

22

Watt F (Fiona) (Marine)

From: Donna-Claire Hunter RAFTS [donna-claire@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 26 November 2012 11:29
To: Callum Sinclair; Roger Brook (RAFTS); andrew wallace; Mitchell A (Alastair); cm@argyllfisheriestrust.co.uk; cherfold@hotmail.com; wsft@btconnect.com; rispond@btinternet.com; lochaberfisheriestrust@gmail.com; Ben Collier; Simon Scott; sft01@btconnect.com; peter.kinloch@btinternet.com; info@wrft.org.uk; admin@wrft.org.uk; Middlemas S (Stuart) (MARLAB); Armstrong J (John) (MARLAB); Barker-Munro CM (Carole); alan@asfb.org.uk; Mark Coulson
Subject: Managing Interactions Steering Group Meeting 6th Dec

Dear All,

The next steering group meeting scheduled for Thursday the 6th of December will be held at the Thistle Inverness, Millburn Road, Inverness, IV2 3TR.

a) To reach Thistle Inverness by road;

From the South on the A9 take the Raigmore Interchange exit (signposted Aberdeen) and take the first left towards the city centre (third turning if you're coming from the North). Thistle Inverness is on the opposite side of the roundabout. To programme your sat-nav, please use the postcode IV2 3TR.

b) If you're coming to Thistle Inverness by rail;

Inverness railway station is a five-minute taxi ride from Thistle Inverness, or a 20-minute walk.

The meeting is scheduled to commence at 1030 and be finished by 1530.

The agenda and briefing papers for this meeting will be distributed shortly.

I look forward to seeing you all there.

Kind Regards

Donna-Claire

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

This email has been received from an external party and has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

Watt F (Fiona) (Marine)

From: Donna-Claire Hunter RAFTS [donna-claire@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 05 December 2012 14:53
To: Callum Sinclair; Roger Brook (RAFTS); andrew wallace; Mitchell A (Alastair); cm@argyllfisheriestrust.co.uk; cherfold@hotmail.com; wsft@btconnect.com; rispond@btinternet.com; lochaberfisheriestrust@gmail.com; Ben Collier; Simon Scott; sft01@btconnect.com; peter.kinloch@btinternet.com; info@wrft.org.uk; admin@wrft.org.uk; Middlemas S (Stuart) (MARLAB); Armstrong J (John) (MARLAB); Barker-Munro CM (Carole); alan@asfb.org.uk; Mark Coulson
Subject: MIAP Steering Group Meeting Update and
Attachments: Rivers and fisheries Briefing 1_ MIAP Meeting 061212.docx; Coastal and Transisitional Briefing 2_ MIAP Meeting 061212.docx; Agenda MIAP Steering Group Meeting 61212.pdf; MIAP Steering Group Draft minutes 220612.pdf

AGENDA IS DRAFT.

Dear All,

Please find attached the papers for tomorrows meeting. This includes tomorrow's agenda, two briefing papers and the minutes of the meeting held on the 22nd of June 2012.

Some concerns have been raised about the weather forecast for over night and tomorrow. I have today received apologies that on the likelihood of the bad weather Argyll members will not be able to attend. In light of this could all members planning to attend please advise me if you would rather this meeting is cancelled. Ideally I would have liked the opportunity to update you all on the work since the last meeting and have discussed directly with all steering group members the papers attached however we can and are willing to deal with them out side of a meeting which would involve email and telephone correspondence with each steering group member individually to progress this work without the need for a meeting.

Could you please copy your reply in regards to this matter to all.

Kind Regards
D-C

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

This email has been received from an external party and has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

Managing Interactions Aquaculture Project

Briefing 1: Rivers and Fisheries Prioritisation

Purpose

This briefing paper summarises the current work activities on the Locational and Sensitivity Guidance part of the Managing Interactions Aquaculture Project specifically the Rivers and Fisheries Prioritisation.

Specifically the paper:

- Sets out two proposed criterion revisions related to other fish species and SAC designations based on the consultations and discussions which have taken place;
- Seeks final agreement on previously discussed criterion to be applied within the model so that information from trusts can be requested and included in the model; and
- Proposes the introduction of two constraints criterion related where aquaculture development would not be considered based upon near proximity to river mouth and minimum depth to sea bed.

