIFE+ Project staff were aware of this, particularly as staff had only three months remaining on their current contracts. DPH confirmed that all LIFE+ Project staff are aware of the situation and the process.</p>	
<p>6. End of Project Conference – update – AL</p> <p>AL started by confirming that the Doncaster Racecourse and the Earl of Doncaster had been visited by herself and DPH. Both venues had availability on Tuesday 15th and Wednesday 16th May 2018 to host the conference. Final quotes, valid for 14 days has been received from both venues and these had come in within the prices discussed at the steering group meeting held in March. AL informed members that a £500 deposit was now required by Doncaster Racecourse to secure the venue to host the two day conference and a similar deposit was required from the Earl of Doncaster to secure the 15th May to host the conference Dinner and guest accommodation. PD asked AL to make</p>	<p>Action 8: AL to register both venues as suppliers and raise purchase orders to pay the deposits.</p>



arrangements to get both venues registered as suppliers so that purchase orders can be raised to cover the required deposits.

AL also confirmed that she had spoken to Doncaster Tourist Information Centre to find out if there were any other major events planned in the Town on the 15th/16th May 2018. They had confirmed that they were not aware of any other events.

Following on from the suggestion made at the last meeting of the steering group AL informed members that she had been in contact with Doncaster Youth Orchestra to ask if they had availability to play at the event and the associated costs. The costs to secure the Jazz Youth Orchestra is £1,200 and members discussed and felt that as there was no budget to cover the costs then an alternative option should be explored. AL offered to contact Ash Hill Academy, Hatfield, as a Performing Arts School to see if they had a youth orchestra that would be happy to perform before the start of the Dinner.

AL said that she had contacted two film companies – Let There be Light Productions and Toothpix following members suggestion that a film ‘A Year in the Life of the Humberhead Peatlands’ should be commissioned for use at the conference and as part of future community engagement activities. AL said that she had sent both companies a brief for the film, as follows:

Purpose of film: To promote the Humberhead Peatlands – landscape, people and habitat

Working title of film: A Year in the Life of the Humberhead Peatlands

Audience: Community, scientists, conservationists

Length of film: 3-5 mins

Topics: Film footage covering the four seasons – summer, autumn, winter and spring, including what the Moors means to key people

People involved: Natural England, Members of local conservation groups, volunteers, community members/visitors

Format: Film produced so that it can be played on YouTube and through PowerPoint presentation, and our website.

AL went on to demonstrate the films that ‘Let There Be Light productions’ had produced to provide members with a flavour of what could be achieved. In addition, she read through an email received from Toothpix on how the filming could be approached. AL went through some of the costs associated with producing films of a similar standard to the ones produced by the film companies. There was some

Action 9: AL to contact Ash Hill Academy, Hatfield reference Youth Orchestra performing at the Conference Dinner.



<p>discussion on different formats that could be used to produce a film, for example, using current stock still photographs and editing these, including views from different stakeholders and partners on their perspective of the Moors.</p> <p>AL went onto discuss the action in relation to sourcing guest speakers for the Dinner and conference. She said that she had not progressed these for two reasons, firstly awaiting confirmation of the venues' availability and secondly a decision from the EU Monitor on whether speakers' fees could be covered by the Project. DPH clarified that the EU Monitor had said that LIFE+ Projects would not normally cover these costs but it was not necessarily a 'No'. However, members felt that as there was not a budget for a speaker but that costs such as travel and accommodation could be covered then having a celebrity guest speaker was not a necessity for the conference.</p> <p>PD asked if DPH and AL could look at budgets and where and whether monies could be used to cover the production of a film. MC raised the point that he had been contacted by an ex member of the RAF who was keen to offer their drone services and who had all the paperwork to cover the regulations/legislation required to carry out this work. MC said he would forward the details to PD and DPH to progress further, if applicable.</p> <p>PD suggested that as there were a number of actions related to the End of Project Conference that required support and advice from steering group members he asked if it would make sense to formulate a 'task and finish' group. Members said that it seemed a sensible idea and the membership of the group was discussed, with the following expressing an interest or being suggested as members, DMBC (MM), DPH, PD, AL, Ed Brightman, LIFE+ Assistant Project Manager and a NNR volunteer. PD invited other members to join the group. He asked AL to organise a meeting of the 'task and finish' group after the Easter holidays. MM asked if the agenda for the first meeting of the group could be focused on one aspect of the conference rather than trying to cover everything.</p>	<p>Action 10: DPH and AL to identify if monies are available to provide a budget for a film.</p> <p>Action 11: MC to forward drone contact details to PD and DPH.</p> <p>Action 12: AL to organise a date for the End of Conference 'task and finish' group to meet.</p>
<p>7. Overheads – DPH</p> <p>DPH explained to members that the IDB can draw down from the LIFE+ Project overheads and asked if a formal approach had been made on their requirements. PD said that at the outset of the project this had been discussed with the IDB who had confirmed that they would require only a minimum payment to cover items, such as postage. PD and DPH agreed to seek clarity and confirmation on a ballpark sum</p>	<p>Action 13: PD and DPH to seek clarity and confirmation on a ballpark figure from the IDB to cover their overhead costs.</p>



<p>from the IDB to cover overheads.</p>	
<p>8. VAT letter requirements – IDB – DPH</p> <p>DPH reported that obtaining a VAT letter from the IDB was still outstanding and was critical, particularly as it put 20% of the IDB’s match funding at risk. He explained that the letter he had received from the IDB would not suffice and that a letter from HMRC, similar to the one secured by Natural England was what the EU wanted to see. DPH asked if RM could chase the letter up with IDB colleagues. RM said that he would and DPH will send him the relevant details.</p>	<p>Action 14: RM to chase up with IDB colleagues the importance of obtaining a VAT exempt letter from HMRC. DPH to send RM the relevant details to support this action.</p>
<p>9. Any Other Business – PD</p> <p>PD invited members to raise any other items of business. Colleagues said they did not have any further items to discuss.</p> <p>PD said that although not a LIFE+ Project related topic he wanted to inform members that the organisation was currently exploring the possibility of a new Reserve Base on Hatfield Moors, with Defra. A scoping report is currently being produced by Kier and it is hoped that the Reserve Base could be delivered during 2017/18.</p>	
<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>PD thanked members for their attendance and valuable contributions.</p> <p>The next meeting will take place at the Humberhead Peatlands office on Monday 3rd July 2017 from 10:30 – 12:30.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 12:30</p>	