1. Introduction

Work to date on the Rivers and Fisheries Prioritisation Section has:

- Identified and developed prioritisation criterion, their attributes and weightings.
- The creation of GIS criteria base data layers for the decision-making process. These data layers have been geo-referenced in a standardised format.

2. Current and Revised Rivers and Fisheries Prioritisation Criterion

Through a series of steering group meetings a set of criteria has been developed to generate a prioritisation of Rivers and Fisheries within the study area and a limited range of data has been collated, analysed and evaluated against these to date.

The criterion currently agreed in the prioritisation are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Rivers and Fisheries Prioritisation Criterion attributes and weighting descriptions.

Rivers and Fisheries Prioritisation Criterion	Criterion Attributes	Criterion Attributes Score	Criterion Priority Weighting
Designations and Features	SAC (Atlantic Salmon or Pearl Mussel)	High	High
	SAC (other) e.g. Brook Lamprey	Medium	
	SSSI (currently under investigation)	currently under investigation	
WFD Classification (Catchment Summary and Coastal Catchment)	Majority of sites/length High or Good Sites	High	High
	Majority of sites/length Moderate	Medium	

There have been a number of on-going discussions with the Steering group and wider third party stakeholders regarding the criteria under proposal for inclusion in the Rivers and Fisheries Prioritisation. In light of these discussions there are two final proposals to review the current criteria included in the Rivers and Fisheries Prioritisation. These are summarised below.

Firstly it is proposed that the “*Other Fish Species Present*” criterion is removed from the prioritisation. The proposal to remove this criterion is based on its presently unquantified relationship to aquaculture developments and the assumption that the primary use of the tool will be to input to planning applications where the interactions between aquaculture and wild salmonid fish and fisheries are to be highlighted. Within this context the presence or absence of eels is not likely to be relevant.

Secondly, it is proposed to refine the Designations and Features Criterion Attributes where the specific attribute “*SAC (other) e.g. Brook Lamprey*” should be removed from the prioritisation. The proposal to refine this criterion is based on the expression from a number of parties that as the primary use of the tool will be to input to planning applications where the interactions between aquaculture and wild salmonid fish and fisheries are to be highlighted the inclusion of SAC designation for unrelated species is not relevant and could better be reflected by trusts in the written planning submission itself if they wished. The presence or absence of an SAC would be represented by SNH and considered by the planning authority as a result.

In addition to the revisions proposed above the Steering Group is asked to undertake a final review and approval of the other criterion by completing and return of the summary questions in Table A1. When agreed the criterion can be used in v1 of the model and information requested from partners to populate these criterion across the study area.

3. Introduction of constraint criterion

The Steering Group is also invited to consider the inclusion of two constraint criterion into the model summarised as below:

- **1km exclusion round all river mouths**
This would take from the model all waters of up to 1km from all river mouths out as the assumption that these are the most sensitive locations of all for wild fisheries and are never likely to be acceptable areas.
- **<15m depth exclusion**
Currently aquaculture should operate in a depth range of 15m to 70m due to operational requirements. Although technical developments may allow operation in greater depths it is less likely that a lesser minimum depth will allow effective aquaculture operation due to the need for clear depths below cages, the need to use sites with appropriate flushing rates and assimilative capacities etc. Therefore, it is proposed to exclude all waters of <15m depth from the analysis as aquaculture is not likely to occur in such locations. No maximum depth constraint is introduced as technical advances by the industry and a general move towards offshore production may change the current limitations.

4. Steering Group Appraisal

5. Appendix

Table 1A: Please review and comment on the following questions. Check boxes are provided and any relevant information can be added as necessary into the additional comments column.

Rivers and Fisheries Prioritisation Questions	Yes	No	Additional Comments
Are the Designations and Features criterion attributes, scores and weighting appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Should the Designations and Features Criterion Attributes be refined to remove the "SAC (other) e.g. Brook Lamprey" attribute?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Are the WFD Classification criterion attributes, scores and weighting appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Are the Value of fisheries criterion attributes, scores and weighting appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Are the Nature/Type of fishery criterion attributes, scores and weighting appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Are the Genetics (Introgression) criterion attributes, scores and weighting appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Are the Catchment Accessibility and Availability criterion attributes, scores and weighting appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Are the Juvenile salmonid populations criterion attributes, scores and weighting appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Should the Other Fish Species Present criterion be removed from the prioritisation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
If you consider the Other Fish Species Present criterion should remain in the prioritisation, are the criterion attributes, scores and weighting appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Are the Habitat Quality criterion attributes, scores and weighting appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Managing Interactions Aquaculture Project

Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation

Purpose

This briefing paper summarises the current work activities on the Locational and Sensitivity Guidance part of the Managing Interactions Aquaculture Project specifically the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation. Whilst this area of work has been identified as less significant than the Rivers and Fisheries analysis due to project timings there is an opportunity to progress this issue in parallel to this work and to conclude it quickly as the data and information required is available from non-trust sources.

1. Introduction

Work to date on the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Section has:

- Identified and developed prioritisation criteria;
- Collected data from trusts and other relevant sources which have now been collated and analysed in excel
- The creation of GIS criteria base data layers for the decision-making process. These data layers have been geo-referenced in a standardised format.

2. Coastal/Transitional Water Body Prioritisation

We have developed a set of criteria to generate a prioritisation of Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies within the study area and a range of data has been collated, analysed and evaluated against these.

The criterion currently agreed by the steering group in the submodel;

- Water Body Characterisation (MSS for Aquaculture Development)
- Water Framework Directive Classifications (SEPA)
- Designation and Features (SNH)
- Type of Loch System
- Orientation of Loch System

Criterion currently under proposal to the steering group for inclusion in the sub model;

- Flushing Rate of Loch System
- Monitoring Site Data for Loch System
- Farm Treatment Strategy and Agreements within Loch System

There will be questions at the end of each section that all Steering group members are requested to complete in Table A1 in the Appendix.

2.2.1 Criterion: Type of Loch System.

The first criterion which has previously been discussed and agreed for inclusion in the Coastal/Transitional Water prioritisation is the type of loch system. As identified in peer review there is one specific type of estuary which are considered to create more suitable environmental conditions for *L. salmonis* which are the fjordic systems (Murray and Gillibrand, 2006). The accepted descriptor of fjordic systems are defined by Dyer (1997: p8/9) which will be used to identify fjordic systems in the study area. As guided by previous steering group meetings this criterion would be assessed by the scores and weightings in Table 1.

Table 1: Type of Loch System criterion attribute and weighting details.

Water Bodies (Transitional & Coastal) Criterion	Criterion Attributes	Criterion Attributes Score	Criterion Priority Weighting
Type	Fjord	Medium	M
	All Other Inlet Types	Low	

Question;

2.2.1 Are you happy for us to progress this criterion using the attributes, scores and weightings above? If not what should change and why?

2.2.2 Criterion: Orientation of Loch System

The second criterion which has previously been discussed and agreed for inclusion in the Coastal/Transitional Water prioritisation is the orientation of a loch system. It was well documented that currents within the marine environment are a major driving factor in the advection of larvae (Siegel *et al.*, 2003; Penston *et al.*, 2011). Predominantly wind driven currents within a loch system may play a major role in the dispersion of sea lice planktonic stages (Amundrud and Murray 2007). As reported by the Met office, 2012 the western and northern parts of Northern Scotland are, on average, the windiest in the UK, being fully exposed to the Atlantic and closest to the passage of areas of low pressure. In these areas the greatest wind speeds and directions are from the South West direction (Met Office 2012). In consideration to this environmental factor it is likely that loch systems orientated to the South west direction will create advection of sea lice planktonic stages over a larger distance. As guided by previous steering group meetings this criterion would be assessed by the scores and weightings in Table 2.

Table 2: Orientation of Loch System criterion attribute and weighting details.

Water Bodies (Transitional & Coastal) Criterion	Criterion Attributes	Criterion Attributes Score	Criterion Priority Weighting
Orientation	181 ^o to 269 ^o	Medium	M
	All other orientations	Low	

Questions;

2.2.3a) Should the flushing rates of loch system be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation?

2.2.3b) If the flushing rates of loch system is to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation are the criterion attributes and scores suitable?

2.2.3c) If the flushing rates of loch system is to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation what criterion priority weighting would you attribute (High, Medium or Low)?

2.2.4 Criterion: Monitoring Data

As identified in the RAFTS Regional monitoring report there is currently no guidance on the acceptable proportion of fish exceeding a detrimental threshold. There has been a recommendation from the EU project "Sustainable Management of Interactions between Aquaculture and Wild Salmonid":

"that a level of 10% or fewer of wild sea trout in any given population in Ireland bearing total infestations of ≥ 13 lice • fish-1 should be adopted as indicative of a satisfactory or acceptable lice loading. Within any given sea trout stock, frequencies of heavily-infested juvenile sea trout (i.e. those ≥ 13 lice • fish-1) $> 10\%$ should perhaps be considered a cause for concern." Hazon *et al* (2006)

Being able to adopt such an acceptable or unacceptable proportion of lice loadings in Scotland would aid the local management strategies and aid with location guidance of fish farm developments. As such it is proposed to implement the regional monitoring data analysis which determines detrimental sea lice loadings implementing Wells *et al* (2006) thresholds. It is proposed that this criterion would be assessed by the scores and weightings in Table 4.

Table 4: Monitoring Data criterion attribute and weighting details.

Water Bodies (Transitional & Coastal) Criterion	Criterion Attributes	Criterion Attributes Score	Criterion Priority Weighting
Monitoring Data Sites	$> 10\%$ in the past two years	High	To be confirmed
	$< 10\%$ in the past two years	Medium	
	$\geq 0\%$ or No Survey Data	Low	

Questions;

2.2.4a) Should the monitoring data be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation?

2.2.4b) If the monitoring data is to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation are the criterion attributes and scores suitable?

Farm Treatment Strategy	Adequate Consented therapeutants and strategy for treating the total biomass in loch system.	Low	To be confirmed
	Inadequate consented therapeutants and strategy for treating the total biomass in loch system.	Medium	

Questions;

2.2.5a) Should the agreements within a loch system be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation?

2.2.5b) Should the farm treatment strategies within a loch system be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation?

2.2.5c) If the agreements within a loch system are to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation are the criterion attributes and scores suitable?

2.2.5d) If the farm treatment strategies within a Loch System are to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation are the criterion attributes and scores suitable?

2.2.5e) If the agreements within a loch system are to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation what criterion priority weighting would you attribute (High, Medium or Low)?

2.2.5f) If the Farm Treatment Strategy within a Loch System is to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation what criterion priority weighting would you attribute (High, Medium or Low)?

2.2.6 Creating the Coastal/Transitional Water Body Prioritisation.

It is now proposed that the five criterion as identified in sections 2.2.1 to 2.2.5 be combined in a weighted multi criteria modelling process as shown in Figure 3. This prioritisation will allow for the risk impact of the abundance and infectiveness from *L. salmonis* on wild fisheries to be explored. It is envisaged that in the future as dispersion patterns within sea lochs become available these will also be encompassed into the prioritisation.

4. References

Amundrud T.L. and Murray A.G. 2007 Validating Particle Tracking Models Of Sea Lice Dispersion In Scottish Sea Lochs. ICES CM 2007/B:05.

Boxaspen, K. 2006. A review of the biology and genetics of sea lice. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 63 1304 -1316.

Dyer, K.R. (1997). Estuaries: a physical introduction. 2nd edition. John Wiley and Sons/Wiley & Sons: Chichester. ISBN 0-471-9741-4.

Edwards, A. and Sharples, F. 1986. Scottish Sea Lochs: a Catalogue. Scottish Marine Biological Association/Nature Council council. Available from Scottish Marine Institute <http://www.sams.ac.uk/contact-info>.

Hazon N., Todd C.D., Whelan B., Gargan P. Finstad, B. Bjørn, P.A. Wendelaar, Bonga S.E. & Kristoffersen R. 2006. Sustainable management of interactions between aquaculture and wild salmonid fish. Final report for the SUMBAWS EU project.

Met Office 2012. Regional climates. Accessed online <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/climate/uk/regional/>

Murray AG (2009) Using simple models to review the application and implications of different approaches used to simulate transmission of pathogens among aquatic animals. *Prev Vet Med* 88:167–177

Murray, A.G. and Gillibrand, P.A 2006. Modelling salmon lice dispersal in Loch Torridon, Scotland. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 53, pp 128 to 135.

Penston M. J., McBeath A. J. A., and Millar C. P. 2011. Densities of planktonic *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* before and after an Atlantic salmon farm relocation. *Aquacult Environ Interact*. Vol. 1 pp 225 to 232.

Revie, C.W., Gettinby, G., Treasurer, J.W. and Wallace, C. 2003. Identifying epidemiological factors affecting sea lice *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* abundance on Scottish salmon farms using general linear models. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms*, 57 pp85 to 95.

Robbins, C., Gettinby, G., Lees, F., Baillie, M., Wallace and Revie, C. W., 2010. Assessing topical treatment interventions on Scottish salmon farms using a sea lice (*Lepeophtheirus salmonis*) population model. *Aquaculture*, 306 pp191-197.

Schram T.A. Supplementary descriptions of the developmental stages of *Lepeophtheirus salmonis* (Krøyer, 1837) (Copepoda: Caligidae). In: Boxshall G.A., Defaye D., editors. *Pathogens of Wild and Farmed Fish*. New York: Ellis Horwood; 1993. p. 30-47.

Siegel, D.A., Kinlan, B.P., Gaylord, B., and Gaines, S.D., 2003. Lagrangian descriptions of marine larval dispersion. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 260 pp83–96.

Edwards, A. and Sharples, F. 1986. Scottish Sea Lochs: a Catalogue. Scottish Marine Biological Association/Nature Council council. Available from Scottish Marine Institute <http://www.sams.ac.uk/contact-info>.

Bodies Prioritisation are the criterion attributes and scores suitable?			
2.2.4c) If the monitoring data is to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation what criterion priority weighting would you attribute (High, Medium or Low)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.2.5a) Should the agreements within a loch system be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.2.5b) Should the farm treatment strategies within a loch system be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.2.5c) If the agreements within a loch system are to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation are the criterion attributes and scores suitable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.2.5d) If the farm treatment strategies within a Loch System are to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation are the criterion attributes and scores suitable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.2.5e) If the agreements within a loch system are to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation what criterion priority weighting would you attribute (High, Medium or Low)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.2.5f) If the Farm Treatment Strategy within a Loch System is to be included in the Coastal/Transitional Water Bodies Prioritisation what criterion priority weighting would you attribute (High, Medium or Low)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.2.6a) Is the proposed weighted multi criteria modelling process suitable for creating the Coastal/Transitional Water Body Prioritisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

24

Watt F (Fiona) (Marine)

From: Donna-Claire Hunter RAFTS [donna-claire@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 05 December 2012 17:19
To: Simon Scott; Callum Sinclair; Roger Brook (RAFTS); andrew wallace; Mitchell A (Alastair); cm@argyllfisheriestrust.co.uk; cherfold@hotmail.com; wsft@btconnect.com; rispond@btinternet.com; lochaberfisheriestrust@gmail.com; Ben Collier; sft01@btconnect.com; peter.kinloch@btinternet.com; info@wrft.org.uk; admin@wrft.org.uk; Middlemas S (Stuart) (MARLAB); Armstrong J (John) (MARLAB); Barker-Munro CM (Carole); alan@asfb.org.uk; Mark Coulson
Subject: Re: MIAP Steering Group Meeting Update

Dear All,

As the majority have indicated a keenness to attend this meeting it will be going ahead tomorrow. If your travel plans are disrupted and you are not able to attend please do let either Callum (██████████) or myself (██████████) know. We will endeavour to get through the meeting agenda in a timely fashion which will allow everyone to get away earlier than is currently indicated on the agenda.

I look forward to seeing you all tomorrow.

Kind Regards
 Donna-Claire

From: Donna-Claire Hunter RAFTS <donna-claire@rafts.org.uk>
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2012 14:52:34 +0000
To: Callum Sinclair <callum@rafts.org.uk>, Roger Brook <roger@rafts.org.uk>, Andrew Wallace <andrew.wallace@fishhall.org.uk>, <Alastair.Mitchell@scotland.gsi.gov.uk>, <cm@argyllfisheriestrust.co.uk>, <cherfold@hotmail.com>, "Shona Marshall (WSFT)" <wsft@btconnect.com>, "Charles Marsham (NW Sutherland)" <rispond@btinternet.com>, Lochaber Fisheries Trust <lochaberfisheriestrust@gmail.com>, Ben Collier <ben@ohft.org.uk>, Simon Scott <grimersta@btconnect.com>, <sft01@btconnect.com>, Peter Kinloch <Peter.Kinloch@btinternet.com>, Wester Ross FT <info@wrft.org.uk>, <admin@wrft.org.uk>, <Stuart.Middlemas@scotland.gsi.gov.uk>, <John.Armstrong@scotland.gsi.gov.uk>, Carole Barker-Munro <Carole.Barker-Munro@scotland.gsi.gov.uk>, Alan Wells <alan@asfb.org.uk>, Mark Coulson <M.Coulson@MARLAB.AC.UK>
Subject: MIAP Steering Group Meeting Update and

Dear All,

Please find attached the papers for tomorrow's meeting. This includes tomorrow's agenda, two briefing papers and the minutes of the meeting held on the 22nd of June 2012.

Some concerns have been raised about the weather forecast for over night and tomorrow. I have today received apologies that on the likelihood of the bad weather Argyll members will not be able to attend. In light of this could all members planning to attend please advise me if you would rather this meeting is cancelled. Ideally I would have liked the opportunity to update you all on the work since the last meeting and have discussed directly with all steering group members the papers attached however we can and are willing to deal with them out side of a meeting which would involve email and telephone correspondence with each steering group member individually

30/01/2013

25

Watt F (Fiona) (Marine)

From: Donna-Claire Hunter RAFTS [donna-claire@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 05 December 2012 18:21
To: Middlemas S (Stuart) (MARLAB)
Subject: Re: MIAP Steering Group Meeting Update and

Hi Stuart,

No worries at all we have a few people coming up the A9 and they have let me know that they also aren't sure if they will make it. Please let me know if you have to cancel and I will make arrangements to catch up with you and Alastair separately on the matters discussed at the meeting.

Best Wishes
D-C

From: Stuart.Middlemas@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 5:33 PM
To: donna-claire@rafts.org.uk ; callum@rafts.org.uk ; roger@rafts.org.uk ; andrew.wallace@fishhall.org.uk ; Alastair.Mitchell@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk ; cm@argyllfisheriestrust.co.uk ; cherfold@hotmail.com ; wsft@btconnect.com ; rispond@btinternet.com ; lochaberfisheriestrust@gmail.com ; ben@ohft.org.uk ; grimersta@btconnect.com ; sft01@btconnect.com ; peter.kinloch@btinternet.com ; info@wrft.org.uk ; admin@wrft.org.uk ; John.Armstrong@scotland.gsi.gov.uk ; Carole.Barker-Munro@scotland.gsi.gov.uk ; alan@asfb.org.uk ; M.Coulson@MARLAB.AC.UK
Subject: RE: MIAP Steering Group Meeting Update and

Hi Donna-Claire,

The forecast does not look particularly good at the moment for travelling up the A9 heavy snow at Drumochter is never fun. I will be travelling with Alastair who is coming from Edinburgh and can't guarantee our attendance as it depends on how it looks tomorrow (Alastair is also away today so I haven't been able to confer with him).

Should we fail to make it, or the meeting is cancelled then happy to rearrange or whatever you suggest.

Best wishes,
Stuart

From: Donna-Claire Hunter RAFTS [mailto:donna-claire@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 05 December 2012 14:53
To: Callum Sinclair; Roger Brook (RAFTS); andrew wallace; Mitchell A (Alastair); cm@argyllfisheriestrust.co.uk; cherfold@hotmail.com; wsft@btconnect.com; rispond@btinternet.com; lochaberfisheriestrust@gmail.com; Ben Collier; Simon Scott; sft01@btconnect.com; peter.kinloch@btinternet.com; info@wrft.org.uk; admin@wrft.org.uk; Middlemas S (Stuart) (MARLAB); Armstrong J (John) (MARLAB); Barker-Munro CM (Carole); alan@asfb.org.uk; Mark Coulson
Subject: MIAP Steering Group Meeting Update and

Dear All,

Please find attached the papers for tomorrow's meeting. This includes tomorrow's agenda, two briefing papers and the minutes of the meeting held on the 22nd of June 2012.

30/01/2013

Watt F (Fiona) (Marine)

From: Callum Sinclair [callum@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 05 December 2012 23:00
To: Middlemas S (Stuart) (MARLAB); donna-claire@rafts.org.uk; roger@rafts.org.uk; andrew.wallace@fishhall.org.uk; Mitchell A (Alastair); cm@argyllfisheriestrust.co.uk; cherfold@hotmail.com; wsft@btconnect.com; rispond@btinternet.com; lochaberfisheriestrust@gmail.com; ben@ohft.org.uk; grimersta@btconnect.com; sft01@btconnect.com; peter.kinloch@btinternet.com; info@wrft.org.uk; admin@wrft.org.uk; Armstrong J (John) (MARLAB); Barker-Munro CM (Carole); alan@asfb.org.uk; M.Coulson@MARLAB.AC.UK
Subject: RE: MIAP Steering Group Meeting Update and

All

Like Stuart I'm travelling from Edinburgh and so will do battle with the A9. Based on the forecast on bbc tonight the prospects don't look good for that journey or for others travelling particularly from the west.

Can I just ask that, if possible, people let us know early if travel is not going to happen as if that is the case we will call others as soon as we can to cancel the meeting and save people making what might be unnecessary and tricky journeys.

Thanks
 Callum

From: Stuart.Middlemas@scotland.gsi.gov.uk [mailto:Stuart.Middlemas@scotland.gsi.gov.uk]
Sent: 05 December 2012 17:33
To: donna-claire@rafts.org.uk; callum@rafts.org.uk; roger@rafts.org.uk; andrew.wallace@fishhall.org.uk; Alastair.Mitchell@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk; cm@argyllfisheriestrust.co.uk; cherfold@hotmail.com; wsft@btconnect.com; rispond@btinternet.com; lochaberfisheriestrust@gmail.com; ben@ohft.org.uk; grimersta@btconnect.com; sft01@btconnect.com; peter.kinloch@btinternet.com; info@wrft.org.uk; admin@wrft.org.uk; John.Armstrong@scotland.gsi.gov.uk; Carole.Barker-Munro@scotland.gsi.gov.uk; alan@asfb.org.uk; M.Coulson@MARLAB.AC.UK
Subject: RE: MIAP Steering Group Meeting Update and

Hi Donna-Claire,

The forecast does not look particularly good at the moment for travelling up the A9 – heavy snow at Drumochter is never fun. I will be travelling with Alastair who is coming from Edinburgh and can't guarantee our attendance as it depends on how it looks tomorrow (Alastair is also away today so I haven't been able to confer with him).

Should we fail to make it, or the meeting is cancelled then happy to rearrange or whatever you suggest.

Best wishes,
 Stuart

From: Donna-Claire Hunter RAFTS [mailto:donna-claire@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 05 December 2012 14:53
To: Callum Sinclair; Roger Brook (RAFTS); andrew wallace; Mitchell A (Alastair); cm@argyllfisheriestrust.co.uk; cherfold@hotmail.com; wsft@btconnect.com; rispond@btinternet.com; lochaberfisheriestrust@gmail.com; Ben Collier; Simon Scott; sft01@btconnect.com;

30/01/2013

27

Watt F (Fiona) (Marine)

From: Donna-Claire Hunter RAFTS [donna-claire@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 06 December 2012 09:24
To: Middlemas S (Stuart) (MARLAB); Mitchell A (Alastair)
Subject: Re: MIAP Steering Group Meeting Update and

Hi Stuart,

Thank you for letting me know and please don't worry. I will be back in touch to make other arrangements and hopefully we can catch up soon.

Best Wishes
 D-C

From: Stuart.Middlemas@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2012 7:22 AM
To: callum@rafts.org.uk ; donna-claire@rafts.org.uk ; roger@rafts.org.uk ; andrew.wallace@fishhall.org.uk ; Alastair.Mitchell@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk ; cm@argyllfisheriestrust.co.uk ; cherfold@hotmail.com ; wsft@btconnect.com ; rispond@btinternet.com ; lochaberfisheriestrust@gmail.com ; ben@ohft.org.uk ; grimersta@btconnect.com ; sft01@btconnect.com ; peter.kinloch@btinternet.com ; info@wrft.org.uk ; admin@wrft.org.uk ; John.Armstrong@scotland.gsi.gov.uk ; Carole.Barker-Munro@scotland.gsi.gov.uk ; alan@asfb.org.uk ; M.Coulson@MARLAB.AC.UK
Subject: RE: MIAP Steering Group Meeting Update and

Hi Callum,

After seeing the forecast and discussing with Alastair we have decided not to risk the A9. Please accept our apologies and we will be in touch to make other arrangements.

Bets wishes,
 Stuart

From: Callum Sinclair [mailto:callum@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 05 December 2012 23:00
To: Middlemas S (Stuart) (MARLAB); donna-claire@rafts.org.uk; roger@rafts.org.uk; andrew.wallace@fishhall.org.uk; Mitchell A (Alastair); cm@argyllfisheriestrust.co.uk; cherfold@hotmail.com; wsft@btconnect.com; rispond@btinternet.com; lochaberfisheriestrust@gmail.com; ben@ohft.org.uk; grimersta@btconnect.com; sft01@btconnect.com; peter.kinloch@btinternet.com; info@wrft.org.uk; admin@wrft.org.uk; Armstrong J (John) (MARLAB); Barker-Munro CM (Carole); alan@asfb.org.uk; M.Coulson@MARLAB.AC.UK
Subject: RE: MIAP Steering Group Meeting Update and

All

Like Stuart I'm travelling from Edinburgh and so will do battle with the A9. Based on the forecast on bbc tonight the prospects don't look good for that journey or for others travelling particularly from the west.

Can I just ask that, if possible, people let us know early if travel is not going to happen as if that is the case we will call others as soon as we can to cancel the meeting and save people making what might be unnecessary and tricky journeys.

Thanks
 Callum

30/01/2013

28

Watt F (Fiona) (Marine)

From: Donna-Claire Hunter RAFTS [donna-claire@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 14 December 2012 12:35
To: Mitchell A (Alastair); Middlemas S (Stuart) (MARLAB)
Subject: MIAP Meeting

Hi Alastair and Stuart,

I'm sorry you couldn't make the MIAP Steering Group meeting recently thankfully all the Trusts arrived at the meeting and got home safely. Just to follow up I was wondering if your would both available on the 9th, 10th or 11th of January for a meeting, Callum and I could come to either Pitlochry or Edinburgh for this meeting. I hope there is a suitable date there and please do let me know which location is best for you.

Kind Regards
Donna-Claire

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

This email has been received from an external party and
has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

29

Watt F (Fiona) (Marine)

From: Donna-Claire Hunter RAFTS [donna-claire@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 21 December 2012 16:36
To: Middlemas S (Stuart) (MARLAB)
Subject: Re: MIAP Meeting

Hi Stuart,

Thanks for getting back to me, the 11th of January in Pitlochry is ideal for Callum and I. Could we say a start time of 1130am?

Hope you have a lovely Christmas and a Happy New Year when it comes.

Best Wishes
D-C

From: Stuart.Middlemas@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
Sent: Friday, December 21, 2012 4:13 PM
To: donna-claire@rafts.org.uk
Subject: RE: MIAP Meeting

Hi Dona-Claire,

Alastair and I would be available for a meeting in Pitlochry on the 11th January ☐☐☐ any time after 10.30. Let me know if this suits and we can firm up on a time.
Hope you have a good holiday,
Stuart

From: Donna-Claire Hunter RAFTS [mailto:donna-claire@rafts.org.uk]
Sent: 14 December 2012 12:35
To: Mitchell A (Alastair); Middlemas S (Stuart) (MARLAB)
Subject: MIAP Meeting

Hi Alastair and Stuart,

I☐☐☐m sorry you couldn☐☐☐t make the MIAP Steering Group meeting recently thankfully all the Trusts arrived at the meeting and got home safely. Just to follow up I was wondering if your would both available on the 9th, 10th or 11th of January for a meeting, Callum and I could come to either Pitlochry or Edinburgh for this meeting. I hope there is a suitable date there and please do let me know which location is best for you.

Kind Regards
Donna-Claire

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation☐☐☐s IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.